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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULITY SENATE, 2019-2020

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 17, 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

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

Guest: T. Cooper, L. Spence-Bunnett, S. Gambill, B. Butwin

1. Administrative Reports:
2. President D. Curtis
3. I want to thank the Faculty Senate Executive Committee members that joined us for the football game in the presidential suite this weekend. You brought us our first win.
4. John Douglas was a guest speaker last night (September 16, 2019) in Tilson Auditorium. He was an interesting and engaging speaker to a packed house. Thank you all the people that put in the hard work to get those speakers to come to ISU.
5. Looking forward to family weekend coming up this weekend. There is a lot of work that goes into hosting this kind of event. This is the first time since freshman have arrived that we can truly touch base with the families. I look forward to meeting the families and letting them know that all is well with their students.
6. I have been on a little bit of a tour of some of the student groups. We have been talking about some of the changes to homecoming. It’s always a great opportunity to interact with some of our students. We are blessed with the type of student that comes to Indiana State who has a positive outlook on life like I do. Tomorrow night (September 18, 2019) I have an opportunity to meet with the full SGA to discuss all of the activities our students are going to be able to do this fall.
7. Provost M. Licari
8. The University kicked off its Hispanic Heritage month last night (September 16, 2019) with an event hosted by La Casita. I would like to thank our keynote speaker- Associate Professor Kira Enriquez Loya. She addressed how growing up in Mexico influences her art and work. The address was very interesting and inspiring. She also teaches hybrid classes in the community school of arts giving her a forward facing approach with the community, while showing how much she cares about her students and teaching.
9. The career fair is tomorrow (September 18, 2019). This is a great opportunity for student to start connecting not only with potential employers but also opportunities that could lead to internships. This is a time not only for seniors to look at employers but for all the students to start showing interest in their future.
10. Finally there are few activities this weekend. The first is family weekend. The President and I will be in the banquet center acknowledging the achievements of our African American students that have earn really high GPA’s the last two semesters. That is great event and I always look forward to that. Second is Dr. Joy O’Keefe will be holding the bat festival Saturday night (September 20, 2019).
11. Chair Report: C. MacDonald
12. I am asking for unanimous consent to add one item to our agenda today. If we could have Lisa Spence-Bunnett talk to us about the RFP for LMS process. If we could add that after we deal with the Policy 922 changes, I’d appreciate it. After that, we will deal with the additional charges for the standing committees and there will be at least one more charge to add at our next regular Executive Committee meeting, which will be in two weeks. Please remember that next week is an informal meeting, so we will again be on the 9th floor, instead of here. And as a reminder, Thursday we are having the photo taken of the whole Faculty Senate.
13. You may also have seen in the global email that the survey requesting feedback from faculty regarding the Tobacco Free Task Force Report is out, so please let your colleagues know about this and encourage them to participate. There is a separate survey for staff, and SGA is collecting feedback from students as well.
14. Approval of September 10, 2019 Minutes File #1

Motion to approve as amended: (V. Sheets, M. Chamber): 9-0-0

1. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
2. S. Arvin: We have had discussions in the past about users not being able to find stuff on the ISU website. I was wanting to know if there was interest in me making a video tutorial about how to do Google searches and hacks on the website?

S. Kopacezwski: I believe that would be people interested in that and not just us in the room but other people as well.

S. Arvin: Good. I will make it and make it public.

C. MacDonald: Thank you for offering to do that.

1. S. Phillips: During our last department meeting we were told that our travel expenses have been cut to $500. When I started here twenty years ago it was $1200. Then it was cut back to $800 and it has been cut back again to $500. During times of prosperity the fund was never taken back up. One of the issues that faculty members have brought up is that we are evaluated on research, but have limited funds to present that work

C. MacDonald: Unfortunately I think that is a college level decision.

M. Licari: I can’t offer any comments about that.

R Guell: On budget cutting in general there are examples all across campus where people when submitting them were trying to be clever and perhaps too clever by half when they turned in their budgets for the last two years. Going to what I would call the “Mike Licari School of Public Budgeting” where individuals cut what their boss insisted would be replaced by something else and then gives you resources to do so. It strikes me that this is what (John) Beacon did in cutting money to buy names and what the College of Arts and Sciences did when budgeting for student workers. The departments haven’t learned that there is a new way of budgeting and now there are consequences for being clever.

1. V. Sheets: I have been hearing that the University has been developing this cost of instruction model. I was wanting some reassurance that it won’t do something stupid like divide salary evenly across independent study courses and large classes so that independent study classes look as they are costing money and the larger classes look as if they are making money. I don’t want it to falsely inform.

M. Licari: The process is still being reviewed and has not been published. I have asked the deans to evaluate the validity of the model so that aren’t any strange outliers.

V. Sheets: So there is a chance to revise it.

M. Licari. Yes. What I have asked the deans to do is identify concerns.

1. Policy 922 Changes –Stephanie Gambill File #2
2. Motion to discuss (V. Sheets, M. Chambers)
3. S. Gambill: Everyone should have received a drafted that is both foot and end noted so I don’t believe we need to go through every specific change. The most significant change is that we will require both parties and witness to be present at the Title IX panel hearing. We will have procedures that will detail how this process will work even when the students don’t want to be in the same room. The other significant change will be that the Title IX panel will now make a decision of responsible or not responsible and make a recommendation for disciplinary outcome to the Title IX coordinator. This will allow for more consistency as the panel is made up of three people out of a twelve person pool and each panel won’t hear every case so they won’t know what the disciplinary outcome was for a similar case. The policy change will also allow for students to appeal for due process and the disciplinary outcome.
4. We have made some changes and reorganized it. We have moved the Title IX coordinators roles and responsibilities to one section in the front of the policy. The rest of the policy has been organized so that it follows a more natural process of how we meet with the students.
5. I present this in front of staff council last week. I will also be going in front of SGA in the near future.
6. We haven’t made any significant changes to this policy since 2015 and the Title IX world is changing along with best practices due to new DOE regulations and litigation. That is what necessitated this review and changes.

R. Guell: I am not sure if this part of the change but it did strike me. Does 922.10 in anyway conflict with disciplinary procedures for faculty in general? My question mainly focuses on the scenario in which a faculty member is found responsible for a violation. Does that mean your advice to the Vice President (Provost) who is implementing the disciplinary/dismissal process for faculty that has another adjudication system available? This isn’t an end all process that is separate from the other process that short cuts a faculty members ability to go that faculty body?

S. Gambill: This isn’t a short cut.

B. Butwin: They will still be able to go through discipline and dismissal process or through grievance. It would not on the topic of whether the action occurred but on the outcome of disciplinary sanction. Do you want that in the policy?

M. Licari: Agreed.

R. Guell: I am satisfied that these minutes are fine stating that the University General Council and Provost both agree that this is the process.

B. Butwin: That is true for staff as well.

V. Sheet: 922.10.2 Appeals. Is that new?

S. Gambill: No, that one is still the same. It is only the student appeal that has changed. Staff and Faculty are done as a single investigator model. So I simply making a finding of responsible or not responsible and forward that report about the respondent to Vice President of the area in which they are employed.

R. Guell: Is this in alignment with the problem we have with the student grievance process?

B. Butwin: What problem is that?

R. Guell: Where you stated that we have to do this and do this a quickly as possible. I am wondering why we are seeing this and why it isn’t going to a standing committee or two. If you can say that we need get this in the handbook as quickly as possible for the board meeting in October then I am fine with it instead of violating our bylaws stating that things like this go to standing committees first.

B. Butwin: These changes put us in a much better position than the previous policy because they make a couple thing clearer like the equitable nature of the resources that are available to both the complainant and the respondent. They also make it clear that parties will be present at the Title IX hearing. We have removed a lot of the processes from this policy but the procedures related to this policy make it clear that the parties will be present and that cross examination will be indirectly allowed. This will allow for a fuller due process experience and allow the panel the ability to evaluate the credibility of witnesses. So this policy puts us in a better position to make those things happen.

R. Guell: I have absolutely no problem with that assertion and don’t believe that this is the problem. But I do believe that without some statement of an emergency nature that we shouldn’t be violating our bylaws is the problem. I am willing to accept your assertion that this is an emergency but without you stating that I am not.

B. Butwin: The General Council reserves emergency actions for emergencies so I would not consider this an emergency situation.

R. Guell: I don’t mean to cut this conversation short but I believe that conversation is premature. It needs to happen at the FAC and SAC levels first.

B. Butwin: I will say that we will not be able to take this to the October board meeting then and we will have to share that with the Board of Trustees.

R. Guell: If the President, the Provost, or a Board of Trustees Member find that this something that needs to be implemented for protection of the institution then I am okay with that being stated and inserted. The policy can be backwardly inserted as the policy on policies states that the board can do what it needs to do to protect the institution, but if not then we need to go through the normal process.

B. Butwin: There are circumstances that I can see with Title IX regulation that I will come to you and say that these need to be implemented as soon as possible. I want to save that for those true emergencies.

C. MacDonald: It was my understanding that this was more urgent then it was. We will send this to the standing committees.

B. Butwin: I would like to state that in regards to Faculty there hasn’t been any changes other than the Title IX coordinator making recommendation as to disciplinary actions. It is only a recommendation and that the provost will have final say and they always have.

Motion to move to table (R. Guell, M. Chambers); 8-1-0

1. RFP for LMS process
2. L. Spence-Bunnett: There are a couple of documents and these will be in regards to our RFP. Some background on this: Our contract that ends in August 2022 for Blackboard operating on a web based support system. It is also certain that in the next 3 to 5 years Blackboard will be switching everyone over to their new Ultra platform which is a cloud based platform. It will be a rewrite of some technology but it will not look the same. We are already seeing some of the changes when we go to conferences.
3. We are wanting to get ahead of this so we are starting to look now at the different platforms out there. It is my understanding that when the last LMS platform was changed it didn’t go so well from a faculty standpoint in terms of migration.
4. So we asked the Provost if we could do a review. I want to make it clear the review question is to see if there is enough of new capabilities with the platforms available to benefit us from a cost stand point to move forward with a new platform that this wil also includes Ultra. We are trying to see if there is enough positive weight to move forward with the change that could include migration for both students and faculty.
5. We brought together a small group of faculty to review three different platforms. The platforms that were reviewed are Bb Ultra, D2L/Brightspace, and Canvas. The question was asked so that the scores were recorded as positive/no opinion/negative. The platforms weren’t compared to each other but on their own performance. We wanted to ask if there was positive aspects to platforms as compared to negative or neutral opinions to move forward. As you can see there are a lot of positive scores so there seems to be a lot positives to move forward to a new platform. This is not meant to be a comparative of the different platforms.
6. V. Sheets: It seems that all but Bb Ultra had negative ratings expect for Ultra in the column migration from Blackboard.
7. L. Spence-Bunnett: We weren’t comparing these. Yes Ultra is a player that we might look at. They will be invited to look at questions and proposals we generate.
8. M. Licari: We need to be clear here. That the faculty group that worked on this over the summer only rated the platform and didn’t compare platforms. There is enough information here to move forward with an RFP. Another group of faculty will help develop questions about migration, capabilities, preservation of existing materials, and other functional capabilities can be included in further questions. The only thing this group did was to conclude that it is worth going forward with the RFP.
9. V. Sheets: Are these the only companies that will be asked to move forward?
10. L. Spence-Bunnett: No it will be open to other companies. The rest of the document covers the questions and the responses. It shows that there is enough positives to move forward with the RFP.
11. L. Spence-Bunnett: The next document you will see a high level schedule as we want to have enough time to allow for a migration event if that needs to happen at the end of this. We will need to do something in the next three to five years no matter this outcome. This schedules allows us to form a group with faculty and others. We have made inventions and will have a kick off meeting this week. We are hoping to get a good review from this group and Faculty Senate.
12. There are two phases to this. The first one is to ask the question “what are we looking for?” The second phase is to review the different vendors against our requirements. This will be the RFP process. We want to make these process are very brood. We will be having campus wide events. Requirement definitions will happen this fall. Starting within the next two weeks. We want to make sure that we are getting a good overview of what we need the platform to do. The review process of the applications will happen in the spring of 2020. Once this process is done and we have decided to move forward there will be purchasing going on. Next we will being implementation and staff the training teaming then train the support team. We will then offer early adaptor training. There will also be a transition year. We are hoping to have a sandbox environment with a couple of these platforms that we can have some users get in and use the platforms.
13. R. Guell: Part of the sandbox groups need to be big classroom users so that we can see if they can function with those groups. They need to be able to convert a chapter to see how burdensome it is. Some of the experimenters need to be heavy users so that some of functions get tested hard early in the process.
14. L. Spence-Bunnett: We based the core team on some of the things they do like online learning and tried to get people from the different colleges. We hope to have brood participation. We need to shear up some short cases so when we go to the vendors we can show them exactly what we want.
15. V. Sheets: Do you have among your test users people that use different publishers?
16. R. Guell: A lot of what we asked them about yesterday was does it work with McGraw Hill connect, Pearson, and Cengage. If you get those three then you get a lot of the freshman classes. We do need people to do all three. What we were really big on was the disaster of the WebCT migration. There are things on the student side that Blackboard doesn’t enable then to do. We know that we need to go somewhere other than were we are but our position are that vital functions that have to be there. There also needs to be connectivity with the major textbook manufacturers and easy conversations. We need be able to go from Blackboard to the new platform and know where all the buttons are along with how long it is going to take. Last year when the talks of changing platforms started I was worried that this was going to stop innovation with anyone working in the Blackboard environment. What we need to do for Lisa is to say what we need for the transition process. What we need to do for our colleagues is to let them know that we are anticipating their needs so that they will continue developing the classes in Blackboard because it won’t an enormous process to transfer over to the new platform.
17. C. MacDonald: We are focused on two aspects of this process. The first is communication. So they know what to expect and that they are going to get support. The second is a smooth transition and that there is appropriate support there. This was one of the things that didn’t happen in the last transition.
18. L. Spence-Bunnett: When we get to that point of the transition I am going to talk with Stephanie Alexander and Samantha Penney about more hands on training to help make that transition smoother.
19. R. Guell: There are some departments rely on Blackboard as their means of internal communication of drafts so it locks people out so they aren’t put the drafts on their webpage. There is a different set of user that use Blackboard for non-instructional purposes.
20. L. Spence-Bunnett: I will ask about that and if an evaluation can be done.
21. S. Arvin: How will Yuja work with these platforms?
22. L. Spence-Bunnett: My belief is that it will work with any of these platforms.
23. M. Licari: About how many vendors are we going to have to sort through in regards to the RFP?
24. L. Spence-Bunnett: I am going to say not more than five or six.
25. R. Guell: Is there any value in having a state wide contract with Canvas since most college in Indiana use the platform?
26. L. Spence-Bunnett: We do have a group that meets at IVY Tech in Indianapolis that discuss different technologies. We could broach this topic with the owners there.
27. M. Chambers: The way the gradebook works in Blackboard I cannot use it. It would be nice if it had more functionality. I have to use an excel file then transfer it into Blackboard.
28. L. Spence-Bunnett: I think it is a situation that we will want to hear about. We want to know what all of things that you do are and then figure out the best way to frame that. We will want several different ways on how user do things so we present them vendors.
29. V. Sheets: I am assuming that what we use will migrate with the current attendance system?
30. L. Spence-Bunnett: All of this will be important to gather.
31. Additional Charges for Standing committees File #3

Motion to forward charges: (M. Chambers, V. Sheets): 9-0-0

1. Liaison Reports:
   1. AAC: Meeting next week
   2. AEC: Elected officers. Chair- Tina Kruger. The committee wants to know if the faculty senate knows what their budget is for the year.

R. Guell: This will transferred from Mark Green’s office.

R. Peters: Do you know the history of why the due dates are when they are?

C. MacDonald: No I do not. Do you know who the other officers are?

R. Peters: I do not.

* 1. CAAC: No report
  2. FAC: Will meet this Friday to populate committees.
  3. FEBC: Have a meeting tomorrow afternoon with Diann McKee. They have also reached out to Catherine Spicer to see if she can provide feedback on charge number 3.
  4. GC: On schedule to meet next week.
  5. SAC: Elected officers. Sent in an email. Jason trainer gave us an overview of what is happening. Waiting for the next meeting which is a review of charges.
  6. URC: No report

1. Adjournment: 4:43PM