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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2019-2020

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

November 12, 2019

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 Present: Provost M. Licari

EX-Officio Absent: President D. Curtis

Guest: R. Gonser, S. Gambill, B. Butwin

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Curtis- No report
   2. Provost M. Licari
      1. Ted Maple will be taking over for Sarah Cobb as the new V.P. of the Lilly Foundation. We had a quick meeting with him about enrollment. He then toured a few of the colleges before returning to Normal Hall for a meeting with Linda Maule.
      2. I just left the dedication of the updated fine arts building. If you haven’t had a chance to see it you should take the opportunity to visit. The building now has a glass atrium with new artwork that is on display and the art work can be seen from outside of the building. We have also moved the Community School for the Arts to the main floor. This will give parents and children better access.
      3. Earlier this week was the Inclusive Excellence Awards. Advisor Venita Stallings from the University College received the award, along with the C.H.I.L.L. student group form the Bayh College of Education.
      4. Dr. Curtis and I had a meeting with Linda Maule about how some disadvantaged groups are not graduating in four years. These gaps are between fifteen and twenty percent. We are working on how to put our heads together to lower this rate and get those students across the stage.
2. Chair Report: C. MacDonald
   * 1. Today we will be discussing the proposed changes to 922, now that they have been to both SAC and FAC. SAC passed a resolution of support, so long as “the revisions minimize additional trauma to involved parties and lessens the potential for chilling effect (non-reporting)”. FAC was not comfortable endorsing the policy without attached procedures. Our other agenda item today will be Graduate Council’s Program review self-study directions and template. Coming this week will be a request to consider donating to the Faculty Senate Scholarship, so keep your eyes out for it. Let me encourage you and your colleagues to contribute to this worthy scholarship. You don’t have to be a member of the Faculty Senate to do so!
     2. I will also be adding an Executive Session at the end of this meeting.
3. Approval of October 29, 2019 Minutes -- File #1

Approval of minutes M. Chambers, S. Phillips: 9-0-0

1. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. Online Class Policy
      1. S. Phillips: I have a student that needs to take an online class for graduation. I was told that there was no way a campus based student can take an online class. I was wondering what the new policy is about this?
      2. M. Licari: That is a misinterpretation of what I said. There are some sections that are reserved for distance students, because there have been cases in the past where there hasn’t been enough seats for the distances students to take classes they need because campus based students have signed up for those classes. At this time there seems to be a disconnect on how this is going to work moving forward. We are working fixing that. We have to figure out a way to make this work since at this time our distance students make up eighteen percent of enrolled students and we are looking at that moving to twenty five percent within the next five years.
      3. S. Kopaczewski: There used to be a way to block classes.
      4. M. Licari: There is but we didn’t want to go that far.
      5. K. Games: This should be an easy fix.
      6. R. Guell: One way to fix the problem would be to create two sections. One for distance students and another for online students then leave those open for certain amount of time before opening up for everyone.
      7. S. Phillips: Well, this student needs this class to graduate and I am worried about the student not getting to take the class.
      8. R. Guell: The department chair should be able to waive the closed status of the class.
      9. M. Chambers: There needs to be something in MYSAM that the sections are for distances students.
      10. R. Guell: When classes open there seems to a feeding frenzy with no priority given to the correct students. This seems to be a self-created problem on many levels. With more students moving to distance learning and more classes converting to that format we need make this part of the normal structure.
      11. M. Licari: Yes, this will be a more pronounced area in the future. We still need to open up more opportunities for other types of students. There are going to be less students in the future and more competition for those students. We need to find a way to open our doors for students that are distance and want to complete their degree part time in a short period of time. We also need to look at transfer students that have two year degrees or those that have some college and want to complete their degree.
   2. Library Services
      1. S. Arvin: Several librarians and staff have expressed concern about the quality of service that we are able to provide due to the budget-related cuts in staffing and resources. Some of the staff are struggling to keep up with increased workloads. Some of the changes that have been made are that we no longer share with faculty via a webpage when we discard specific book titles. The person that used to do this retired and this was a time consuming duty. Another change is that when we purchased eBooks we attached Metadata to them to make them easier to find and now we don’t have time to do that, which makes the book harder to find in the system. If people can’t find them, they can’t use them and the purchase was for nothing. We are also found that sometimes eBook batches weren’t uploaded into the catalog and this error was not caught until someone looks them up only to not find them. Another concern is that we cut the budget on subscription services but there are still articles that are needed from those journals. Now it just takes longer to get them because we have to order them via Interlibrary Loan service, where we just charge their cost to a different budget. We understand why there have been budget cuts. We are concerned that learning and research needs are not going to be met. I just wanted to share our concerns and why.
   3. Not enough training at NFO for FAD system
      1. M. Chambers: How much of the FAD system is being covered in the NFO for new faculty?
      2. M. Licari: They don’t spend a lot of time covering the FAD system during the NFO. There isn’t enough time to go into a lot of detail during the NFO.
      3. R. Guell: A representative of the Department needs to be covering the FAD system with the new faculty.
      4. M. Chambers: That was not our departments understanding.
      5. M. Licari: Yes, a member of the departmental personnel committee or for the Department Chair need to cover this so that the new faculty can be successful.
   4. Search for new faculty
      1. C. MacDonald: What is the status in the search for new faculty?
      2. M. Licari: We have not approved any new faculty searches at this time. We looking at the budget and things are tight. We will get more information from Diann McKee next week. At this time I have told the Deans to hold off.
   5. Communication and Marketing
      1. M. Chambers: What is happening with the communications and marketing department? Is it being split?
      2. M. Licari: Yes, the two are being split. The Marketing Department in Gillum will be targeting on brand awareness and recruiting students. The Communication Department in Parsons now reports to the President.
2. FAC/SAC item: 922 Revisions

Motion to approve R. Guell, S. Kopaczewski: 8-0-0

* 1. B. Butwin: There hasn’t been an update on policy 922 since 2015. We have met with the different committees to discuss the changes that are being made to the policy. We are trying to update the policy and procedures based on new regulations that are being released along with following best practices but we want to do it in such a way that there isn’t a chilling effect. We are sharing what we have now because we don’t want there to be any surprises but this is still a fluid environment. We are working creating a comfortable environment for both parties and to provide equitable resources which has not been the case in the past. We want students to know about the life line law and that they won’t get in trouble for something else when reporting. In many cases the RA’s will report an issue and we investigate but there isn’t much we can do when one of the parties isn’t an ISU student other than help the ISU student get to the proper resources.
  2. R. Guell: If the complainant is an ISU student does it matter if the accused is a student at a different institution? How will this work if they are at two different colleges?
  3. S. Gambill: We have had cases where the incident happened at a different school and in those cases that school is responsible for the investigation. We are still responsible for getting our students the resources that they need.
  4. K. Games: How does this work with digital content if it doesn’t happen on the ISU network?
  5. S. Gambill: We look at how this affects the student’s learning environment. In some cases the students have sexted someone then that person tries to blackmail them. We get the students to proper places to help them.
  6. S. Gambill: Some of the changes made to the policy was to remove the procedures. We have also rearranged the policy so that it flows better. We have moved the duties of the Title IV coordinator to the being. We have changed some of the language in the policy. We have made statements more gender neutral. We have change relationship violence to intimate partner violence. We have changed that students have the option to participate in the process to that they will be required to participate. We are working how to set up the when they go before the panel. In the past we have shuffled participants in and out of the room.
  7. R. Guell: Will the parties know if new information is presented as it happens?
  8. B. Butwin: With the new process they will. Currently the mediator repeats everything back to the first party to confirm it and lets them know the information will be shared with the other party. They have to repeat what was said again. We are working on improving the process so that it flows better.
  9. S. Gambill: Once the panel has reached it decision they will give their recommendation to the Title IX coordinator. This will make outcomes more consistent since the committee has twelve members and they only serve three at a time but they don’t have access to prior panel hearings.
  10. R. Guell: Faculty outcomes should be decided by the Provost.
  11. S. Gambill: This is for students only.
  12. R. Guell: Section 4.3.5 Interim Measures. I find that the section prior to a finding questionable. I understand the need to protect the parties but removing a student from a class when it is a student/faculty grievance prior to an investigation could make one party appear culpable. Being able to pull a student out of the class seems like a lot of power.
  13. S. Gambill: A student won’t pulled out of a class until both parties have been spoken with then after that we will look at the power dynamic within the parties involved.
  14. R. Guell: Prior to a finding, I don’t think staff members should have the right to reach into a classroom. That should be at the discretion of the Provost or the President. I would like something to be added in about that in cases prior to any evidence being found. Virgil do you think we will get pushback from the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) without the procedures being included?
  15. V. Sheets: FAC knew that they weren’t the only group involved and so they knew they didn’t have veto authority. I don’t think that there will be huge push back. They just expressed that they wanted to see the procedures and don’t feel like they received that information.
  16. B. Butwin: I am disappointed that FAC feels they didn’t get what they wanted. I thought we provided them the information that they wanted based on what my notes said. They wanted information on the hearings and that the investigations showing it is fair for both parties. Our language covers that. We have legal procedures that have to be followed so that we do what’s best for the University.
  17. C. MacDonald: When a relatively updated procedure is available can it be shared?
  18. R. Guell: Can something be added that once available the draft of the procedures will be shared?
  19. V. Sheet: FAC just felt like the procedure process were going to be shared, but then they weren’t.
  20. B. Butwin: Once we have the final regulations and we know exactly what the procedure needs to be we will share a draft. I don’t want anyone to think we don’t want to share them. It is just such a fluid process at this time we didn’t want to release something only for it to change because we are waiting on that final word on regulations.
  21. R. Guell: Will we have any say on words or timelines?
  22. B. Butwin: We should be able to provide you with the ability to comment.
  23. R. Guell: So you would be willing to add in a 922.12 Procedures to Implement? The procedure will be drafted by the administration and shared with the governance units for comments.
  24. V. Sheets: It should say that future changes to procedures will be shared, i.e., in an ongoing way.
  25. R. Guell: I am suggesting that we pass this today and that you draft in the changes that you feel comfortable with before next Thursdays meeting.
  26. C. MacDonald: I will send this version out to the Senate so that they have a chance to process this with the knowledge that this will be updated.

1. GC items: Program Review Self-Study Directions & Program Review Self-Study Template – Files #2 & 3

Motion to receive information V. Sheets, S. Kopaczewski: 8-0-0

* 1. R. Gonser: Graduate Council was charged with the task of updating the program review procedures. Upon looking at them we noticed that a lot of the information was out of date and it is time to overhaul it since there is a new president with new standards. This will be a two tier process and this is tier one. Graduate Council created an ad hoc committee with a member from each college to look deeper into this and to consult with Susan Powers. We are hoping to roll this out with the start of the next academic year on a rotating cycle but still on the current rotating cycle.
  2. R. Gonser: The new process will allow for the programs to be measured on whatever the current metrics are so that they can demonstrate why the program is valuable to ISU. The Associate Deans will be more involved and have more say in the process. We are trying this process out this year with the College of Health and Human Services. I just sat through an accreditation process with one of the colleges and what they want is not necessarily a good fit for ISU. One of the issues could be they want smaller class size but ISU needs sustainable metrics. They can cut and paste some of the information from the accreditation process but this self-review is more about the education of the program to the ISU community. This will help keep the Graduate Dean up to date on all of the programs. One of the items we have added is the self-study template. We also started distributing back all of the previous self-studies back to the department for review. This is a good way to communicate about what has changed within a program including loss of faculty. Most of the process stays the same with the only major changes are within the assessment and the creation of the self-study template.
  3. R. Gonser: We will roll this out once everyone is happy and look forward to everyone weighing in.

1. Liaison Reports
   1. AAC- No report
   2. AEC- Met November 8th Approved minutes.
   3. CAAC- Met November 5th reviewed a mathematics proposal. Approved a MST minor. Looked at nursing proposals.
   4. FAC- Discussed 922. Updated 310.4 for the time of teaching issue. Worked on clarification of awards committee nominations policy.
   5. FEBC – Met two weeks ago and discussed salary issues. Will meet again tomorrow.
   6. GC- Waiting on clarification of the new charge. Discussed the review of self-studies. Discussed the programs that have not turned in their self-study and what punitive actions need to be taken. Looking for guidance on what actions need to be taken.
   7. SAC- Have not meet.
   8. URC – The URC reviewed all applications and awarded three URC grants (1 fully funded, 1 partially funded, and 1 funded pending notification on if the request was secured by an external grant)
2. Executive Session

Motion to enter executive session: M. Chambers, S. Phillips: 8-0-0

Motion to exit executive session: M. Chambers, S. Phillips: 8-0-0

1. Adjournment: 4:54 pm.