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Guest: B. Stone, E. Farrugia, H. Roberts, C. Spicer, B. Butwin, K. Woods-Johnson, L. Hall, M. Crosby, M. Cohen, R. Gonser, S. Ahmad,

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Curtis
		1. We had a great day packing boxes for our graduates. It reminded me of some of the summer jobs I had while in college. The event was well organized by Jen Keller and her staff. I hope everyone will take the opportunity to tune in on May 16th for our virtual graduation.
		2. We are working towards phasing back to campus. We still have a lot of details to workout. We are releasing video plans this week that lay out the details. Mike Licari and mine were released on Monday, we will have one each day Tuesday through Thursday, and two more on Friday. This will be a slow return.
		3. The Governor continues to point to Friday, May 1 as a moment in time to begin the gradual roll out to slowly re-enter some workplaces. This will be for business and has pointed out that schools and Higher Ed plans will not be released until mid-May.
		4. We are working to develop three robust plans. The normal plan as a measured roll out; an instance where we see a spike on campus following returning to campus; and a situation where there is a worldwide spike which would create larger challenges.
	2. Provost M. Licari
		1. We had a number of individuals help box up about 2,200 commencement packages for our graduating students. We are in the process of shrink wrapping them to get shipped out this week. A shout out goes to Jen Keller and Susan Powers for helping us get this organized in order to prepare it on Monday. They even drafted their families to help set this up. We wanted to make sure that every student received a diploma cover, any honors, and a tassel in the box. We are going to try to have an Instagram tassel turn. I hope that our students appreciate the effort.
		2. The prospect of returning to work is very exciting. We need to feel good about coming back to campus, but we also need to be careful and cautious as we consider this. The pledge I have is that I continue to work collaboratively with Senate leadership so we can work to bring faculty back to campus. We are currently releasing a series of videos that detail different areas and their plans for returning back to campus.
		3. Registration is tracking well as compared to previous years’ persistence rates which is very good news. Freshmen just began registering this week, they have a ways to go, but we got out of the gate strong. We are already at sixty-five percent of our goal. Last year we were at fifty-five percent at the same time. This is a testament that the advisors in the UC are doing great work. Normally, May 1 would have been the deadline for new student enrollment, but this year we are extending that. For the incoming freshmen class will continue to require work and we plan on maximizing the month of May.
2. Chair Report: C. MacDonald
3. Here we are – the last formal Exec meeting of the semester. This academic year, while seeming so slow at some points, is now nearly over, and it is difficult to believe that we are nearly at the end. It seems so anticlimactic, given how hard we have all worked to ensure the success of our students during these challenging times, that we are having so few celebrations this semester. We look forward to hopefully being able to celebrate more with each other this Fall. We will have an informal Exec meeting next week, and I will send out a link for it. While we usually have this meeting at Condit House, and enjoy beverages and snacks provided by the President, this year it will have to be BYOB.
4. Standing committee reports were to be due to us before the last Senate meeting of the year, which is in two days. So, clearly that is not going to happen, so I have emailed the chairs of all the committees, including the template, which is available on the University Faculty Blackboard site, and extended the deadline until May 8.
5. On today’s agenda are a number of curricular items: a couple more licensure programs that no longer lead to licensure, a new minor in Information Technology, and a restructuring proposal for the School of Nursing. We will follow that with proposed revisions to section 170 of the Policy Library, brought to us by the Assessment Council, and take a look at the Standing Committee slates for next year. Malea Crosby will present the website that she is creating to help provide resources for our part-time temporary faculty, and we will discuss the results of the survey of the faculty regarding our core priorities and potential for budget cuts.
6. Approval of March 31, 2020 Minutes -- File #1

Motion to approve minutes R. Guell, M. Chambers: 9-0-0

1. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. Return to Campus
		1. R. Guell: Like I stated in the meeting this morning, it is my contention that faculty should be the ones to judge their comfort level in returning to teach face-to-face in the fall. Faculty members should not be compelled to return to campus to teach if they feel it will be detrimental to their health or the health of their loved ones.
		2. C. MacDonald: I agree with Bob. The health of our campus community should be our first priority.
	2. C.A.R.E.S Act
2. R. Peters: I had a question which has been floated around already. We see that Indiana State is receiving approximately ten million dollars for the COVID-19 pandemic. Will we see where that money will be distributed?
3. D. Curtis: Half of that money must go directly to students. There are requirements which have to be met for students to receive that money. We believe approximately six thousand students will receive some sort of payment. I have signed paperwork for the other half of the money. The money has not yet been distributed. We are studying the best place to put this money to help offset losses. This will not be enough money to recover all of the money we had to pay back to students.
4. R. Guell: Has there been any conversation about if the State will be able to meet the conditions to receive the second half of the Federal CARES Act money?
5. D. Curtis: There has been no formal conversations, but the discussion among the governmental affairs individuals have been trying to address this question. If the State meets their obligation it will be based on the last three years. By that standard, if state could cut us and still meet the obligation under the Act.
6. R. Guell: If they stick to the levels of the Act they could penalize us by cutting some of our funding.
7. D. Curtis- Yes, but as for the Federal money that will be all we get.
8. CAAC items:
	1. Move to approve the elimination of the following programs lot R. Guell, S. Kopaczewski: 9-0-0
		1. Economics for Social Studies Licensure (elimination) [https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4156/form](https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal%3A4156/form)
		2. History for Social Studies Licensure (elimination) [https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4158/form](https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal%3A4158/form)
	2. Motion to Approve S. Phillips, R. Guell: 9-0-0
		1. Minor in Information Technology (new) [https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4131/form](https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal%3A4131/form)
			1. E. Wittenmyer: I assisted in the beginning of the development of this program. It is my understanding that none of the classes will change only the prerequisites. From the courses that are listed it appears as if nothing has changed.
			2. R. Peters: When I was on Academic Affairs Committee approving this there was a course CS256 as prerequisite that had to be changed to allow ECT168 or CS256. This minor is a collection of courses that would allow someone to get a minor in information technology. I know that the computer science department was pleased to have this as a minor.
	3. Motion to Approve V. Sheets, M. Chambers: 9-0-0
		1. School of Nursing Restructuring Proposal Files # 2-3
			1. L. Hall: The purpose of this memorandum of understanding (MOU) is to propose a reorganization of the current School of Nursing into one unit. The School of Nursing currently has three departments: Baccalaureate Nursing, Baccalaureate Nursing Completion, and Advanced Practice Nursing. The School of Nursing proposes merging the current three departments into a single academic unit with three nursing programs: baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral. This proposal was created by a taskforce of faculty and staff within the School of Nursing, in consultation with the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) Executive Committee and ISU Academic Affairs. The School of Nursing faculty voted in favor of the proposed structure 18-6-8. Staff were polled separately and voted in favor of the proposed structure 10-2-2.

The reorganization is supported by the CHHS mission and strategic plan to ensure program competitiveness and student success and to seek and align resources with college goals. The proposed restructure helps to align the School of Nursing with other institutions of higher education. While the “school” designation is very common among nursing structures throughout both Indiana and the United States, the further delineation into departments is not common. The proposed restructuring will remove barriers so the School of Nursing may effectively share both teaching and staff resources. This new structure creates flexibility in how those resources are deployed in order to better serve the School of Nursing student population. The proposal also helps bring clarity to students who often are unsure of their department and the proper administrative channels within that department.

* + - 1. R. Guell: I understand part of the administrative restructuring was to deal with the budget cuts for the forthcoming year, so does the restructuring enable the cuts to CHHS to be proportional to the cuts in other colleges?
			2. M. Licari: It really is. This was already in the works. It helped CHHS hit their budget expectations.
			3. R. Guell: During my time in that College, I became familiar with the governance structure. Where is the conversation on governance restructuring? That would make social work with its eight or nine faculty have the same representation as the School of Nursing that has about thirty.
			4. L. Hall: The plan for next academic year, if this passes, is to follow the constitution. So the School of Nursing will only have one representative. As you pointed out, that isn’t equitable given the number of faculty and students. Kent has been active consulting the departments and Executive Committee on changes that might need to made. We have been looking at a lot of models for this. We will be working on that next year as it felt rushed to complete it this year. We will be taking this to the college to see what would be best to move forward with.
			5. R. Guell: I agree that it would have been rushed to try to do this in the current environment.
			6. K. Games: This a challenge that current exists within the college. If this would go through, AMR and Nursing would have similar numbers. This would be that department with more than twenty members need to work with the departments that have less than ten to come up with some kind of numbers for a representative structure. Currently, we only have one representative for AMR, Nursing, and KRS This will be hard on the smaller departments if we move forward with plan of d size department size determines representation. Our other choice is to go with equal numbers of representative per department.
			7. R. Guell: I simply suggest that you look at the apportionment model of the Faculty Senate itself.
			8. M. Chambers: As I look at the vote here, I see that the number opposed and abstentions are about equal to the number of those that voted for this. Can you explain what some of those concerns were?
			9. L. Hall: I believe that some of the issues are as Bob brought up that with representation on the committees. The other was teaching uncertainties. Some were worried that they might have to now teach in undergraduate programs. Yes, that might happen, but at the same time we have professors funneled into undergrad programs that are capable to teach graduate programs and will now have that chance.
			10. R. Peters: My question is about the structure. How are the Executive Director and Associate Directors different than Chairs.
			11. L. Hall: While they are called something different, they would be similar to chairs. They would have a course release. I would anticipate that anyone could apply for this internally. We are anticipating that the two current department chairs would apply for these positions. They will act similar but their main focus will be different. One will focus on college-related needs and the other student-related needs.
			12. K. Games: Does this at all change the faculty review process? Will they filter through associate directors before going through to the executive director or would the executive director replace the chair level and there would be no associate director?
			13. L. Hall: There is a direct reporting of a faculty to the executive director and an indirect reporting to the associate directors. So the executive director will do all of the reviews, which is similar to what happens now. It is just the added layer that is our process, so the chair layer will be removed. It will now be the same number of layer of reviews that the other college do.
			14. K. Games: Has there been any discussion on how the associate directors will be reviewed?
			15. L. Hall: The current job descriptions are being developed by a subcommittee. They will serve at the pleasure of the Provost just like the executive director and will be reviewed annually.
			16. R. Guell: We developed several years ago special language in the handbook that explicitly acknowledged the executive director position. If this passes can all of those subsections of the handbook go away?
			17. L. Hall: Maybe.
			18. C. MacDonald: No, the language will have to stay because there is still an executive director doing reviews. We might need to add more language because Nursing will no longer have the chair level review.
			19. R. Guell: Constitutional revision is not an easy task. I hope that you take the opportunity to deal with the situation that is in your college, which is governing itself like a small college rather than through the Faulty Council. This would be a good time to review that structure. I am sure that a number of those that are knowledgeable about the handbook would be willing to help.
			20. L. Hall: Great suggestion, thank you.
1. Assessment Council Revisions to 170.10 Files# 4-6
	1. Motion to Approve S. Kopaczewski., M. Chambers: 9-0-0
		1. B. Stone: The changes we have made will affect membership, including membership and voting. The Assessment Council was new when this was written. Since we have tasked ourselves with creating an institutional assessment plan we have changed some of the language regarding membership. We don’t just represent Colleges but instead represent many different units, so we decided to change members and colleges to representatives of institutional units. We felt that this would more flexible moving forward. We also revised the language regarding voting. We change quorum to a simple majority of members so that it would be broader. We have also removed that a unit doesn’t need to request membership. We wanted everyone to know that our meetings are open for everyone to attend. We wanted to state that Academic Affairs is Ex-Officio.
		2. R. Guell: Looking at the clean document, there is no VP for Enrollment Management. Is this a second appointment from the Provost within the enrollment management areas of that office?
		3. K. Woods-Johnson: This is a new addition to the group is impart due to the loss of the Office of Student Success. The division of enrollment management sends a representative to the meeting to discuss assessment needs, status, and activates in regards to SEM council.
		4. R. Guell: Do you mean the appointment to be by the Provost/VP for Academic Affairs or the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management?
		5. K. Woods-Johnson: Thank you for the clarification Bob. So the appointment is by the Vice Provost.
		6. R. Guell: So you want that to be Vice Provost on the fifth bullet point?
		7. K. Woods-Johnson- Correct. We will need to make changes to that.
		8. R. Guell: Jason Trainer is only over what had been admissions correct? So we are only talking about someone from admission or financial aid.
		9. M. Licari: So the Registrar reports to Susan Powers and the departments that report to Jason are admission, marketing, financial aid, and new student transition programs. I think the intention is to appoint someone to the council that is following retention, so it can still be Jason. We might want to clarify that a bit.
		10. R. Guell: So would you want to be the one that select the representative or would it be alright for the Vice Provost to do that?
		11. M. Licari: I would be okay with the Vice Provost.
		12. R: Guell: I am ask for unanimous consent to change the fifth bullet to be the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management.
2. Faculty Senate Standing Committees for 20-21 File #7
	1. Motion to approve S. Kopaczewski, V. Sheets: 9-0-0
3. For information: PTTF website
	1. M. Crosby: There has been a large number of PTTF who believe they have not received sufficient training to be successful as a faculty member at Indiana State. In response, we have created training website to help PTTF be prepared to teach at Indiana State. There are several key portions of the website which includes Important Contacts, Technology Tips, Student Resources and Services, Teaching Resources, Grading and Reporting, and Part-Time Temporary Faculty Review.
	2. R. Guell: Information for payroll should be included on the website under Important Contacts.
	3. M. Crosby: (page Technology Tips) With such a need for Blackboard training, I wanted the links to be easy to access. When looking for the links I found it was hard to find them. (page Teaching resources) This page includes a syllabi check list. (page Faculty Resources)
	4. R. Guell: The Faculty Resource page is missing the Academic Integrity Link.
	5. C. MacDonald: This has all been helpful information for the site.
	6. S. Kopaczewski: When will this be live? I know there are a lot faculty that will be yearning for this information.
	7. M. Crosby: I will be handing the site over to C. Spicer for upkeep in May so any time after that.
	8. C. MacDonald: We will be able to direct faculty to this site and say here’s everything you should need.
	9. M. Crosby: Yes, one place to find all of the information.
4. For discussion: Faculty Survey Results
	1. C. MacDonald: I am glad to see that teaching is considered a core priority and I am glad to see that faculty took this seriously and took the time to consider cuts to themselves instead of just cuts to others.
	2. R. Peters: When I was in the technology leadership team meeting this morning there was talk about the survey. One of the departments shared the link with lecturers. I wanted you to be aware of this. Some even stated that if they used a different computer they could take it again.
	3. R. Guell: The intent of the survey was not to be closed, but simple gauge our colleagues. If any changes need to be made it will be over the next three months when many won’t be available. So it will be up to a few to represent everyone and we what them to have sense of where everyone is at.
	4. R. Peters: That is what I explained to them. That was Exec driven because we knew there were going to be a lot of decisions coming up over the summer.
	5. C. MacDonald: Given the high response rate, if someone wanted to use every machine in their house, they would have little effect on the results.
	6. R. Guell: Items at the top and bottom of the list pretty much stayed where they were. I pulled this at 90, 200, 300 and 428 participants. What found most interesting about the data the percent of faculty willing to hurt students is tiny. The percentage that dislike administrators is high. What I did find interesting was the amount of faculty willing to take on hard decisions. The fact the forty-one percent would be willing to go through a program prioritization process, given that it is a black hole of misery, says that faculty of 2020 are much more university minded.
	7. M. Chambers: Just looking at this show that spirit of the faculty you were talking about is correct. It shows that we are all in this together.
	8. R. Guell: Big take-away: The current faculty are committed to the success of the university and are willing to take cuts as long others take cuts as well.
	9. E. Farrugia: I am an instructor in the final year of my second three year appointment. What do the cuts look like for us? Should we be on the job market? Should we stay put?
	10. M. Licari: I don’t have a lot of current information. We are in a waiting pattern while we are waiting to see what happens to our appropriations from the State. Once we have more information there we will have more of a view of the budget. The hold on reappointments until the middle of May was designed to not dig a deeper budget hole in the budget than what we already have. I don’t have more information than the last time we meet.
	11. R. Guell: I asked the President the question I did. The CARES Act itself requires that the State governments maintain their previous commitments. There are basically two paths that we could go down. Path one is that State fulfills the CARES Act and we fill a giant portion of loss in housing refunds. Door number one is that budgets have to be cut but they don’t have to be decimated. The second is that they don’t and budgets are a disaster. That is the hole Mike is talking about.
	12. D. Curtis: I would be quite shocked if they didn’t take advantage of getting the CARES money. Indiana is in better shape than most others states that I have worked in on keeping up with their commitments. But that CARES money will not fill in the hole that has been lost by the return of housing and dining dollars.
	13. C: MacDonald: We are all keeping our fingers crossed that is what actually happens.
	14. R. Peters: Are we going to send this out or create a new document.
	15. C. MacDonald: We will be creating a second document with a summary. It will most likely be in the Musings after the Senate meeting.
	16. R. Guell: Just because you have it doesn’t mean you need to share it.
	17. C. MacDonald: I just wanted to share this with everyone here.
5. Liaison Reports:
6. AAC: No Report
7. CAAC: Had its last meeting today and approved 4 minor program changes
8. FAC: Met last week. We discussed who signed up for standing committees. There is work to be done next fall regarding who actually volunteers and was assigned to committees.
9. FEBC: We are meeting tomorrow so the committee can address its remaining charges.
10. GC: They are still completing their program reviews and working on streamlining the changes in grad program requirements.
	1. R. Guell: How did GC end the year on the communications graduate program?
	2. S. Kopaczewski: I didn’t get the sense that there was any bitterness, the program got to work to make the changes from the review. The Department did supply a large volume of material as requested by R. Gonser.
11. SAC: No Report
12. Adjournment: 5:05PM