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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 29, 2015

3:30 pm, HMSU 227

Final Minutes

Members Present: C. MacDonald, T. Hawkins, L. Brown, E. Hampton, D. Hantzis, S. Lamb, V. Sheets

Members Absent: J. Conant, C. Paterson

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Bradley, Provost M. Licari

Guests: R. Gonser, V. Hammen, R. Guell

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Bradley
      1. I thought I could expand a little bit on Christina Contrell, as I mentioned her in my address. She has been given responsibility over 150 members of the freshmen class of 2010 and needs to get as many as possible graduated by May. She will look at MySam; who has money issues; who needs to change majors; and all the other things that get in the way of graduating on time. The hope is to have a significant impact on the graduation rate of those 150 people. We are hoping to get 75% to 80% of them graduated within the year. We will try to do the same for the class of 2011 and have someone push hard, by working with the regular academic advisors and deans, to get students graduated. Many have 100 credits or more. It would be a shame if they left without a degree.
      2. I have mentioned that I will be speaking to the Regional Cities Initiative. We are proposing that the ICON building become a collaborative work space. This would mean significant remodeling. The upper floor would become apartments.
         1. S. Lamb: It would become a workspace for whom?
         2. D. Bradley: For anyone. We’re looking into an “Entrepreneur” type of space for people with ideas—for example, in IT—who want a space to work. Hopefully we can get enough of those kinds of people together to innovate.
      3. St. Mary of the Woods College would like to further expand their Equine Center. Ivy Tech would like to add an Agricultural Center. There are also proposals from Vincennes and smaller groups as well. Our proposal is small at $32 million. The one from Fort Wayne is hundreds of millions. We will see how it goes.
         1. V. Sheets: Do we own the ICON building?
         2. D. Bradley: Yes.
         3. V. Sheets: What’s currently in the building south?
         4. D. Bradley: Currently athletics uses it for practices. They also rent it out to Little Leagues. It’s a bare-boned space, an old refrigerated warehouse. When we replaced the turf at the baseball field, they salvaged some of it and then moved it to that building. I think with the remodeling of the Arena they will put some offices over there for cross-country and track coaches.
   2. Provost M. Licari: no report.
2. Chair Report: C. MacDonald
   1. The “*It’s On Blue*” deadline is tomorrow.
      1. D. Bradley: 94% of faculty and staff have completed it as of this morning. They are finding people that are still in the payroll system that are not active but still on the list. The updated lists will be provided to the Chairs. I think students are at 70% or so and freshmen are at 80%. It’s moving along. I think K. Butwin and A. Janssen-Robinson are very happy with the responses.
3. Approval of Minutes of September 15, 2015
   1. Motion to approve as amended (D. Hantzis, L. Brown) Vote: 7-0-0
4. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. S. Lamb: I’ve had initial feedback from C. MacDonald that M. Licari has been receptive to some of the following concerns. I have several faculty on contract status in the Accounting, Finance and Insurance & Risk Management (AFIRM) Department that have loyally served this institution for many of years. Some of the following is guess work on my part:
      1. E. Gallatin has served perhaps twelve years. He has had more than one multiyear contract, perhaps two three year contracts, but they have not been consecutive. He is professionally AACSB qualified. According to a recently received form, he is presently in his third year of his first three-year contract.
      2. R. McMahan has served 26 years, since 1989. He is professionally qualified. According to a recently received form, he is presently in his fourth year of his second three-year contract.
      3. S. Robinson has served perhaps eight years. She is professionally qualified in Finance, having established the Financial Planning major. According to a recently received form, she is presently in her third year of her first three-year contract.
   2. We have others in similar situations in the Scott College of Business. S. Williams is in her ninth year of service as ISU in Marketing. I was so pleased with all D. Bradley has done to attempt to achieve much greater stability for these individuals by revising the Regular Faculty category. He is greatly responsible for championing this effort. The concept of regular faculty has been so gratifying for so many. It has led to much greater productivity. It is my wish that the cases of the individuals above, as well as similar individuals across the institution, could be advanced by the relevant personnel committees, chairs and deans, ending at the Provost’s office so that they could be evaluated as if they were in the sixth year of their second three-year contract. They then could be considered for advancement. Please consider this.
   3. S. Lamb: I would also like to comment about the Biennial Review. I thank S. Powers for answering all my questions over the weekend.
      * 1. D. Bradley: Yes, and she did so in a kind and considerate way.
   4. S. Lamb: I am bothered right now about something that we did as the Senate body. That is, that you can overall be contributing even if you’re exceeding expectations in your number one category. We have five faculty members who are doing exceptional in their first category. The decision-making process will now move out of our department up to the dean. It puts a burden on them and takes the decision away from the departmental personnel committee. C. MacDonald has sent me the rationale for this.
      1. C. MacDonald: I do know the department can only put forward so many for *Contributing Exceptionally*. No more than 1/7th of a department’s faculty can receive this designation.
      2. S. Lamb: I did not read that. If I go through that category, if I have more who exceed expectations, what do I do? Start paring down?
      3. C. MacDonald: Yes.
      4. D. Bradley: I call that the T. Hawkins rule.
      5. T. Hawkins: I don’t like it either.
   5. S. Lamb: There is much good with the present form. I think the three-page report is wonderful. I think the attempt to identify marginal faculty is wonderful. The rest I am upset with, especially when I am going to have to choose between one very highly qualified and another very highly qualified faculty member. If we could just give scores and weights in the various categories. We have been weighting since Excel was created.
      1. D. Bradley: What do you mean?
      2. S. Lamb: If you give every faculty a score in teaching 1-9….
      3. D. Bradley: No, no no.
      4. S. Lamb: That’s how it worked in our department.
      5. L. Brown: I like being able to distinguish the marginal performances and those performances not meeting expectations. The trouble and angst comes in with the exceptional category.
      6. D. Bradley: You don’t have to put anyone in it. I know what happens on some campuses in these kinds of circumstances. Clearly that’s why we have a process that ended up in the final draft where the department can submit an additional name.
      7. L. Brown: That is true. I think that’s where most of the issue comes to play.
      8. C. MacDonald: You submit the top candidates to the college committee who then make the decision.
      9. D. Bradley: There are clearly people who are exceptional. Ultimately, you make the choice. It’s just like giving people A, B, and Cs.
      10. D. Hantzis: The policy says “may be.” There is no guarantee. The decision should be left to colleagues. What we’ve created is not an “A, B, C” model. It is an “A, F.” “B, C, D” are all in the middle. That’s where we have the discrimination. That’s why we have peer review. What does “meets expectations” mean between those three? I think the angst is due to the improvement plan.
      11. E. Hampton: I would disagree. The president’s system means that it is more likely that someone great will be affected than someone at the bottom.
      12. D. Bradley: There’s nobody arguing for people to be put in the bottom category. Part of the faculty’s responsibility is to do faculty assessment of peers.
      13. E. Hampton. The somewhat arbitrary decision to give extra incentives to a small percent of faculty is where the real angst comes in. Tying the Biennial Review to salary has been its downfall.
      14. D. Bradley: We will have more conversations about this. You could argue we are all good. Some people go above and beyond. We want them to feel rewarded.
   6. D. Bradley: I think there are still some kinks that we should work out on the instructor piece. M. Licari and I have talked about this. I would be okay with saying once you get through the six-year review that basically faculty members/instructors would be on rolling three-year contracts. Basically they are assured of a two-year notice. There are some details in the three-year contracts that we haven’t worked out just by talking about it. We should have assumed that a lot of one-year people have turned into three-year people. Some have been here 25 years. Do they need to go through the six-year process? As long as the Provost and the deans make sure there are sufficient evaluations when moving from one job to another, I don’t see any big issues in that.
      1. D. Hantzis: I agree with D. Bradley. Speaking on behalf of FAC, we chose not to try to write the language regarding assessment of instructors. It was difficult to navigate. It would be easier to leave it discretionary right now. I do think there is a difference between a six-year review and “you’re promoted to senior instructor.” Senate has kept promotions separate for a reason.
      2. D. Bradley: I am not comfortable with bringing someone in immediately on a rolling contract. It should read like a tenure contract.
      3. D. Hantzis: We can. In the Handbook we can.
      4. D. Bradley: I’m not sure we can. Contracts have been written and need to be on three-year rotations.
      5. L. Brown: Can we change “marginal faculty” to “marginal performances”?
      6. D. Hantzis: The ones I have seen read “pending review.”
      7. D. Bradley: There are a lot of ways to clean this up.
      8. L. Brown: We are getting there.
   7. D. Hantzis: I want to give two thanks. The handicapped spaces on Cherry Street have been painted. I wanted to say thank you for that. Also, I had a lot of fun entering my interim grades. It worked seamlessly. I wanted to thank those responsible for all their work. The manual-entry option is also a good thing.
      1. S. Powers: that will always be there.
   8. E. Hampton: I want to ask about the metric used to determine where departments are regarding new lines. I am specifically concerned about how courses taught by graduate assistants (GA) affect faculty deployment. If GA information is not incorporated, the department becomes increasingly less deployed.
      1. D. Bradley: The model does not look at “faculty deployed.” If you have graduate students, it helps you. They are faculty of record many times. J. Maynard and I couldn’t figure out how to count them because they are used in many different ways. Right now they are a freebee.
      2. E. Hampton: Using my own department as an example, right now we are at target. But that is only when we use every GA, since two faculty members have resigned.
      3. D. Bradley: We only count graduate-assistant SCHs.
      4. R. Guell: Graduate students plus EAPs.
      5. E. Hampton: The metrics don’t counteract each other?
      6. D. Bradley: Correct. They don’t.
5. Minor change to Handbook 922.9
   1. Motion to change the word to match the number “twelve”. (T. Hawkins, V. Sheets) Vote: 7-0-0
   2. Chris: The problem here is that in 922.9 the word says “nine” and the number is “12.” We just need to pick one.
   3. D. Bradley: I would bet it’s twelve. Just say twelve. The goal is to allow people to have other jobs than just the panels.
   4. D. Hantzis: It says full-time faculty or staff. You could have no faculty.
      1. D. Bradley: You will always have faculty. One of the things we have to grapple with is that we should have students on these panels. The idea that students aren’t on these panels I’m not sure is fair to those involved. That’s another thing that is going to have to be decided.
   5. C. MacDonald: Shall we agree to make it twelve with the promise that this will be revised later this year?
6. Updates on IRB
   1. C. MacDonald: I know we have had some questions about the IRB. Let’s invite V. Hammen to the table.
   2. V. Hammen: I have been involved with leadership of IRB since 2008. Back in 2008, the two leadership positions received two course releases. At that time, we had a full-time staff member who received applications and paperwork and assigned reviewers. Up to that point, the staff processed all of the applications. Our job was oversight. When we went through our budget crisis in 2012, we lost the full-time staff member then converted to an online review process. K. Bodey and I began to divide up all the administrative work in addition to the reviews. So, one of our problems is workload. In addition, many of the submissions need work. I will say that if I have ten applications come in, I would be shocked if eight or nine are ready for review. In most cases, there are missing items. Over time, we have gotten to where we are trying not to enable the applicants. Now we say there is a checklist available on the IRB website.
      1. D. Bradley: Do those applications go through the chair or dean?
      2. V. Hammen: Yes they do, which is why I would like your input.
   3. V. Hammen: Another interesting phenomenon is a 63% increase of applications since 2012. This can only get larger as graduate programs grow. While support has decreased 100%, our workload has increased 63%. Recently, L. Holloway has left. She was by title a budget analyst. In practice, she did support work for IRB and had a lot of interaction with applicants. When she left in June, the process slowed down. D. Underwood, K. Bodey and I tried to work around this. It created challenges to complete reviews in a timely fashion. We now have a Graduate Assistant assigned through the Office of Sponsored Programs. The full board discussed whether we felt comfortable letting this student participate in the review process. We think she can do the initial checklist and pre-reviews. She is not making review judgments. She has only been working for about three weeks. We are still trying to figure out the logistics of it, since the GA does not work during summer or breaks. I am reviewing her workload and hoping that she can check to see that applications are complete. I still have to go in and check each application now. There were also several health and faculty issues during the summer that forced IRB to take the backseat. I am happy to say we are caught up. Everything is read and processed. Summer is difficult. No IRB members get compensation besides K. Bodey and me. As a result, people have few qualms about leaving town and breaking communication with the IRB. Do we want to help out V. Hammen and change her response to the President to read “yes, both”?
   4. V. Hammen: The other challenge that we are dealing with more and more is the quality of applications we receive. Some come from faculty, but others come from students who need much more faculty mentorship. We have applications that come through that are so poorly written you can’t understand what they are doing. I had one exempt study that had 57 comments. This was signed off on by the faculty sponsor and chair. I have had students come to me with their applications on their iPhones saying that I was to do their application for them. I said no. It shouldn’t be a difficult process, but it is. I have had conversations with T. Allen from Student Success regarding IRB training sessions for students. Student participation has been a problem. We have done them for faculty sponsors as well. We don’t know what else to do. I am happy to hear your input. I am passing out a copy of the membership of the IRB. These are the individuals who are serving. We do have someone from Technology and Business. We send out open calls for individuals who wish to serve. Federal guidelines require a non-scientist, and community, child, and prisoner advocates. People who serve have many other obligations. We try not to burden them.
   5. D. Hantzis: You mentioned numbers, what are those?
      1. V. Hammen: We went from 107 in 2012 to 170 in 2014-15.
   6. D. Bradley: How many are exempt?
      1. V. Hammen: A majority. 116 were exempt last year.
   7. D. Bradley: Any chance that the criteria can be reduced?
      1. V. Hammen: This is a concern. There are conversations at the federal level to increase the number of exempt categories. The process will take a long time. Internally, there has been a conversation about self-determination for the exempt category. IRB does not support that. One reason is because of the poor quality of the applications we see. Another is the questionable ethics, especially the potential for coercion. Many faculty members want to use their own students as research subjects. We’ve taken the position that although they are not a federally protected population our students should have protection. There would be problems if there is no oversight.
   8. D. Bradley: Are there individuals who make several applications a year?
      1. V. Hammen: Yes.
      2. V. Sheets: I do.
   9. D. Bradley: If there are a number of those people, you could possibly give them the seal of approval.
      1. V. Sheets: She has caught many of my mistakes and I appreciate that.
      2. V. Hammen: Thanks. I think that is what happens. For example, when I see an application from Virgil, the review process is much faster. It takes me a tenth of the time to review someone who knows what they are doing. Some departments have an internal committee that reviews applications. They take on the responsibility to ensure quality. E. Hampton and C. MacDonald know this; we had one in our department. In another piece of good news, one particular unit was having a very significant issue with compliance. This led to sanctions and a better sense of what can and cannot be done. There was a learning curve, but now we have fewer issues. Last year there were no events. I think that we certainly see that we carry the burden of education. Maybe we are starting to see that pay off. Now where do we go? Online programs, mandatory training? Unfortunately, some new faculty members don’t interact with the IRB.
      3. D. Hantzis: Are department chairs required to go through training? I was acting chair for eighteen months and had to sign off on two of these applications but did not have any training.
         1. V. Hammen: If something was really bad we used to send a notice to the chair, but we have gotten away from that. How do you ensure compliance? The most efficient would be to have evidence that you submit with an application. Anybody that’s registered can upload training records. You can submit once and link. I will be working on instructions hopefully tomorrow. D. Underwood is the one who will certify those training records.
      4. V. Sheets: Will there be updates to IRB.net? One of the problems that I have seen more than once is that proposals are being sent off without being signed off. It should be simple to say that you cannot submit because you haven’t signed.
         1. L. Brown: That would be very helpful. New people who don’t use it often don’t know these things.
      5. V. Hammen: There’s a checklist and instructions that walk you through it. In a student success series, I showed how to get applications ready and how to submit. When it comes to IRB.net, we have probably the less expensive version. There are versions that do more, but they cost more. We can’t justify that kind of expense. Last year, I was able to go to a conference for IRB and review other versions. However, we do a lot with margin comments. This isn’t possible in some versions.
         1. V. Sheets: I like the forms. They are better than in the past.
      6. V. Hammen: We had one case where the student never clicked on submit. You have to hit submit. This is in the checklist. We can put the checklist on top of Form A so that you have to go through it. We need to send a message to students that the care with which you do the application gives us a sense of the care with which you will treat your subjects.
      7. L. Brown: We also need the timeline to be adjusted.
         1. V. Hammen: Right now it says 10 working days, but it doesn’t usually work. If someone submits on November 1st, it will be on agenda for November 14. The length of time between time of submission and the actual review is often longer. Usually we try to turn things around quickly when things are turned in correctly.
7. Updates on BR/FAD:
   1. S. Powers: A lot of questions have arisen on the interpretation of the policy itself. I forwarded those to C. MacDonald. It’s also become clear that not everyone had Biennial Review guidelines in place. Many seemed surprised about that. We had a handful of workflow issues. I am extremely appreciative of S. Brake’s help on this. The workflow was designed to prevent a department chair from reviewing himself/herself. There were some problems there. Many put their materials in the chairs only workflow.
      1. D. Hantzis: It’s that way in the default.
   2. S. Powers: Other faculty put theirs in the library workflow. It got frantic at the end straightening things out. I’ve already talked to Digital Measures. They provide an opportunity to suggest a top ten list of changes. I suggested for example, that I would like to be able to see the workflow for everyone. We should have the ability to delete early uploads to the workflow.
      1. D. Hantzis: Everyone in my department has multiple versions of the report.
      2. L. Brown: Yes.
      3. S. Lamb: You asked a few of us if we would submit early.
      4. D. Hantzis: And now you can’t delete?
   3. S. Powers: Right now I can’t delete a workflow. You don’t want someone to delete while still making changes. Once a workflow is done, if they change a layer of review, I can’t delete the old one. There might be a work around on that, but we haven’t had time to figure it out yet. Another issue was the links. Some people wanted to use links even when directed not to. Finally, I was surprised by the number of people who called on the 20th who had never before opened their Digital Measures.
      1. D. Hantzis: Not everyone went through the pilot.
   4. S. Powers: We need to get better training throughout the colleges. Some had good training, others did not. It’s not solely on me or on M. Miller. She has not been the FAD fellow since June. I am very good at answering e-mails. I did try to convey to deans and department chairs that I was available to assist. 30% of questions I received were straightforward technical questions. A couple of departments have finished their part of the review and sent their reports to the dean’s office. I am also getting some requests for extensions. It will be easier next time. There is now some clarity for those who were promoted last year. It doesn’t necessarily mean they have to be reviewed again this year. We need to be clearer on that policy. And we need to think more about the evaluative criteria.
      1. C. MacDonald: We certainly have found that we need more clarity.
      2. S. Lamb: It will be easier the next time around.
      3. D. Hantzis: I think that it’s good that most of the issues are about faculty preparation. Training is critical, especially at the department level.
   5. T. Hawkins: My biggest concern is the convenience factor. Everyone needs to know how to use the system. But I don’t want it be become something that requires hours of training before you can feel comfortable. It should be so intuitive that faculty can use it without extensive training.
   6. D. Hantzis: Were we supposed to see all of our colleagues in the department? I saw their FADs. I saw everyone’s materials. I stopped looking when I realized what I was looking at.
      1. L. Brown: So did André.
      2. S. Powers: You can’t manage data in them.
8. FAC item:
   1. Motion to approve FAC recommendations for Faculty Awards as amended (V. Sheets, S. Lamb) Vote: 6-1-0
   2. R. Guell: One of the things that FAC didn’t get to discuss last year was the issue of making instructors eligible for the Caleb Mills Award. After our most recent meeting, we recommend making Senior Instructors eligible for the Caleb Mills Award. We recommend revisions to the Handbook language for the Faculty Distinguished Service Award to make it parallel to the Caleb Mills Award. Finally, we recommend a waiting period of ten-years before an award winner is eligible to win again. There was an example last year of someone receiving the service award for a second time. There are minutes going back to 2000-2001 when the Senate voted to make the Caleb Mills a “one and done” award. We were uncomfortable with taking that vote, one that had not been made into formal policy, as the basis to oppose repeat winners. One point of discussion was whether winning a second time should require a higher bar, e.g., doing something extraordinary or significantly different from the first time. At the same time, codifying those differences seemed very problematic. We voted 4-1 for a waiting period. You can imagine who the “1” was. It was me. I wanted a higher hurdle to win it the second time. The proposal is to go with 10 years. That would be the standard. The Dreiser award has its own pre-existing standards for winning multiple times.
   3. E. Hampton: A question about the example. Ten years from now would be 2026 or 2027?
      1. R. Guell: You would be eligible after ten years. The effective wait is 11 years.
   4. E. Hampton: A point of order, are these separate motions or a single one?
      1. C. MacDonald: We are taking them as one motion.
   5. D. Hantzis: Could we substitute something for the word “win”? It’s good to say “award” and “awarded” or “received.” Really, these aren’t awards for which you compete. I don’t know how you would want to do this, but I have some wordsmithing suggestions. As revised, 380.1.2 would read "Any tenured faculty member or any Senior Instructor who is teaching a minimum of 15 semester hours or 24 contact hours at Indiana State University during the current or previous calendar year is eligible for nomination." The final sentence remains unchanged.
      1. R. Guell: I don’t believe that FAC would have any objections to those changes.
   6. C. MacDonald: 380.1.3.2 representation: we don’t currently have any senior instructors. If we pass this right now, we can’t fulfill this.
      1. R. Guell: We considered this. If this goes to the Senate in October, the Board of Trustees wouldn’t take up until December. We should have some then. By the time this is in place, the nomination season for the 2017 awards, we will likely have senior instructors. It is not worth it to rewrite the language.
      2. C. MacDonald: We have to hope they are willing to serve.
      3. R. Guell: Yes, we hope it is worth it.
   7. D. Hantzis: 380.1.4 seems cumbersome. 380.3.3 should say “appropriate”?
      1. R. Guell: The point of that section wouldn’t exclude chairpersons.
      2. D. Hantzis: I think these changes are good changes.
      3. S. Lamb: Add “appropriate”
   8. L. Brown: I’d love to have a discussion about the ten-year waiting period. I agree with R. Guell. There should be some kind of higher bar if it is your second time receiving it. You should show significant progress or significant changes from when you received the award.
      1. D. Hantzis: Endurance.
      2. L. Brown: Right.
      3. S. Lamb: The standards would change in ten years.
      4. V. Sheets: It seems to me that a committee would build that bias into its deliberations. If I were on a committee, I would only consider someone a second time if there were significant changes.
      5. T. Hawkins: That has to be good faith. If a committee is considering a candidate a second time, it would be hard not to recognize that the person has won before. A candidate would be expected to demonstrate a significant departure from the achievements that merited the award in the first place.
      6. D. Hantzis: R. Guell and I talked about this. When I was nominated, I did not think I was eligible. I submitted only work that I had done subsequent to receiving the first award. The award would be given based on subsequent work.
   9. R. Guell: That in no way made the distinction in the teaching area. If you taught at the same level throughout 10 years, well, the language is that you could.
   10. L. Brown: I think the committee would go back to the language.
   11. R. Guell: Or is he/she doing anything differently? The level of “stuff” you have to put into the Handbook or an educational section for the award would be silly. I was more than content to write ten years for a justification. Sometimes simplicity is best. I agree with T. Hawkins and V. Sheets. The committees have brains.
   12. S. Lamb: Move the questions.
   13. R. Guell: A question about the Advising Taskforce recommendations: Are you giving it to us immediately and do you have a time frame?
   14. C. MacDonald: I have not been given a time frame. The answer to those questions is that I don’t know yet. I assume I will be sending it soon. Once I know a time frame I will pass that out too. I just got it yesterday (9-28-15).
   15. R. Guell: FAC wants to deal with the anti-retaliation and anti-bullying policies. We would wait for the university attorney to chime in, but she has been very busy. May we have your blessing to go forward?
   16. C. MacDonald: Absolutely.
   17. R. Guell: The Provost came to FAC today to pitch his ideas about a Policies Committee. The Policy Committee essentially takes the task of writing the Handbook language out of the hands of the standing committees. It would be tasked with doing what we all tried to do last year with Section 305. Generally, it would serve the standing committees. They would maintain their jurisdictions. They would maintain their authority and would be the approval bodies for any language written by the Policy Committee. Who do you want to take the lead in writing into 246 the Handbook language authorizing the committee? My suggestion is to ask the standing committee chairs to meet as a special committee to write the language. We would then bring it forward with endorsements from all the standing committees.
       1. C. MacDonald: Yes, I appreciate that suggestion.
9. GC item:
   1. Motion to approve language changing the timing of notification for the Dreiser Award to 1 December (V. Sheets, L. Brown) Vote: 7-0-0
   2. R. Gonser: The deadline in the Handbook for receiving final nominations is January 20th. Dean Maurer did not realize the deadlines and was caught off guard; last year was her first time. We thought that a change to December 1 would allow nominees more time to submit and give the committee more time for review. The change we would like is from January 20 to December 1.
      1. V. Sheets: I’m not at all opposed to that. We received emails that nominations are due November 17.
      2. R. Gonser: She begins to receive them starting November 17. They’re not due until January 20. You might also consider reviewing 380.2.4.1.
10. Adjournment: 5:38 PM