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1. Administrative Reports
2. President Curtis

Greetings everyone from a snow packed campus. Sidewalks are cleared and we are ready for everyone to return.

I want to start out with an update on the search for Vice President of Academic Affairs. I also want to thank the committee for their outstanding work. It was a pleasure to meet with them last Wednesday. Please wait for an announcement early next week.

Spring enrollment numbers are 9662 plus another 246 duel credit students. This has certain budget implications and we have already sent out an announcement about that. We met with the University Budgetary Committee on February 8, 2021. The two points that we discussed were completing the FY21 year and preparations for the FY22 year. There will be more to come. I will say to you that we are working diligently and with confidence that we will finish FY21 in the black. Everyone has done such a good job managing spending to make sure that we are moving towards a positive outcome. I will ask you to continue to do that. We will meet with the University Budgetary Committee at least two more times as planning rolls out. We have three scenarios we are using to plan. At this time we are sticking to the middle of the road one depending on what things take place. Deans, vice presidents, and cabinet members are all working with their divisions to prepare for a budget that will be one that we can live with in FY22. We will keep you updated as different pieces unfold. We are watching the work that is taking place in Indy. Currently it looks like we are going to have that seven percent reversion restored in this next biennium. This will be good news. It maybe a little bit more because we hit our performing funding measures. So there are some good signs on the horizon and I am a cup half full type of person. We will manage through this.

I want to lift up the Charles E. Brown African American Cultural Center and the Black History Month Committee for the wonderful array of opportunities that they have provided for all of us in this Zoom environment over the last two weeks. I have really enjoyed participating in serval of the events. My take away has been great appreciation for the enormous effort and knowledge from our staff and faculty that not only planned but presented as well. Not only that but the tremendous inspiration from our students that have engaged in these activities. There have been some technical difficulties during this process but they have shown resilience in presenting this. There is still about ten more days left so please visit one of the future presentations. It has been a wonderful event for us this spring.

Now I turn to this bitter sweet moment that I will finish my remarks with. Mike Licari came to Indiana State University in 2015. He has managed a portfolio that includes: academic affairs, enrollment management, marketing, information technology, institutional research, extend online learning, university college, college of graduate and professional studies, research and sponsored programs, the honors college, residential life and inclusive excellence, title IV, global engagement, student success, and library services just name a few. He has hired six new deans in the years that he has been here. He has reorganized several division since 2015. His off-campus engagement has included Riley’s Children’s Hospital Foundations Society, Rotary Club Board, Rural Health Innovation Collaborative President and Board Member, Cross Roads of America Boy Scout Council of Indiana, Terre Haute Symphony Orchestra President and Board Member, band buster at Terre Haute North High School, and certainly most significantly to many of us he has been a colleague, a mentor, confidant, counselor, psychoanalyst, fixer, and most of all a good friend. It was my distinct honor on February 2, 2021 to award Mike Licari with the Jones Medal in recognition of his distinguished service to Indiana State University. Mike your ISU family wishes you the very best as you and Kristin next special adventure. Indiana State University is a better place because you were here.

1. Provost Licari

Thank you. It has been a wonderful not quite six years and I owe it all to everyone around me. These kinds of jobs and particularly this one isn’t a solo ride by any means. Thank you all for you collaboration. This year and past years many have of you have been Senate Chairs and I have enjoyed working with you. We have gotten a lot done and that is what really matters at the end of the day. I hope I have made the institution better. I hope our work made the institution better for the students that are here and the communities that we serve, because that is why we are all in higher education. We are all interest in something bigger than ourselves. Thank you for help, support, and friendship. Good luck, even though you don’t need it. I will be watching you of course. We will be in touch and I will be back in May for commencement. This isn’t Goodbye it is a temporary displacement. Thank you very much.

1. Chair Report Liz Brown

This in Mike’s last Executive meeting. We will be able to see him again on Thursday at the Faculty Senate meeting. I will have longer remarks at that time.

1. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
2. Budget (summer compensation)

R. Guell: This is a question for the President on the budget. Some of us have been talking about a concession by faculty on summer compensation on both CREF and CAP. FEBC passed recommendations on both. In those discussions it has been suggested that V.P. McKee would not count them unless they were permeant and inscribed in the handbook. I am uncomfortable making a significant compensation concession if it’s a) not going to count or b) has to be permanent in the face of a temporary budget situation. Could you clarify whether an endorsement of capping summer compensation on a base of $75,000 and not paying CREF if it were for a few years would count as to Academic Affairs contributions to budget cutting?

D. Curtis: This is the first I have heard of this but I would be willing to have this conversation. The best place to start is with Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Let me get the background information on that first and look at whatever materials are available. If FEBC has moved those forward that is wonderful news. I am incredibly appreciative of that effort. Please send any information that you have to me so we can talk about this at Faculty Senate Executive meetings with Vice President McKee.

L. Brown: FEBC hasn’t officially moved it on but Debra and Lindsey both let me know that is what they had passed. It should be coming to us soon.

L. Eberman: Liz, are the minutes required?

L. Brown: No just the motions.

1. Weather Related Closing

C. MacDonald: My question is weather related. I just looked up the travel advisories and our county is still red. I am just wonder about our timeline for making decisions for tomorrow and whether we will be back on campus.

D. Curtis: We certainly are in active conversation with not only our off campus people but with our campus personal about whether we can be prepared to have people back on campus tomorrow. It will be sooner than later when we put that information out. We will put that update out quickly. I know that there is new information coming in from facilities sense of where they are with campus preparedness.

1. Approval of Executive Minutes for February 2, 2021 File #1

Motion to approve with edits M. Chambers, C. MacDonald: 9-0-0

1. FAC Items
2. University Wide Chairs Council File #2

Motion to approve C. MacDonald, M. Chambers: 0-0-9

D. Selman: Senate asked FAC to first query department chairs to determine if there was an interest in establishing a regular way the University Wide Chairs Council that has already been taking place informally. Brian Bunnett kind of headed this up the last year or so. Since he is gone, we have surveyed the faculty and department chairpersons there is an interest in it. We felt it was important to spell out what those rolls are. This won’t make them an official input body but having them as resource. They will also provide resources for chairs and a place to learn, explore and grow together. We are putting this in a more formal way because there were people that weren’t even aware of it that really felt they could have used it and would want to use it in the future.

T. Hawkins: A quick grammar point. 6.3 UWCC is singular and it should read ‘member of its choosing.’

R. Guell: I am not sure what the real necessity of putting language such as this in the handbook if the body in fact doesn’t have actual authorities. Anybody’s can meet at any time, as well as any subgroup if it doesn’t have a role in reviewing and removing policy in any way. I am not sure if this is a useful addition to the handbook.

C. MacDonald: Since I am one of the people that asked for this to happen, I understand Bob’s point. We need it to go somewhere, as we have been operating in kind of void. As chairs would get these emails from Brian Bunnett stating this was happening and you are required to come, for new chairs it felt very context less. Having a mechanism in place for selecting the leadership of that group will be very helpful. If not in the handbook than where?

L. Eberman: I am inclined to agree with Bob in terms of some sort of authority attached isn’t attached to it so to it doesn’t make sense to me for it to be in the handbook. I also get Chris’ point. It seems to me like an infinity group needs to be more formally developed. I would guess that the Black Faculty and Staff Coccus is not formalized anywhere either but they certainly are an infinity group since they have shared interest and work. Is there a plan to develop these groups more formally across campus that doesn’t include being in the handbook.

D. Selman: I think one of the other pieces of this is that at least in the last couple of years it has had the financial support of Provost’s office and I think that there was some concern with our Provost changing that there was a need for it to be somewhere so that people understood what it was, what its mission is, and to add some legitimacy that it does have some resources for support.

V. Sheets: I can go either way on the formalization of this myself. I could recognize that there is value sometimes in specifying that there is a group that doesn’t have direct authority. Historically our faculty has sometimes been a little worried about groups of administrators that get together for things. Having some clarification that the reasons they are getting together are not to engage in thing against the faculty is not a bad idea.

T. Hawkins: Personally I think that I am persuaded by Bob’s perspective on this. I don’t think that it needs to be in the handbook. The language needs to exist. I would suggest that maybe Donna has already illuminated the correct place for this to go and this can go on the Academic Affairs website, so that it exist. It doesn’t need a place in the handbook itself. Bodies that exist in the handbook exist for something of a different reason and this should not be confused with those organizations.

R. Guell: I am reminded of the “Council of Governance Chairs” that was in the handbook that was a required meeting of the governance bodies with the Faculty Senate Chair. We struck it around the time that I was Chair because it had no authorities and had basically ceased to meet. In a time when we needed to formalize face to face meetings for the purposes of communication, prior to email, those bodies had a communication function. This one had a training function that had been described and had a serious gap and a support of one another function which at times has had a serious lacking. I think Tim’s idea of placing this on the Academic Affairs website is better place for it. Acknowledging the annual meeting of the Academic Affairs retreat being one of the times in which the chairs meet and perhaps one other time during the year that have that meeting. To have it be in such a way as it needs to be for training and collaborating.

L. Brown: I have been thinking as I wasn’t sure either. Here’s another thing to consider as it comes in the language about chairs and it is responsibility of the chair to participate in these meetings when they occur. Could it perform that function? Could it say here is another responsibility or duty of that chair person?

D. Selman: Just to give a little bit more information of our conversation in the committee. One of the things we wanted to make sure of is that this was a chair generated topics, chair generated needs, and remained in the wheelhouse of the chairs themselves rather than becoming another duty that chairs have to perform. So tying it to the Academic Affairs retreat, yes that is a meeting that they go to, but that is required and we didn’t want to do that kind of linking to requirements. It was more supportive rather than chairs must do this kind of duty.

C. MacDonald: I think that is good. We all go to the AA retreat, but finding another time when all of the chairs would be available during the year as required would be lucky. I am good with it just being on the Academic Affairs website the way it is.

J. Gustafson: I am not a chairperson and I know that we are all stretched to our limits and from speaking with many chairpersons on campus they are the most stretched thin people. My worry when I saw this was that we are much better at creating excess work for ourselves than we are cleaning up the handbook and once this is placed in the handbook it would become an obligation. I am philosophically opposed to creating more duties or committee work. I did not know until Donna said this that it already a standing practice. If it a standing practice and it works well let’s keep it as a standing practice.

V. Sheet: I am hearing and am supportive of placing it on the Academic Affairs website. Do we need a motion remove the numbers so there is no mistake this is a handbook item? Do we need to formally approve it?

L. Brown: I don’t think we need to formally approve it just for it to go there and then there is no reason for it to go to senate either.

J. Gustafson: Do we need to move to table it or do we just vote it down.

K. Yousif: Just vote it down.

L. Brown: This is a friendly no. I appreciate the work that FAC did on that. The Academic Affairs website is the best for this and hopefully they will have good administrative support for chair.

1. Resolutions File #3

Motion to approve J. Gustafson, L. Eberman: 9-0-0

L. Brown: The next item on the list is the resolution that came to us with unanimous from the subcommittee of Minoritized Faculty Concerns and FAC.

K. Yousif: Donna, I just want to say thank you for this. SAC really wanted to write something on this but could not come with something as polished.

D. Selman: Thank you for that. This was directly out of the Subcommittee for Minotized Faculty. They worked really hard and educated many of their own members to make this happen. I think it speaks for itself and it particularly timely and appropriate given that it is Black History month. I would just like to say we really wanted to speak to this regardless of whatever the University is forced to make legally or otherwise. We just wanted to be out in front of this and let the student know how we feel about this.

J. Gustafson: I know that we are under some legal obligation to allow this to go forward but we can object and object loudly. I know that Katie is online and I would like to hear her perspective on whether we are doing anything that will put us in legal jeopardy doing this.

K. Butwin: The Institutional position is different than the Faculty Senate resolution, this resolution or any other frankly, and that is part of the whole idea of free expression that allow us engage in these kind of debates and discussions. I will just say that legally I am much more comfortable defending your right to say things about particular topics than I am with shutting down speech to begin with. I would say institutionally we are not going to take a position on the resolution specifically today. I will refer that to Mike/Chris Olsen and Debra. From a legal perspective you can take a position as the faculty Senate.

T. Hawkins: I am not philosophically opposed to the resolution. I think it is fine. I think that it possible that there might opposition to it. Unanimously presumes that everyone will be supportive of it and I don’t think you can say that in advance. It might wind up with unanimous consent here and in the senate but to have it in the resolution in advances is not appropriate.

V. Sheets: It wasn’t in advance to the committees that forwarded it.

L. Brown: So they just said not opposed and the unanimous was added afterwards?

V. Sheets: No the unanimously was true for each committee that forward it. It was true for them. If Senate choose to remove unanimous it is up to them.

T. Hawkins: I think it should be removed ahead of time and allowed to be placed back in later. If it happens to be a unanimous vote that will speak to itself. I don’t think the word is appropriate in a resolution ahead of a vote.

L. Brown: I agree too.

R. Guell: Again a question of Katie and perhaps the president. Do we have a stated goal/requirement that all student organizations adhere to? For instance if there was an organization of Muslim student or strict Christian students that objected to the sexual orientation/gender identity aspect. Do we currently band such organizations from existence on campus?

K. Butwin: So we require that our student organizations take all comers. That means a student organizations cannot discriminate based on of these basis based and this is based on litigation and court decisions. There are some nuances to fraternities and sororities, and you have all seen the articles in Chronical of Higher Education about the Harvard situation and the litigation that followed. That is why we are updating policy 450 to make it stronger. I have talked length with Brooks-Moore and I feel confident that they are very clear about our student organizations. Student organization should not discriminated against and organization or group in practices within memberships.

R. Guell: So because the word here is access, it does clearly state the rules of the institution correct? In the third bullet it provides just and equitable access.

K. Butwin: I think it gets there. I have to look at the language of our policy specifically to figure out exactly what we say and if there is any room within that, but I think the point is all comers.

D. Selman: Virgil do you know if my understanding is correct and that they were work from the wording of the policy language to make these bullet points?

V. Sheet: We all sort of contribute to this and I am trying to remember who added that point. I don’t recall off hand. I believe your statement right about what they were working from.

L. Eberman: I don’t know if we landed on Tim’s recommendation but from a grammatical perspective all three bullet points started with a verb. I am going to motion that we strike the word unanimously.

L. Brown: Can that be a friendly amendment?

R. Guell: That would be a unanimous consent request.

L. Brown: Anyone object to that?

V. Sheets: If senate unanimously votes for this can that be put back in?

K. Yousif: Can’t someone at senate ask for a unanimous consent request to put unanimously back in?

T. Hawkins: That’s still before the vote.

R. Guell: After the vote it is easy for some to make the request to put it back in.

J. Gustafson: Can it be made conditional? That is if this unanimously passes that unanimously can be added back in.

V. Sheets: I will not object to the unanimous consent removal of unanimously.

L. Brown: There are no objections so let remove unanimously and if it is a unanimous at senate vote we can vote to put it back in.

1. Strategic Plan Updates: President Curtis, T. Exline, and B, Balch

D. Curtis: First, I want to thank everyone that has been a part of the process so far and kind of highlight at this point that this is first draft. I was sharing that with trustee Taylor today that there will continue to be revisions between now and May. A lot of work has gone into it at this point. I want to thank Brad and Teresa so much for facilitating this in a year that could have easily pushed aside this work. They have maintained the persistence in moving us forward. There have a lot of people that have participated in this so far and there is still more work to be done. I want to ask each of you as we move forward to think about the very specific years ahead of us. Next four years are critical given the environment we currently in and it will have an impact on them. Please use that lens when we are taking a look at we are committing to do. One thing I will say is that there may be many more good ideas that could be in this. I am going to ask you to use that lens. Are these correct goals and strategies to move the needle on our core mission over these next four years? We really need to focus on the most likely goals to move our needle on some of these strategies.

T. Exline: I would like to reiterate that this going to be formally presented to the Board of Trustees and to campus on Friday but we wanted you to have a chance to have a preview of it, but we would encourage everyone to invite people to attend that work session Friday morning at 9 o’clock. The zoom link is on meeting notice off of the Board of Trustees. There will be announcements in the ISU today the rest of the week. This is an opportunity to share it. After Friday we will also have this available on the strategic planning website. We will also have some sort access to the qualtrics survey for feedback. We really just wanted to let you know about the process, were we are, and what work we have left to do.

B. Balch: A few additional comments and a heartfelt thanks to the committees for each goal. They accomplished so much in a short amount of time. It really added validity to both our strategy and KPI’s. The President challenged the goal committees to keep our KPI’s to minimum. Hopefully you will see some efficacy built in to this four year plan as we tried only determine the essential metrics that measure success. What isn’t in the power point is our next steps for us as we will have some parallel pathways between and May. The Trustee will receive this on Friday and be made public. Next week will also publish the qualtrics survey for feedback. It will be available for a four to six week period. The drafts will also be shared with the broader governance units and different stakeholder groups. At some point near the end of March Goal Committees will have opportunities to meet again to review feedback and start prepare a final draft. We will share that draft in early April with our governance units.

T. Exline: Just clarify on one point that you made I believe that Liz had planned for the strategic plan would be on the March agenda for the Faculty Senate.

L. Brown: Meaning you could present it there.

K. Yousif: It is unclear what the process you want for feedback. Do you prefer I question here or do request I fill out one of the surveys? What are looking for from us today?

B. Balch: Suggestions that would influence edits between now and Friday would not be the case. What I was hoping for was to get a sense of the general reaction from the Executive Committee. This next round of feedback will the KPI’s broken down and you will have the ability to pick and choose the ones you want to react to. We have two options for selecting feedback. There will also be a video presentation in the power point that has the option to opt out if you have already seen it. Our hope is that to have an informed response that people will take time to watch the video. I think the answer is both.

R. Guell: My faculty sensibilities is like fingernails on a chalkboard to see the notion that ISU has a brand. In goal five the Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) in regards to the university’s brand awareness as well as athletics appears far to centrally to the notion of institutional reputation. I don’t mind use goal four within goal five with is the use of athletics in the connectiveness between internal and external audiences. That is a great use of athletic, but then measuring athletics KPI’s five by talking about attendance at competitions doesn’t seem like a core mission item and not a core mission kind of measure.

T. Hawkins: I was wondering what you about the areas in the strategic plan that might be most vulnerable to a budget crisis. I would think that is something in the next few weeks need to be addressed and depending on what happens might not be able to be funded.

B. Balch: First of all in this consultancy role to impose myself on this. I see increasingly as we arrive in May more of consultative role on structure and process. I believe strongly in committee compositions we put together and their willingness to participate. Bob’s requires about athletic is a good request to deposit back with that committee and have them revisit that. We need to trust that our colleagues can discuss this thoroughly and that your reactions are going to help form this process. I don’t feel comfortable reacting to a single issue in my role, but I take your feedback very seriously. We have not charge committees with having a budget crisis discussion to see where areas might compete to gain ground in area to lose it in another. I think what you asked is fair question that needs to be looked at. So far discussion have been around developing strategies and KPI’s.

J. Gustafson: Thank you. This is very well developing document overall. I was trying to read this from the perspectives of my colleagues and where we could be good partners in this. A lot of it is very much a top down reshuffling of the university but beyond goals two and three it hard to engage with this as a faculty member. It’s hard process how much of this going to filter down to things we can effect. A lot of it seems external, budgertary, or beyond what I can do in the classroom or my department to adapt to thing the university needs to as a whole. That is one piece of feedback is that this felt a little alien to me and where this is going to touch on my day to day life. Bob had this word that was like fingernails on a chalkboard to him and mine was workplace. I was happy to see that there was less this time around of ISU has job training. I thought it was much more tastefully done this time as compare with the past.

B. Balch: thank you James. Your comment about finding a fit in the plan is duly noted. We wanted to maintain fidelity to the chain of command structure so it’s probably your felling that V.P. level phraseology. In some plans there is even greater detail such strategies would give rise to move initiatives under each strategy. Some plans are also fraught with trust. I like that this plan stops at the KPI’s but we will still have targets that will list success meanings and that will be forth coming once these drafts are fairly well in place. We are trusting that through chain of command that a fit can be made.

M. Chambers: I want to pick up with James last point and I know this has been brought up every time we have looked at this document. The whole issue with preparing the workforce. It might have less but it still bothers me. More importantly as I am looking at the KPI’s and some of the strategies in there I don’t see much that connects strongly with workforce development. A lot of the strategies and KPI’s are just typical things that we would expect to do as we are trying develop better people. I am wondering a little bit, knowing that you are going to get pushback from faculty on the issue of workforce as it is in there in several places, if that is not what is being measured in some of the specific measures and goals is it necessary to put it out there so front and center? It seems to me that it isn’t really being measured and you are creating angst among the faculty.

B. Balch: Your point being that through our strategy and KPI’s we may not have made the case for the bold statement in goal three where we say build a skilled workforce. Is that the point you are making?

M. Chambers: How are you going to measure that? Let me click on goal three. It says through experiential learning and career readiness which are something we already do and that is not necessarily building a skilled workforce. Preparing students to be responsive and culturally competent. We want that generally and that not necessarily building a skilled workforce. As I look at those and the KPI’s. What percentage of course are getting experiential learning and how many recent graduates have positive outcomes on the first destination survey? What is the percentage that community based learning courses or intensive co-curricular service experience? What is that we are saying is workforce development verses things that we have already been talking about? It is going to grate on faculty ears like fingernails on the chalkboard. Those are things that we have already been doing and it’s not necessarily workforce, but developing the whole person. Why have the one term that is going to create some to take offense?

B. Balch: Good point, thank you.

L. Eberman: I want to say that I appreciate that we have put goal one front and center. It is clear alignment with the advancing and inclusive excellence plan. I think when that plan was first presented I asked how we were going to measure those outcomes and I am glad to see that direct connection with those KPI’s. Relative to goal five and I think it has a shared KPI with goal three. One observation I have is relative KPI number one is that the focus here is on posts verses formal engagement and actual impressions. We can increase our posts but if we are not actually connecting with people or if people are not interacting social media content than the posting is less meaningful. As we consider that as a KPI we need to think about engagements and impressions as a more reasonable metric for that kind of KPI. I want to reinforce what Bob said relative to the KPI’s related to five and I realize that repeating ourselves it not super helpful but I believe in this case that status saturation inform everyone if something should be included or modified. In terms of KPI four for goal five and shared KPI in goal three, I am curious about the special emphasis on student athletes given the small percent of students on campus are athletes. If we are going to identify with specialty populations we should be considering larger swaths of people. Specifically identifying student athletes in these KPI’s seems odd to me given the whole goal to me is about diversifying, so when we narrow what we are diversifying seem to be contradicting to me.

C. MacDonald: Were this to make sense to the faculty as a whole would be to fill in some of the things Mike Chambers was talking about. It makes sense to me to make explicit how the priorities that we have on the beginning impact our goals and how they relate. How each strategy under those goals are linked to those performance indicators. Often in these kinds of plans KPI’s have been something that we can measure that has something vaguely to do with this and not tell us something that is meaningful. I think that it really important that out KPI’s tell us something that is meaningful that directly allows us to say this strategy we are pushing this and here is the data to prove it. Rather than we are doing all of this things and they may or may not relate to our strategy. In one place we talk about student retention and that is obvious but there other place where the connections are not as obvious. Some of the conversation has been who is the audience that the strategic plan for? Is it just us? Is this an internal document that guides everything we do or is this a document that informs outside audience about what we are and what we do? If it is more of an external document than workforce goes down a little better because external constituent’s understand that word, but if it is a more internally facing document than we might want to look at deeper.

B. Balch: Good point Chris. It will have an external impact, but appreciate that narrarative needs to point back to the original priorities to help make the case as opposed to just leaping in to strategies and KPI’s.

K. Yousif: They have asked all of the questions I had. I just want to repeat one which is a question of budget. I am particularly concerned about goal two and strategy three which is case management and advising for undergraduates. While I nothing against case management and advising, since it probably quite effective, it is extremely expensive and time consuming. I guess I would echo Tim’s question about asking some of these goal committees about to consider the budget reality that is upon us for the next few years as they are suggesting things that could cost a lot of money.

R. Guell: This maybe a point that is to pedantic even for me. In goals one through four you have strategies that lead to KPI’s. So in goal two you have strategy that is number five which is to transform graduate and undergraduate programs and processes to recruit no traditional transfer students and then you have measures of those kinds of things that are in the KPI’s. In goal four for instance you have strategy to increase Indiana State University endowment through increased donor funding and you have a KPI is about dollars and continued growth in fund raising. So it the thing you are going to do and the result you are going to get. Whereas five has results that are self-achieving such as increase university presents in media placements. You just spend money on that KPI rather than what you are going to do that is going cause us to have higher media placements for the university and athletics. There was no giant committee of all of the committees in this process and we just had our meeting on our set. Five just stands out to me as indicators that do not result from strategies where all the rest of them do.

J. Gustafson: I wanted hear about the life cycle of the strategic plan as this is four year document and will obviously go through stages. Are these committees going to hang on? Are these committees going to be involved in developing the next stage? Are these going to be handed off to the person responsible listed for each strategy and goal? What sort of engagement beyond this with those responsible persons and committees and where does that filter to everybody else?

B. Balch: I will the president to respond to what I say isn’t what was envisioned. It is hoped that over the next couple of month that our committees would hold together so that those created those original KPI’s and strategies would have a chance to look at all of the feedback that we will be receiving. Just based on your feedback today there is certainly opportunities for them to react to and think through. There will also be the goal of targets. What is success going to look like through those KPI’s and I think that needs to be an informed conversation since it is larger than any one person. After that I think it slow migration to the person or persons responsible so they can begin to see how those situations play out which hopefully be all the way to the faculty level.

D. Curtis: I will add one more piece. I heard that keeping these committees together throughout the process created a shadow of people responsible for the process when the last plan was created. There was multiple concerns expressed about carrying on committee work beyond the implementation so that the people responsible for those areas are actually responsible for seeing these strategies through and responsible for the target.

J. Gustafson: I am just trying to envision what the four year plan looks like. Are there milestones we are going to try meet as we start to develop goals for each of these? Targets are defined. Are there going to be people embedded in that over the course of four years that figure out what those performance indicators look like and where we are on that path? The other thing I was wondering about is how this going to interact with ambitious plan university transformation and this taskforce that has been put together. This seems quite conservative to some of the goals that being laid out by this committee.

B. Balch: One of the first point you made was about milestones. I think it is envisioned that this will be reviewed twice per year so that updates can be made. With regards to the targets and KPI’s institutional research will take a large role and responsibility in help get these in place. When I working with the trustees it is hoped that this component that they will be receiving in May will be endorsed and that allows flexibility throughout the life cycle to make changes. If changes take place it may not influence the core priorities that the Board of Trustees, but is could change goals, KPI’, targets, or the way we measure them.

 R. Guell: Can I assume that the co-chairs are really referring to the offices that they hold in goal two? It would be the V.P. for Academic Affairs and the Provost that sit in these positions to allow longevity.

D. Curtis: Yes, the position specific.

L. Brown: Thank you Brad and Teresa for sharing with us.

1. Standing Committee Reports
2. AAC (M. Chambers)-No report
3. AEC (R. Guell)-Solicited for grant applications. Will meet the first week of March to decide.
4. CAAC (C. MacDonald)-Met today. Approved a whole bunch of curriculum. Starting grind on both notion of students receiving Pass/Fail grades for certain course as well on Micro-credentialing and Certificate of Strategic Importance.
5. FAC (V. Sheets)- In addition to the thing we looked at today they passed the modification of the tenured extension language based on the COVID acceptance. Did Donna send that to you?

L. Brown: No

V. Sheets: We are also looking at the charge regarding looking the development of a sub-committee for FAC.

R. Guell: I have a question of both Mike Licari and Chris Olsen. Did we settle the question of whether tenure extensions were going out again?

M. Licari: No we did not.

K. Yousif: We have someone that has already asked about when and how they backout the extension. I am hoping that at some point there will be a deadline for this.

M. Licari: Looking forward to this coming fall we had discussed the potential for another round of extensions but we have not made a final decision.

R. Guell: You don’t need to make that decision on your way out the door. That is one item that Chris is capable of making.

M. Licari: You are right that is one item that has not been taken care of and similarly Keri’s suggestion of a firm date/deadline by which faculty know.

K. Yousif: I am not saying that is should be in the next few months. You would think that at some point the candidate would have decide as it make a difference in the type of portfolio they create.

V. Sheets: There was a lot of discussion about this at FAC and we actually stuck a date tentatively in. They would have a firm deadline before the review so the rooting of the FAD could set up properly.

C. Olsen: That would be fine with me as I didn’t know we were discussing another extension. I am happy to take that on.

1. FEBC (L. Eberman): We had a busy meeting on Monday. There was a vote for 4-2-1 remain a base CAP of $75,000 to be used for the PERF calculation summer pay schedule. There was a 6-1-0 vote to recommend the 10% TIAA contribution to be eliminated from the summer pay. I have emailed Debra to ask if those can be forwarded to Liz or I. In addition we meet with Amy Demchak to discuss the management of COVID related issues at faculty and staff level. One of the items that would be helpful from Faulty Senate was the enforcement of the use of the assessment survey. Response rate/completion has gone down since the start of the fall semester and part of that might be due to understanding of when it needs to be filled out. On the front page of the survey it list reason why the survey should be filled out. Can this placed in the musings?

L. Brown: Yes this can be added to the musings.

1. GC (T. Hawkins)- Met on the 3rd. Approved language for curriculum Strategic Importance and Micro- credentialing. It is going to CAAC and then back to GC for final approval. A number of courses were approved for programs. GC meets tomorrow.

C. MacDonald: It shouldn’t go back to GC as CAAC has final authority over the program.

T. Hawkins: The way Rusty understood it would come back.

C. MacDonald: Well that isn’t correct.

T. Hawkins: You can let him know tomorrow.

1. SAC (K. Yousif)-No Report
2. URC (J. Gustafson)-Will meet on March 4th to review grant applications.

1. Adjournment 5 pm