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3:30pm, via Collaborate

Members present: A. Anderson, S. Arvin, M. Badar, M. Bergbower, M. Blaszka, M. Chambers, M. Cohen, A. Czyzewski, S. Ferng, J. Frost, K. Games, R. Guell, J. Gustafson, C. Hanson, M. Hutchins, M. Jackson, B. Jose, B. Kilp, W. Ko, S. Kopaczewski, C. MacDonald, A. Mohamed, R. Noll, J. O’Keefe, R. Owegi, J. Park, R. Peters, S. Phillips, V. Sheets, A. Solesky, L. Walters, E. Southard, E. Wittenmyer

Absent Members:

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

Guest: A. Waite, A. Hay, C. Drew, G. Morehead, D. Richards, F. Teston, J. Liu, M. Crosby, R. Perrin, R. Crumrin, S. Hardin, S. Powers

1. Memorial Resolutions
	1. Effie Hunt Presented by R. Perrin

## Effie Hunt

## 1922–2020

## In Memoriam


## Effie Hunt earned an AB in English in 1944 from MacMurray College for Women (Jacksonville, Illinois) and an MA in English in 1945 from the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign). After working as a key-punch operator for the U.S. Department of the Treasury in 1945, she returned to the University of Illinois to continue her studies—although her time at Illinois was interrupted by a variety of academic work. In 1947, she served as a Special Librarian for the Lamont Project at the Widener Library at Harvard University; in 1948, she served as a Special Librarian at the University of Pennsylvania; between 1949–1950, a Fulbright Grant allowed her to study at University College, College of London; on her return, she completed her PhD in English at the University of Illinois in 1950.

## Hunt’s path to ISU was a varied and interesting one. Between 1951–1952, she worked as a Researcher at the Library of Congress; between 1952–­1959, she taught at Mankato State University (Minnesota)—although that work was interrupted by a year of post-doctoral study in Reference Librarianship at Columbia University (1953). Between 1959–1963, she taught English at Radford College (Virginia), where she also served as department chairperson.

## Hunt came to ISU in 1963. During her twenty-four years at ISU, Hunt taught a variety of literature classes but favored early British drama and her specialty, Shakespeare; between 1971–1974, she served as the Director of Graduate Studies in English. She was also an active member of the Faculty Council, the Faculty Senate (including the Executive Committee), and the Dean’s Advisory Committee; she was the chairperson of ISU’s Commission on the Status of Faculty Women (1971–1972) and a long-time member of the American Association of University Professors, the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the College English Association; she also served on the search committee that brought President Richard Landini to ISU.

## In 1975, Hunt became the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a position she held until her retirement in 1987. After retirement, Hunt remained actively involved in the University, the College, and the Department, regularly attending lectures, receptions, dinners, and, importantly, the awards programs that recognized ISU’s students. A love of literature and the arts, of book collecting, of travel (especially to England), and of scholarship was her hallmark, and her interest in and commitment to ISU, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Department of English—its faculty and its students—never wavered.

## THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University expresses to her family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further expresses its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which she gave to her students, the Department of English, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to her family.

Robert Perrin, Chairperson and Professor of English on behalf of the Department of English

* 1. Duane Sorenson Presented by D. Richards

Duane Sorensen (written by Debra Israel, with input from colleagues and former faculty member Marvin Fischbaum, presented by Don Richards)

Duane Sorensen passed away on February 6, 2020. He was 83 years old. He worked in the Economics Department as a Faculty Member from September 1, 1968, until May 10, 1997; he retired with almost 29 years of service. He grew up on an Iowa farm, completing his bachelors’ degree at Iowa State, later doing his graduate work at the University of Chicago and the University of Illinois.

His former colleague Marvin Fischbaum reflected that Duane was one of the rare individuals who excelled at teaching in both large lecture classes and small seminars. He noted that he became aware of Duane’s ability to draw out students when they both took part in the oral exams for graduate students.

He also remembered that Duane’s specialities, the location of economic development, and regional economic development, were very much in demand. As an example of this, Duane received a sizable grant from the Crane Naval Weapons Center. With the end of the Vietnam War, the center was programmed for a substantial downsizing. Duane’s task was to lessen the economic impact on the civilian community. After this, Duane garnered a smaller Federal grant to help revitalize downtown Terre Haute.

He worked closely with students in his areas of specialty in Urban and Regional Economics. He is remembered as a pioneer in experiential learning as he took students to Indianapolis to tour neighborhoods undergoing gentrification and meet with alumni working in redevelopment efforts.

One colleague recalled that Duane had high regard for rigorous scholarship in economics, one time citing Theodore Schultz as a person he admired. He was a good-humored, jovial guy who was popular with his colleagues. He also is remembered as an independent thinker who encouraged his students to be independent thinkers as well.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Duane Sorensen’s family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and may it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication he gave to the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to the Sorensen family.

* 1. Mary Slack Presented by C. MacDonald

**In Memoriam**

**Mary Gertrude Slack**

Mary Gertrude Slack was born May 12, 1920, daughter and only child to the late Harvey and Tressa (Marks) Slack. She passed away February 12, 2020 as a resident of Indiana, at age 99.

Gertrude was a graduate of Brazil High School, earning her Bachelor’s degree from DePauw University and a Master’s degree from the University of Michigan. She served our country admirably in the United States Navy.

Indiana State University was fortunate to have had Gertrude working at University School as a faculty member from September 6, 1966 until June 2, 1986; whereupon she retired with almost 20 years of service.

While at ISU, Gertrude taught English and Drama, directing various staff productions both in State High School and then in University School. Those who knew Gertrude share that she made the most of the changes that occurred at ISU, and was always good-spirited, professional, sensitive to the needs of her students, and appreciative of their efforts. Like so many of our former laboratory school family, she made a true and lasting difference in the lives of students and our university.

Gertrude held membership in the First Presbyterian Church in Brazil, Indiana, the Eastern Star, and the Democratic Party. Funeral services were held on February 19, 2020 at Moore Funeral Home in Brazil with trees were planted in Gertrude’s remembrance.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Mary Gertrude Slack’s family its sincere condolences, as well as sympathy at Gertrude’s passing, and that it further expresses its appreciation for Gertrude’s selfless service, dedication, care, and commitment which she provided her students, school, Department, College, and University.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

**Prepared and presented by Dr. Ryan Donlan, Chair of the Department of Teaching and Learning**

* 1. Allen Ray Keathley Presented by Chris MacDonald

**MEMORIAL RESOLUTION** Allen Ray Keathley, 85, passed away March 14, 2020, at home surrounded by family.  He was born October 27, 1934, to Clarence Ray Keathley and Anna Lee (Sutterfield) Keathley in Ironton, Missouri.  He was preceded in death by his wife of 57 years, Mabel (Knight) Keathley and his parents.

He was an active member of First Baptist Church of Terre Haute, where he participated in music ministry, children's ministry, and was a Kid's Hope mentor.
He held a bachelor's degree in cello performance from the University of Missouri, a master's degree in Divinity from Midwest Baptist Theological Seminary, a master's degree in Church Music from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and a master's degree in Library and Information Sciences from the University of Missouri.
He spent his career at Indiana State University where he was a reference librarian and music librarian. For many years Allen taught the research course for graduate-level music majors. He was responsible for acquiring and organizing the Kirk Collection which contains many examples of popular music. It is among the most frequently accessed collections in the library’s Special Collections. He was a member of Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia, and a 41-year member of the Terre Haute Symphony Orchestra. Most recently, he continued to play in the ISU Concert Band, the Terre Haute Sinfonietta, and the Terre Haute Concert Band.

His wry wit, awesome knowledge, and his smile were appreciated and will be missed.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to her family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to the University.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to her family.

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Curtis
2. First, I want to extend a huge thank you, to each of you, for all of the incredible work you are doing to keep our students moving forward on their path to completing an ISU degree. Now I have a few updates.
3. We are working on the interpretation of the support ISU is to receive from the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act, or the CARES Act. Congress has approved $31 billion in Education Stabilization Funds supporting both K-12 and Higher Education. Universities must use half of these monies for direct student aid before the remainder can be used to offset lost revenues and increased expenses. This is going to make a difference for students and will likely have some impact on the lost revenue for the university due to the COVID-19 pandemic. I will share more details as we have them.
4. For employees: Some information about the Families First Coronavirus Relief Act (FFCRA). There are two parts we are gathering information about: 1. The Families First Act 2. The Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act. Details about each of these components of the FFCRA act is available on the ISU HR website.
5. While you are so actively engaged in delivering our core mission, which is teaching our students. Colleagues in University Advancement, University Engagement, and Student Affairs are making phone calls to current students and prospective students at varying levels of interaction with ISU to attempt to positively impact our student retention and student recruitment for AY 2021.
6. The Leadership Team is working on several tasks. We are running contingency plans for funding should certain situations present themselves. Those situations include any loss of state appropriations for the remainder of FY 20 (April), is in any potential cut in appropriations from the state for FY 21. We are studying and developing strategies for return-to-work activities. As well, we are examining potential approaches of a plan to return students to campus in the fall. As more information becomes available from the state and federal governments about this, they will be studied.
7. Please know that we continue to be confident that an end to this disruption is inevitable. We may not return to business right away exactly as it was conducted in the Fall of 2019 but we will be ready to engage in the important work that this university provides to our students and ultimately the state of IN and beyond.
8. One more time . . . Please allow me to say that our Board of Trustees extend their sincere gratitude to you for maintaining the distinctive ISU dedication and commitment to teaching, discovery and learning that you provide so well all year long.
	1. Provost M. Licari
9. A lot of the updates are related to reactions to questions concerning effects of the virus. Summer plans about classes have been made with the Deans and the Chairs of the departments. A vast majority of the classes were already online, so the amount of classes that have to change from an online format is pretty low.
10. While commencement has always been a fun experience, this year it has been moved online, but we are trying to make the event as meaningful as possible. We are still printing the programs, which will included in the packages that are being sent out to the graduating students. The creating of these packages has been an enormous undertaking since they will include any honors that the student may have earned, their tassel, alumni information a program, and their diploma cover. We are wanting to have a tassel turn at graduation. I would like to thank Jen Keller and Susan Powers for all of their work packing up the 2000 boxes.
11. New student orientation has been moved to a virtual event. The event will be preceded by one-on-one communication with the students. They should be in contact with their advisor to set up classes. The financial aid and controller’s offices should also be in contact with them to help figure out the next four years of their life. We are going to try to mirror the campus experience as much as possible.
12. We are working on engaging new student enrollment by offering a number of opportunities since we can’t meet with them personally. We are doing early outreach for new student orientation and early scheduling of classes. Another one of the activities is offering a 1 credit class to those that will commit to investing in their education; this idea is pretty cool. This will be a good way for those students to feel more connected to the University and allows us to continually interact with the new students. This should help us improve our yield. Like I said, we have a lot going on.
13. Once again I would like to thank everyone. I am impressed with how well this change over went. You rose to the challenge and handled the situation and the students with style and grace.
14. Chair Report: C. MacDonald
	1. I know it was weeks ago now, but I hope you all found some time to relax over Spring Break, so that you are coming into the home stretch of the semester with energy. I can assure you that the officers and the administration have been extremely busy, with a focus on making sure we are compassionate and humane to our students during this time of stress and upheaval. I appreciate all of your flexibility, as well as your patience and understanding with us, as we do the best we can under the circumstances. We benefit from having an administration who recognizes the areas of primary authority of the faculty. When it came to the issue of the Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory grading option, it was brought to us in recognition of that authority. Other administrations in other times and places might have chosen to ignore faculty governance, but that did not happen here.
	2. We have worked to ensure that when we need to take exigent action that we stick as closely to Handbook policy as possible. Yet we know that these times will often require us to be more nimble than we thought we could be, so we will continue to figure out and regularize processes for us to do so. I particularly want to thank Bob and Kent for enabling our nimbleness, as well as Mike Chambers, our parliamentarian, who has been having a more active role than I ever remember a parliamentarian having to. I also want to thank Randy Peters, for his diligence regarding Robert’s Rules of Order.
	3. In light of all the changes we are dealing with currently, it looks like the earliest the Taskforce on Institutional Transformation is likely to meet will be this summer. We have not given up on this, but the institution is already adapting in ways that we were only beginning to consider at the start of this semester. More on that as we know it.
	4. Given the economic impact of the pandemic on the state of Indiana, it is likely that higher education may feel the impact, which is not good news. There are still much that could happen to change the minds of both incoming and returning students. If the budget projections turn grim, I would ask that we focus on our core mission, which is instruction. While we could make cuts in instruction, and save a few thousand here or there, we would likely be doing damage to both faculty morale and the quality of instruction. We cannot risk that. I would ask us to examine areas outside our core mission first if it comes to that. We will be asking the faculty for input on priorities for budget cuts, so that we can clearly convey the will of the faculty as a whole.
	5. Today’s agenda is a bit lengthy, but some of the items will undoubtedly be quicker than others. We will move the Faculty Senate Scholarship presentation to immediately following the reports. Then we will deal with the elimination of three licensure programs which no longer lead to licensure. Then, as promised the “Understanding” regarding S/U grades, which was not part of the motion passed via electronic vote will be voted on, so that it becomes part of the official record. We will then vote on the Constitutional changes that were read at our last meeting, then we will address the Biennial Review Replacement proposal, and end with a report on staffing from AAC.
	6. I also want to congratulate the new Senate Officers for 20-21. The Chair will be Liz Brown, The Vice –Chair will be Keri Yousif, and the Secretary will be Bob Guell. In addition, the new at-large members of the Executive Committee will be: Mike Chambers, Lindsey Eberman, James Gustafson, Tim Hawkins, Chris MacDonald, and Virgil Sheets. I hope you will thank them all for their service and leadership!
15. Staff Council Report: T. LaComba
	1. No report
16. SGA Report: M. Longyear
	1. Good Afternoon, I hope that you all are well. The past month has been chaotic, and I’m sure that many, if not all, of you can share in that feeling. More than anything, our students are overwhelmed. Balancing online courses away from campus on top of everything going on creates obvious anxieties and stress. SGA has been able to connect students with appropriate resources as they contact us about their concerns. Students are grateful for the option of satisfactory & unsatisfactory grading. They were very concerned about their GPA being negatively impacted by the changes this semester, so they are thankful for the ability to avoid that.
	2. Residential Life issued housing refunds this week. The concern was brought to my attention that ResLife staff, however, did not receive a refund. Our RAs, SJEs, and ASEs work tirelessly for our students all year, and feel like they have been devalued and betrayed by not receiving a refund. They understand that they do not pay out of pocket for their housing but are frustrated that they were left out. Students who have scholarships to cover their housing still received refunds, so I think there is a lot of confusion and anger. I hope that ResLife will address this concern with their staff soon.
	3. Internally, Ashley and I have been hard at work as we try to wrap up our term as SGA President and Vice President. Our staff typically would create transition binders for their respective positions during this time. Seeing that our staff is no longer getting paid, we did not think it was fair to ask them to do this. Ashley and I are working on transition binders for our entire staff, so that the next administration can adjust to their new roles quickly. Our president and vice-president elect have opened applications for their cabinet that will close on May 1. The four of us are working together to make the transition as smooth as possible given the circumstances.
	4. Thank you all for your continual hard work, especially in this time. As always, do not hesitate to reach out with any concerns you may have. Thank you.
17. Temporary Faculty Advocate: C. Spicer
	1. During the last FAC meeting, Malea Crosby updated us on the adjunct training materials she has been creating in conjunction with FAC. Based on her survey results, the majority of those who responded would prefer online training materials and webinars rather than in-person training sessions. In-person sessions would also be difficult to arrange since some lecturers only teach during fall or spring and not both, some only teach once every few years, and others get hired with little notice before the start of the semester. Many lecturers have also mentioned that they would like ongoing training rather than a one-time session. Because of the responses and suggestions from the survey results, Malea is building a website where lecturers will be able to find all the resources we need to be successful in our positions on campus. For example, we cannot be effective in upholding policies and standards if we do not know them. Some lecturers have been around for quite a while and might have difficulty finding where new policies are listed online since documents and websites change frequently, and newer lecturers might not know any specific policies since some departments do no training whatsoever. Having training materials and other helpful documents together online will make it easier for all lecturers to find the proper tools to be better prepared for situations that could come up during their time at ISU.
	2. An issue that I would like to ask about is the hiring freeze and how that affects reappointment. I have heard from lecturers who are highly worried about their future with the university at this time. As temporary faculty members, we understand that our jobs are never guaranteed, but the situation caused by Covid-19 is unique, and the hiring freeze adds another layer of anxiety to an already difficult time. Is there any information that I can give them that would make them feel any better about their jobs?
18. Faculty Senate Scholarship Award Presentation
	1. J. Liu Presents Scholarship to Franko Gilbert Teston

Good afternoon! It is our great pleasure to introduce to you the winners of this year’s Faculty Senate Scholarship, two excellent and outstanding undergraduate students. I will introduce the first recipient, and Steve Hardin will introduce the second recipient.

Our first recipient, Franko Gilbert Teston, is a sophomore honors student from Harrisburg, Illinois. Franko majors in music business, and he has maintained a fantastic academic record with an overall GPA of 4.0. Franko is a model student, dedicated, driven and passionate about helping others and building community. Franko also participated in many extracurricular activities, including the Baptist Collegiate Ministry, Music Industry Association, and Sycamore Leadership Coalition. Franko hopes to open up a music business in the future. Congratulation, Franko!

* 1. S. Hardin Presents Scholarship to Kate Kennedy

Our second recipient, Kate Kennedy, is a sophomore honors student from Terre Haute, Indiana with a Major in Applied Medicine. Kate is a student research assistant at the applied health department, and she has maintained an excellent GPA of 3.94. Kate plans to continue her graduate education in ISU’s Doctor of Physical Therapy program, and aspires to work in therapy and help people get healthier and stronger. Congratulations, Kate!

The recipients will have an opportunity to say a few words about the scholarship. Thank you!

1. Approval of March 19, 2020 File #1

Motion to approve J. Gustafson, E. Southard: 33-0-0

* 1. B. Jose- I just wanted to make a clarification. In under 7b I had asked the question If someone does well with student evaluations that they can still use them in FAD. It makes it sound as if I was doing well. I didn’t not want to imply that I am in anyway doing well.
	2. C. Hanson- In section 7c my last name is spelled wrong.
1. Approval of Record of Senate Electronic Vote March 24-26, 2020 File #2

Motion to approve E. Southard, V. Sheets: 32-0-1

* 1. C. MacDonald- When I sent out the adjusted agenda, it was to clarify that our electronic vote does not count as a meeting because what we did was not a meeting. We do want to make sure that the record does include a vote on this.
	2. M. Affan- I thought that was to bring to the floor the discussing of this and another for the passing of this. There was some discussion going on and we didn’t get time to have that discussion.
	3. C. MacDonald- I am sorry you misunderstood. I understand your concern. I am not hearing what you want me to do about that.
	4. M. Affan- Generally when you make a motion you have to have a discussion. Last time we were not given that opportunity. There should be some forum for that.
	5. C. MacDonald- I understand your concern and we are going to do things different in the future so we are much clearer about what makes a meeting. That is part of the reason that this doesn’t constitute a meeting is because we didn’t have that discussion or deliberation.
1. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. Online Instruction
2. K. Games- The announcement about online instruction only has to do with that and not any other business on campus, correct?
3. M. Licari- Yes, that is correct. We are working on plans to get other parts of business back to campus. We don’t know what that looks like at this time yet.
	1. Eduroam
4. B. Jose- I am happy and surprised that ISU has joined in on the Eduroam collective among colleges. I must applaud OIT for moving in this direction considering they are always talking about technologies and security issues. I have to say thank to the person that got that ball rolling.
5. M. Licari- That thanks will have to go to Lisa Spence-Bunnett
	1. Textbook Rentals
6. M. Chambers- Can you repeat what you told us at the Executive Committee meeting about textbook rentals?
7. M. Licari- Yes, that is a good question. Things have changed since the last time we have met because at that time we were under the understanding that they bookstore would accept returns as long as they were mailed back close to the deadline. Abbe, the bookstore manager, has decided to extend the deadline for the returns of the textbooks. Students have until the start of the fall semester to return the textbooks. This was a nice move on their part.
8. M. Chambers- There is also information on the website as well. If students ask, just direct them to the bookstore website.
	1. Virtual Meetings
9. C. Hanson- My understanding is that Collaborate is no long available for summer or fall classes. Is this going to change at some point? Also I wanted to bring up is that many of my students live have poor internet service areas and it effects their education so as you interact in the State House can you relay these issues for us?
10. D. Curtis- We have been very vocal about needing consistent internet throughout the State. I will add Faculty encouragement for this as I share that with administrators. This pandemic has heightened awareness of that issue. We aren’t going to slow down on letting them know that this is an issue. Thank you for bringing that up.
11. M. Licari- I am still talking to Lisa about this. At one point we had plans to migrate to a different platform but this virus has put a wrench into some of those plans. I don’t have a definite answer for you yet. I acknowledge that we are working on Collaborate at this time but there are many parts to this process that we are working on. I will have more information in the near future.
	1. Indy Star Article
12. M. Jackson- There was an article in the Indy Star this weekend about a task force that Purdue has put together that is comprised of campus stakeholders to plan for and navigate at this trying time. Are there any plans on creating one here?
13. D. Curtis- We are open to that. At this point we are gather more information so that when we are ready to put a pin in the calendar we can say here is where we are; let’s start developing a plan.
14. M. Licari- As we start rolling back into normal operation we are going to need a lot of coordination. So far, my approach has been to intersect between my leadership team and the governance bodies. We aren’t making decision without a consultation or letting leadership know. As we contemplate reopening campus, there is a lot to review and that might not be a bad idea.
15. C. MacDonald- The officers have been talking about some contingency plans if the virus keeps us away from campus or removes us from campus again. We presented a “breaking the glass” plan at Exec that will be coming to you at the April 30th meeting. We will be putting in plans to regularize electronic participation. We are putting in place some guideline in the event of emergency meetings.
	1. TBA Classes
16. M. Blaszka- With job contract renewals on hold there some classes that have been moved to a TBA standing. How are we supposed to help our student sign up for classes that are TBA? Are plans for filling those empty slots?
17. M. Licari- Yes, this is bad time with the virus. We are asking each of the colleges and departments to have contingency plans in place to help fill those spots. Each college knows how to juggle workloads.
	1. Online Course Creation
18. B. Jose- In the past, the University has claimed ownership of online courses like we have been forced into teaching this semester. Under normal circumstances, the university claims ownership of them. Will that practice be applied at this time?
19. M. Licari- I am not sure exactly what you mean about ownership. In terms of this spring semester, this has been a weird one. Nobody expected us to be finishing classes online, so I don’t think there will be any ownership issues. If you are talking about the Universities claim to use a template of a class created for online education that shouldn’t apply this semester.
20. R. Guell- Several years ago the University had contracted people to create these courses. They had language in that contract that stated if the person creating the course left, that the people left behind would be able to use that course, in order for the person creating the class to get the payment for creating the class. What Brian’s question and your answer implies is that administration has no plans on exploiting any of the faculty to lay claim to the course they created this term.
21. B. Jose- That sounds consistent with what I information I was working with.
	1. Returning to Campus
22. R. Noll- There are concerns that there will be a second wave of the virus that will hit in the fall. Are there any contingency plans for those that are or married to someone that is high risk?
23. L. Walters- Or have children that are?
24. J. O’Keefe- I concur. I have a colleague who is in that position.
25. M. Licari- We are just in the beginning stages of moving back to campus. We are going to have to see what further instruction we get from the governor.
	1. Lawsuits
26. J. O’Keefe- There are colleges out there that are getting sued over what has happened in terms of how they handled this situation. Have we been planning on how to protect ourselves?
27. D. Curtis- We have been watching the lawsuits. ISU was far more responsive to our students needs than the schools that are being sued. That being said, we have been talking and are preparing in the event that something might happen.
28. CAAC items:

Motion to eliminate. R. Guell, K. Games: 33-0-0

* 1. Geography for Social Studies Licensure (elimination) [https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4159/form](https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal%3A4159/form)
	2. Government for Social Studies Licensure (elimination) [https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4162/form](https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal%3A4162/form)
	3. Psychology for Social Studies Licensure (elimination) [https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4160/form](https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal%3A4160/form)
1. Understanding re: S/U grades -- File#3

Motion to approve A. Solesky, R. Guell: 31-2-0

* 1. C. MacDonald- We wanted to bring this forth to solidify that we understood what we were voting on in terms of the S/U grading.
	2. B. Jose- I just want some clarification the third sentence states that students will be strongly advised against taking the S/U option if they need a course grad of a C or better for their program requirements. Can this requirement can be modified at the department level still?
	3. C. MacDonald- My understanding is yes they can do that.
	4. R. Guell-That is my understanding as well.
	5. A. Czyzewski- This is another clarification. The last sentence reads instructors will be asked to verify their grades. If a professor leaves the University what happens to those students who grades that they need to verified?
	6. R. Guell- That has been changed. I believe that we have been asked to just grade the class and ORR will be making the changes.
	7. S. Powers- Grades will be recorded separately. So there will be a record of both.
	8. C. MacDonald- ORR will have a record of the original grades. Instructors will not be asked to do that.
	9. R. Guell- At the time this was written, we didn’t know that ORR would be doing this.
	10. C. MacDonald- Should we delete the last sentence now that we know better.
	11. R. Peters- We need to keep this the way that it is. This was our intent at the time and we need to keep a record of that.
	12. R. Guell- The word “may” gives us wiggle room.
	13. J. Walters- I just want to clarify that this understanding was given to us after we had the right to vote on this.
	14. C. MacDonald- Yes, it was added as clarification
	15. J. Walters- Some of may have voted differently if we would have had that clarification. Is that why we are voting on it now?
	16. C. MacDonald- Yes.
1. FAC items:
	1. 145 Constitutional Changes- - File #4

Motion to approve J. Gustafson, M. Chambers: Motion withdrawn

1. R. Guell- I am wondering given the built-in inefficiency of changing the constitution and the fact that at the next meeting we will be presenting breaking the glass, if we should delay voting on this. Having two constitutional votes in a row might be inefficient.
2. V. Sheets- As electioneer I am in favor of Bob’s suggestion. We have such a specialized process to meet with votes about constitutional change it seems that we could somehow combine the two since they fit together very well.
3. C. MacDonald- M. Chambers, pleaase correct me if I am wrong. If we table this now we can bring this up when we have the rest of the changes to 145?
4. M. Chambers- Yes, we will just need a motion to do that at the time.
5. A. Czyzewski- Could we not just have a motion to postpone instead of table?
6. M. Chambers looks up issue
7. R. Guell- While he is looking that up let me state the following: What we talked about at the Executive Committee meeting and what we are going to talk about at the next meeting. In my mind, we will have a reading of all of it combined at the August meeting, a vote of it at the September meeting, and finally a vote of all of faculty after that. A motion to postpone, table, or defeat would be irrelevant at this time since we will be combining them.
8. C. MacDonald- I think it is relevant that a motion to defeat it would defeat it. We do have a motion to approve it on the floor.
9. M. Chambers- I think if we postpone until August that would fine.
10. J. O’Keefe- The motion can be withdrawn.
11. J. Gustafson- I withdraw my motion.
12. C. MacDonald- That makes this simpler. We will read it in August and vote in September on the new combined 145.
	1. Biennial Review Replacement (Faculty Performance Evaluation) File #5

Motion to untable B. Jose, R. Guell: 33-0-0

Motion to begin the process with a year 3 (full) review in fall 2021 R. Guell, M. Bergbower: 25-7-1

Motion to approve the Faculty Performance Evaluation: 23-7-2

1. A. Czyzewski- Was that motion to table or postpone?
2. C. MacDonald- It was a motion to table.
3. M. Chambers- It was motion to table at the last meeting.
4. A. Czyzewski- I don’t believe that was the intent and that you can’t put a timeline on a tabled motion you can put one on a postponed issue. Which is what I believed was his intent.
5. C. MacDonald- Unfortunately, we can’t work with intent; only with what is said. Having said that, a motion to untable is not debatable.
6. C. MacDonald- Several faculty have forwarded concerns about the proposed Biennial Review replacement proposal. So, I want to begin by addressing some those questions. There has been a question about the origin of the proposal. It was entirely faculty-generated. The draft of the motion to instruct that this body sent to FAC was written by the officers, who were attempting to address the various issues and problems that had occurred during this year’s biennial review. We ran it past the Provost before bringing it here, to ensure that the administration would be willing to bring such a revision to the Board. Without that willingness, we would be wasting our time. FAC took that, and drafted a version which the administration would not have been willing to take to the Board. So, Exec worked to create a compromise document, that addressed many of FAC’s principles, but which also had the administration’s approval. With regard to the timing, we are on out normal two-year cycle of review and revision to the Biennial Review. The document itself charges us to engage in continuous improvement at the completion of every review cycle. We have not rushed the timing, nor are we rushing the proposal through. We have historically spent the last two meetings at the end of such a cycle discussing and voting on changes, as we are doing here this year. While it is unfortunate that the covid-19 outbreak occurred this semester, and while this has impacted many aspects of our work, I do not think we should allow it to keep us from doing the work that we are charged to do. The one time constraint that we do have is the timing of the Board of Trustees May meeting. Tomorrow is the deadline for items to make it onto their agenda. Additionally, it is our intent to offer a motion to delay the onset of the new cycle until fall 2021, thus giving departments an entire year to revise their criteria, as well as for faculty to be informed about the new process. Regarding faculty workload, let me just say that we currently waste a heck of a lot of time as reviewees creating our materials and narratives and manipulating the FAD. As reviewer, we waste a heck of a lot of time reviewing folks in depth who are meeting expectations. Under the proposed system, faculty being reviewed would not have to write 9 page narratives explaining their work every two years, then refresh and submit a report in FAD, and hope that they did it correctly. Instead, they would, as all faculty really should be doing, enter their activities into the FAD once a year. Every three years, faculty could write a much shorter narrative to explain whatever cannot speak for itself in their materials. Department committees’ workload would also be reduced, by having to only review everyone every three years, instead of every two. They would also come into play, of course, in years 1 and 2 if there was judged to be a concern. Regarding the workload of chairs and deans, first, chairs should already be pretty informed about what faculty are doing, and it is helpful for Deans to be as well. Second, the reviews in years 1 and 2 by chairs and deans can be as shallow or as deep as necessary. For the majority of faculty, who are doing their job, this will take little time. We have attempted to build in checks and balances to protect against rogue chairs and rogue deans while still keeping faculty workload lower. I will again remind ask you to be courteous enough to your colleagues to allow the discussion to occur today.
7. V. Sheets- It’s been over a decade ago since the initial development of what is now biennial review. Thrust upon us by an administration who was reacting to outside forces, it was a hard-fought battle. We had come through several years of internal discord between the faculty and administration; there was not a lot of trust, and faculty morale was abysmal. Thus, we wanted a system with multiple layers of checks and double checks—to insure that faculty couldn’t be targeted by ne’er-do-well administrators. Then we added to this basic system—whose purpose was really to verify that faculty were adequately engaging in their duties—a merit-pay system that of course required the generation of a report so that faculty could highlight their strengths in order to qualify for an “exceeding expectations” review. In trying to accomplish both, we seriously overbuilt. The process we built required that tenured faculty and senior instructors (and initially any faculty member who wanted to qualify for “merit” pay) to not only to report their activities–something that’s always been required, even pre-FAD—but to generate a report along with a narrative for each faculty domain, which is something that continues even in the absence of a tie to “merit.” This report then gets reviewed by departmental peers, by the Department chair, again by the Dean, and possibly a college-level committee, all of whom have to undergo special training in the process and/or changes to the process every two years. What do we get for the 100s and 100s of hours of faculty investment in this process? Maybe 1% of the faculty are identified as underperforming. Hours and hours and hours of effort, as well as angst, are being wasted reviewing the 99% of solid faculty to chase a very few whose weaknesses can be identified in a far simpler (and frankly, potentially less embarrassing) process. To me, that is what this new plan represents. First, while this new plan does call for an annual review rather than biennial review of faculty, this annual review does not require the generation of an annual report (that needs reformatted multiple times) and a set of accompanying narratives. It merely requires that faculty report their activities in FAD, something that faculty are supposed to do anyway. Second, this plan calls for department chairs—but not P&T committees—to review the FAD annually to verify faculty are meeting *departmental* expectations for performance in assigned domains.

Some have suggested—because of this Chair-based review in Years 1 & 2—that there is an “absence” of peer review in this policy, but in fact, it’s in there, in what I think is a more reasoned way. While it is true this policy doesn’t require departmental peer/committee review of every faculty member every year, peers are there as they should be, as protection (from the potentially rogue chair), called upon whenever a department chair and dean indicate someone isn’t meeting expectations. But, we don’t waste our P&T committee members’ time doing annual or even biennial evaluations of the 99% of faculty who are doing just fine. The policy does, however, retain a departmental committee peer review of everyone every third year—which is where many have argued it should be—in a triennial peer-review process.

Now, others have raised concern that this places an increased workload on chairs (and deans) who are responsible for an annual review of all faculty. But this really is part of their job, isn’t it? Yes, the chair may have to go into the FAD to do the reviews, but I wouldn’t think there will be anything in there that chairs don’t already know (i.e., what classes faculty are teaching and how they are going; what scholarship or creative activities faculty are passionate about and how they are developing; which committees faculty are on and in what roles; and whether they are assigned advisees and meeting with them). Chairs regularly use this data to generate information for administrative reports, to brag about faculty achievements, to argue for new positions, and hopefully, to intervene when problems are discovered. To me, this “new” process simply formalizes something I hope chairs already do, and may in fact help them to catch concerns or issues earlier.

 As I see it, this new plan is not as it has sometimes been portrayed. It is not a complete “blowing-up” of the current system; in fact, I know some—particularly on FAC—who would like to see more dynamite used. But the proposed changes—for which there is administrative buy-in—are significant, and would reduce our process burden. I really hope we don’t let our pursuit of the perfect be the enemy of the good (or in this case, the better). I hope we will pass this today.

1. B. Jose- My first statement is in regards to something you said about this not being rushed. We might be following the normal calendar but it feels as if it is being rushed. When we were given a choice of A or B to be sent to FAC there was no advanced notice. They were there sitting on the desk when we arrived at the meeting. We had to hurry up and vote on these. We seemed to have discussed choice A but didn’t discuss choice B. Then the second time we discussed this we weren’t given an approved copy from Exec until a day or two before the meeting and not given much time to look at with the expectation that we would vote on it right away before anyone could get a good look at it. While that may not have been the intent for some of us it feels like it was the intent. For me that make me very, very nervous. My other comment is that in spite of what you and Virgil have present about the benefits of this, there seems to be an overwhelming opposition from the faculty. If we pass this then as it was stated at the last meeting we are stuck with it. We cannot approve this at this time and should revisit it later.
2. M. Johnson- I agree. I feel that faculty outside of Senate did not have the opportunity to express concerns about the annual review until now. It felt one-sided. I agree with what Brian is saying.
3. C. Hanson- I agree as well.
4. C. MacDonald- Let me address a couple of points. This Senate is better informed about what might be coming their way then Senates have been in the past. When we presented the motion to instruct to the Senate before sending it to FAC, that has never happened before. Let me explain the process what happens when an items comes from FAC, it comes to Executive Committee to be voted on, then sent to the full Senate to be voted on. Sometimes the timing doesn’t allow a lot of time from Executive Committee to Senate. From what I have heard the vast majority of faculty is not unhappy, there are pockets that are unhappy. I have heard from a number of departments and they are quite pleased with it.
5. J. Frost- I have to agree with Brian. It is almost concerning to me when you say that this would not have normally come from Exec on the day of the meeting and that FAC would have sent this to the Senate.
6. C. MacDonald- Let me clarify that. Let’s start with the motion to instruct. There were two potential choices and they were to tweak what we have or to make a larger change. The Senate decided to seek a larger change. That piece has never happened before.
7. J. Frost- I would like to say that on the day we received it we were not allowed to discuss option B. It was started out can I have a motion to approve option A. I know that is disturbing to me. I have asked a lot of faculty to give me responses. I have to agree with Brian that this highly unpopular with a lot of faculty within the College of Arts and Sciences.
8. J. Gustafson- I want to say that I am one of the four people that had a hand in writing this. There have been a lot of negative tones suggesting a conspiracy to rush this through Senate without oversight. We were acting on motion from the Senate. We took in a lot of input from departments with their concerns. One of the concerns was an opposition to annual review without faculty input and it was raised before we began writing the document. I am not sure where that came from but it has been repeated in most of the emails that have been sent from Senators and the College of Arts and Sciences. That was the main problem that I could see and it actually isn’t in the document. If you read the document there is an annual check-in review of what we are supposed to be doing anyway by updating FAD yearly. If there are any concerns it start where it should at the departmental review committee. I have heard the same comments from the same people that this unpopular and that there are problems with it because it was rushed through. I would like to something of substance in opposition to this. I am astounded that there are so many faculty opposed to process since it would make our workload lighter, retain the oversight, and remove some of the more contentious processes.
9. K. Games- I just wanted to a moment to respond to some of the comments made by my fellow senators. I wanted to make it clear that silence is not agreement. Just because one did not share their viewpoints does not mean they are in agreement. I don’t want sense of the senate to be the voice of a few loud senators or a single college.
10. R. Noll- I am from the College of Arts and Sciences and I wanted to say that I am very much in favor of this. We started to see this in January. I can see how some people might see this as rushed. I really appreciate both Chris and Virgil’s comments as they gave us a broad view on the document. I have had conversations with faculty since January about this issue-- many expressed concern through email. I am really quite at peace with this. This is a much improved process and I think we should vote in favor of it.
11. A. Czyzewski- I have been told not to vote on this by everyone except one person. I believe that comes down to the lack of involvement by peers in years one and two. We talk about people who could unnecessarily dinged by a Chair. What about those who get dinged by the Chair and don’t deserve it.
12. C. MacDonald- That is why the Dean also reviews everyone.
13. R. Guell- We voted on giving FAC a list of items to improve upon or to try to create a simplified system. I believe we reasonably described it in January. The vote at the time was overwhelmingly to send FAC off in the direction of creating a simplified system. FAC did what we asked them to do. What we have now is the choice between the current system and the new system. By voting against the new system we would be stuck with the current system for two more years. Part of what I think created a level of angst at the last meeting was when we would start. Upon reflection, it seems to make sense to treat next year like it would have been treated regardless of the vote today. There will be no review of any kind next year. If this motion passes, it will be a year for departments adjust to the triennial review. We would then start Fall 2021 as the third year of the triennial review. The fall of 2021 would be no different than if you vote for it or against it. The motion would to place in the preamble at the beginning of the document that would say “that we will start in the fall of 2021 with year three of the cycle.”
14. C. Hanson- Bob, can you speak to why there is a need for years 1 and 2, especially if they are "review light" as has been suggested? Why not just have it be triennial review?
15. C. MacDonald- The administration would not approve that.
16. M. Johnson- I am glad to hear that won’t start until fall 2021. I had been told it would start in fall 2020.
17. Second from M. Bergbower on the motion to start in the third year in Fall 2021
18. B. Jose- I may have misheard but I thought the motion was to start the fall of 2021 with year three.
19. R. Guell- That is correct. That keeps us on course.
20. M. Badar- So Bob, are you saying that fall 2021 would be the first year of the three year review or the third year of the review?
21. R. Guell- We would start fall 2021 with the full review. We will be doing a full review in that year whether you vote yes or no.
22. M. Chambers- So would the standard we use in that full review reflect what we are currently doing or would they reflect the new system.
23. R. Guell- In my mind we would use the standard that we currently use. This would give us a full academic cycle to adjust to year one of the new process.
24. C. MacDonald- The math is a little confusing. I think that I might missed something. I am seeing some conversations in chat about how many years would this cover. If we are going to start with year three and only go back two years. I am worried about that causing confusion.
25. R. Guell- I truly don’t care if we start the process with year one or year three. I was saying is that by calling fall 2021 year three of the cycle would not change our behavior in any way on the review cycle. My reasoning starting with a review is because I didn’t think the administration would bite on not having a review for four years. This would mean it would be five years between full reviews of faculty.
26. M .Johnson- Fall 2021 makes me feel better because there’s more time to prepare. So, it would be the same as the normal Biennial Review?
27. V. Sheets- Would we be able to use the simpler non-narrative process?
28. R. Guell- You are either going to have a full review as part of biennial review or as part of this in fall 2021. Fall 2021 seems like the right time to do a full review.
29. B. Jose- I actually understand Bob’s math, so I am not confused at all. So what you are saying is that we could not adopted this now and table it to take back up in the fall and it would have no effect on us. I saw that Cody had mentioned this in chat as well.
30. J. Frost- I agree with Cody.
31. A. Czyzewski- I also agree with Cody.
32. R. Guell- I think that we need to debate this more. I encourage you not to make a motion to table this now. I have been told by Chris that there will be an opportunity to table this later.
33. S. Kopaczewski- As Bob was making his motion, it did occur to me that if we started in year three in the fall of 2021 it would put right back in a review process. We could try doing a one year review followed by a triennial review and then make changes as needed. I am wondering if the way this is drafted lends itself to read differently than it is intended to appear. When you place deadlines for putting items in your FAD other than just checking their FAD by certain date. If they don’t have items in place in FAD then they will have a deficiency plan putting place. The wording of this process is the roadblock too many people because it sounds more complicated than it actually is. I think this a real concern that needs to be addressed.
34. C. MacDonald- I am not sure how to go about doing that. I will say despite all of the comments made here no one forwarded any revisions.
35. M. Johnson- Departments just need time to modify their expectations for one year rather than two years.
36. C. MacDonald- Yes.
37. M. Jackson- Wouldn’t we need to start fall 2021 with year two to keep us with the correct sequence?
38. M. Badar- Wouldn’t fall 2021 will be the second year of the triennial review?
39. R. Guell- We did a full review in the fall of 2019 and no evaluation in fall of 2020. What I am suggesting we do is a full evaluation in fall 2021 and fall of 2024. What I am trying to is simplify the process and instead of doing a review we don’t have standards for. This leaves next year as a non-evaluation year and will make fall of 2021 a full evaluation year.
40. M. Badar- So the new one would apply in fall 2022.
41. R. Guell- Yes.
42. M. Bergbower- Doing a Full review in the fall of 2021 under the old standards allows for “Exceed Expectations” and a decision on merit-pay increases?
43. C. MacDonald- There is not going to be merit pay anytime soon. There is no longer “Exceeds Expectations” in either the proposed or existing documents.
44. V. Sheets- There is an implication in Bob’s motion. Yes, we would have to figure out the time span as many are asking about in chat. If we follow the rules of the current biennial review we would still have to create training and a narrative. Following the current biennial review will be more time consuming and costly than adopting the new triennial review process.
45. M. Jackson- Do we need to vote on the motion?
46. R. Noll- Let’s do this please.
47. C. MacDonald- Bob your motion caries.
48. R. Guell- You need to grant someone the opportunity to table this.
49. C. MacDonald- Would anyone like to table this? I am not seeing any hands up for such a motion. I am not seeing such a motion.
50. C. MacDonald- We have a new faculty performance evaluation, which will start with year three of the performance evaluation in fall 2021.
51. AAC item: Annual Report -- File #6

Motion to accept report M. Badar, V. Sheets 28-0-0

* 1. A. Mohamed: The committee has investigated based on the recommendation of the Executive Officers the organization and the reorganization of the overall ratio between staff (exempt), staff (non-exempt) and faculty. We also studied ISU average student credit hour by faculty rank. Then we went a little above and studied student credit hour by faculty rank for each college.
	2. A. Mohamed- With the first item we found that there is no significant difference between 2018 and 2019 staff to faculty ratio which is at 2:1.
	3. A. Mohamed- The second item covered student credit hours (SCH) by faculty rank. The committee observed that 20% of the SCH are taught by temporary faculty and that 10% are taught by graduate assistants and administrative staff.
	4. A. Mohamed- We went through each college. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences SCH was almost the same as the ISU average. The Scott College of Business is almost the same as well. The College of Education, if you look at professors and associate professors is about 10% higher than the ISU average for SCH. The College of Health and Human Services for assistant professors the average of SCH over the years is about 15% more than the University average. The rest of the college are very close to the ISU average.
	5. A. Mohamed- One of the charges for the committee was to review the calendar. We reviewed and had some questions so we spoke with Susan Powers. We found that since the calendar has been accepted we cannot make changes. We also found that school districts don’t want to work with us on aligning spring break.
	6. M. Badar- I would like to point out that COT is not the same average as ISU. If you look at the instructor side for the last two years it is much higher than the ISU average.
1. Adjournment: 5:49 pm