

#8

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

March 24, 2016

3:30pm, HMSU Dede III

Final Minutes

Members Present: A. Anderson, C. Ball, P. Bro, L. Brown, B. Bunnett, J. Conant, B. Corcoran, E. Gallatin, N. Goswami, R. Guell, D. Hantzis, M. Harmon, T. Hawkins, J. Kinne, J. Kuhlman, A. Kummerow, S. Lamb, I. Land, C. MacDonald, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, C. Paterson, J. Pommier, V. Sheets, S. Stofferahn, H. Tapley, L. Phillips

Members Absent: E. Hampton, E. Southard, K. Lee, K. Berlin, M. Schafer

Ex-Officio Present:

Ex-Officio Absent: D. Bradley, M. Licari

Guests: L. Spence, K. Butwin

1) Memorial Resolutions

a) Vote: 27-0-0.

b) L. Brown

Former ISU Mathematics Professor Gladys Taylor, affectionately known as "G.G.", died December 8th, 2015 in Bloomington, Indiana.

Professor Taylor was a member of the Department of Mathematics for 26 years, starting as an instructor in 1963, and retiring as a Full Professor in May of 1989. She joined the Department after receiving her B.A. from Skidmore College in 1948, and her M.A. from Radcliff/Harvard in 1952. While at Harvard, she began her teaching career as a teaching fellow in the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She completed her Ph.D. in the History and Philosophy of Science at Indiana University in 1980. Her writings dealt with the Science at Indiana University in 1980. Her writings dealt with the Foundations of Mathematics and focused on the implications of the work of Bertrand Russell, in particular the Russell-Whitehead opus Principia Mathematica.

Professor Taylor's teaching encompassed great breadth in both Mathematics and Mathematics Education. When the Department began offering courses in Computer Science in the 1970's, Professor Taylor taught some of our early classes.

Her professional memberships included the American Mathematics Society, the Mathematics Association of America, Pi Mu Epsilon, and the Philosophy of Science Association. She was very active in the Terre Haute community, serving on the boards of the Red Cross and the Terre Haute Symphony. She was thrice named queen at our local Beaux Arts Ball. She received much national recognition as the dedicatee of her daughter Jill Bolte Taylor's best-selling book on the human brain *My Stroke of Insight*.

She is remembered fondly by faculty members who remember her supportive nature and her eagerness to welcome new colleagues. Her expressions of good wishes were always genuine and heartfelt.

The College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science acknowledge Gladys's dedication to enriching the lives of many and bringing out the best in those whose lives she touched.

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

2) Administrative Reports

- a) President D. Bradley: none.
- b) Provost M. Licari: none.

3) Chair Report:

- a) C. MacDonald:
 - i) I hope you had a great Spring Break.
 - ii) We have two Special Senate meetings scheduled for March 31st and April 14th in Holmstedt Hall 102 at 3:30pm. Please put those on your calendar. I had hoped not to have any during my term, however the amount of things we have to get done this semester mandates these sessions.

- iii) The election ballots for next year's senators are going out on Friday. Business and Technology may be underrepresented next year, since we are still missing one nomination in each college. You will have one week to vote. We appreciate having you vote as soon as possible. The New Senate Social will be on April 4th, and the Senate officer elections will take place on April 7th. If you are interested, I encourage you to run for Exec or an officer position.
 - iv) We will be dealing with a Constitutional change today. This is a first reading, so we will be voting on it next week. I don't think it will be controversial. Our primary goal this week is to begin discussions about the Biennial Review. Exec has also begun discussions, but nothing has been voted on. We need to start discussing the issues so each can get a full hearing.
- 4) Support Staff Report: none
- 5) SGA Report: none
- 6) Temporary Faculty Advocate:
- a) M. Muyumba: I want to follow up from the last Senate meeting. We discussed giving temporary faculty an option to use the Recreation Center with no charge. Currently, only the full-time temporary faculty have that option. I am also meeting with FEBC to discuss the possibility of other benefits. Hopefully, I will have some updates next time.
- 7) Approval of Minutes:
- a) Motion to approve as amended: (V. Sheets, D. Malooley) Vote: 26-0-1.
- 8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion:
- a) None.
- 9) Discussion Item: E-mail Retention
- a) L. Spence:
 - i) Last time there were some questions about what the e-mail retention initiative means, and there were concerns about the lack of faculty involvement. I will speak to both issues. First, I think you all are in one of three states: 1) we've met with you and your department; 2) you were unable to participate in the department meeting; 3) we have yet to meet with you and your department.
 - ii) This initiative started almost a year ago to make sure we do a better job managing our e-mails. This effort was started with the goal of helping people understand how to use the new tools available to us. We realized that OIT was not saying a lot about

the issue of e-mail retention. The initiative itself has to do with turning on new capabilities regarding retention of e-mails. It defines a period of time for automatic deletion. And, it turns on an online archive.

- iii) Currently, we define a four-year default maximum limit for this institution. That's the longest one can retain e-mails. You can also make longer requests for retainment. Two departments have requested a longer retention. There is a process. We have visited many departments to discuss our new capabilities. At this meeting, we talk about how the system works, and we determine a time for activation. The default is for a six-month deletion unless you turn on a tag to enable longer retention. We have met with 31 of our academic departments to date. We have two departments that have been activated all the way through to the point where their e-mails are being deleted at the six-month mark. Consultants are available to meet with individuals to discuss retention time as well as how to use tags.
 - iv) It is important for people to sit down and think about how long to keep their e-mails. We also encourage saving e-mails to the H-drive or L-drive. We have discovered that there are employees who don't know they have those drives. We are attempting to improve communication as we meet with people.
 - v) I hope these meetings have been productive. We are hoping to finish them by the end of April, though some will probably have to wait until the fall. The administrative departments will begin in the fall as well. We hope to finish the entire initiative by October 31st with everyone turned on at that time. We're trying to pay attention to the timeline, and I will try to reach out to Chairs right before we turn on the default settings. I will also check back to make sure things are going smoothly and to ensure people don't lose important information.
 - vi) I want to acknowledge a misstep when we were thinking about implementing this. Typically, what happens with an initiative that affects faculty is we start the conversation with an advisory committee. It goes to OIT and then to the Provost's Office. At some point I get in touch with ITAC members for input. In some cases, we go to Exec. In this initiative we had a lot of advice, but I missed the step to go to ITAC or Exec. We are now thinking broadly about the advisory process and governance. I am planning a meeting with ITAC. One problem is that we don't have solid representation with our distance education faculty. We need to close that gap. As we look to revise our advisory process I want to make sure we have a couple of people designated by the Senate on our committees. I expect to talk to the provost about this. Questions?
- b) R. Guell: As the author of the criticism regarding consultation, I appreciate the mea culpa. I would only note that ITAC is staffed by tech-savvy people. Non tech-savvy

faculty also have the right to be heard. I hope that when you consider how to get input you think more broadly about the people who populate the committees.

- i) L. Spence: That's true. We want the right representation from the right constituencies. That makes one set of characteristics we will look for.
- c) D. Malooley: Has there been any contemplation about the six-month limit? Someone just contacted me about an e-mail from last year. Is it possible to extend it to an academic year?
 - i) L. Spence: I think that would be difficult based on the way the system works. We actually talked in committee about six months versus a year. We give people the tools to save beyond six months. I think with the appropriate approval, we can change almost anything about this. But, we have tagging. And, there are other methods you can use to save your e-mail for as long as four years with the right set-up. What I've been telling people is that right now our system allows everyone to keep everything forever. We can't keep that up. Anything we come up with as an alternative is probably better than what we have.
 - ii) D. Malooley: It was not an e-mail I would have marked to keep. I luckily had not deleted it.
 - iii) L. Spence: Again, almost everything is changeable about this. We are waiting to hear from people to see what we need to change.
- d) S. Stofferahn: As a medieval historian I have a different perspective on the past. We should all be concerned about this, since we have been pushed to become virtual professionals. Our professional lives are contained in e-mails. I have important contacts in e-mails that go back several years. Ideally, policy making should be consultative. Policy should be designed to improve an institution. What is the compelling reason to delete everything from our past older than six months? Why are we doing this? We don't have a compelling reason.
 - i) L. Spence: I think it is about highlighting the good practices that allow you to retain what you value and let the other stuff go. There is some risk in navigating the two. But we hope this makes sense. This is a resource that we need to pay attention to. People are not paying attention to it. What we were doing in the past was not necessarily the best.
- e) R. Guell: I know I sent you and K. Butwin an e-mail today. I was exposed the word spoliation by someone who was willing to sue many of us in the room. One of his threats was we were assumed to be at fault if we deleted anything. So, we had to keep everything. What is it that we are supposed to do in terms of preserve things that we are legally obligated to preserve?
 - i) K. Butwin: It depends on the circumstances. Let me remind everyone, from an operational perspective we have a records retention policy. There are things that we

- should not be keeping in our e-mail. I recognize the difficulty doing that. If you advised a student by e-mail, you need to make note of that somewhere else, because you could decide tomorrow that you are leaving and we won't have record for that. We need to think of e-mail in a more transactional way than ever before. Save operational documents outside the e-mail framework.
- ii) R. Guell: If I took the substance of what the gentleman said and saved everything in a Word document on my hard-drive, I am doing it even though the e-mail is gone because the substance is retained. Can I defend myself in court for that?
 - iii) K. Butwin: There are many people every year that threaten to sue. Very rarely do we actually have litigation that arises from these general threats that would cause us to need to preserve email for a longer period than our email retention policy. This analysis about preserving email is done on a case-by-case basis. Items that are operational in nature should be saved elsewhere – not in email. L. Spence will tell you that if you want to save the e-mail, you can save it directly without cutting and pasting. IT has information on how to do that. Some of it is a case by case basis. If you have someone who has called to sue you, I would save the e-mail and let the General Counsel's Office know if you are concerned. If we have a policy that calls for a deletion of e-mail after a period of time, we can't be held responsible unless we are required to save it. I would and should be involved in those situations.
- f) S. Lamb: I want to address the concerns of our medievalist. They are valid. Regarding e-mails that have already been sent, could we extend that deadline to a year? From this point we could use six months.
- i) L. Spence: I don't know if that would be possible. People ask if they have enough time to save all of their e-mails before implementation. I say we can work that out. You can still drag over to your H or L drive. You can do a variety of things to save e-mails. We hope that people create an organization strategy for different e-mails.
 - ii) C. MacDonald: I see this as a new filing system for our e-mail. We can still tag that e-mail and hold on to it for four years. We are not in desperate straits. We don't have to go through every e-mail in the next six months.
 - iii) L. Spence: If you feel you have to do something, please don't move your e-mail to a Gmail account. Please talk to us. We can discuss the tools we have.
- g) J. Kinne: I think there are some who will divide their e-mail in two categories: professional and personal. I assume that will happen.
- i) K. Butwin: Your institutional e-mail address should only be used for your work life. Public records requests are made for a lot of e-mails. What does the Open Records Act require of us? This may be a presentation for another time, and I'm happy to do that. We need to learn to manage e-mail as a transactional process and not let it be

- a repository for this document or that faculty vote. Such things should be saved somewhere else.
- ii) C. MacDonald: So, I think we need to have some more training.
 - iii) L. Spence: We have started that. Our training is for not only e-mail retention, but also storing documents and e-mails elsewhere.
- h) D. Hantzis: When we've done these major faculty investments regarding software, such as Portal and Banner, OIT recruited a number of faculty members to discuss the changes with their colleagues. We did that in the past, and I think that was helpful to help faculty learn new tools. I don't keep my letters in my inbox, and if I have an e-mail I want to save, I save it elsewhere. I have worked with colleagues in Communication regarding filing strategies.
- i) L. Spence: I have been using screenshots of my inbox to talk about these things. I share how I am using this process to help with all my incoming e-mails.
- i) N. Goswami: In terms of certain e-mails that I have right now—student e-mails from 2011—that I want to keep, right now at ISU the maximum I can keep them is for four years?
- i) L. Spence: Yes, if you leave them in your inbox.
 - ii) N. Goswami: In order to save them for posterity, you can tell me how to do that? It would be something workable?
 - iii) L. Spence: Yes. We can get you the training.
 - iv) C. MacDonald: This is exactly the kind of training I think faculty will want.
- j) S. Stofferahn: We need a clarification. Should we understand that everything we do on Outlook is belongs to ISU?
- i) K. Butwin: All the content belongs to ISU. It can be searched. We have decided that you get to make the decision about what to keep. We are not mandating it. Some delete everything they receive. It depends. ISU owns the e-mail system, though. If we get a subpoena, we have to provide the information.
- k) B. Corcoran: When something is deleted, there is no possible way to ever recover that information? Does the institution maintain a backdoor?
- i) K. Butwin: That is a great question. There is a period of time when the e-mail is not yet deleted from the system.
 - ii) L. Spence: There is a window of fourteen days that you get to say "restore that e-mail".
 - iii) K. Butwin: That is the extent of the searching. I take the position that if we get a request for something that involves you, I let you and OIT know before anything gets released. The only exception to that is if I have a court order that says I can't tell you.

10) Prohibition on Hostile or Intimidating Workplace Behavior (Section 502):

- a) Motion to approve: (S. Lamb, A. Anderson) Vote: 27-0-0.
- b) C MacDonald: You all should have a copy of the new version. The reason you have this is Exec made some changes. This used to be Section 906, the Anti-Bullying policy, which we already passed. We are bringing it back to Senate because of the revisions before taking it to the Board.
- c) K. Butwin: We renumbered this to incorporate employees, faculty, and staff. It now follows Section 501 in the Handbook. We wanted to ground it in faculty/staff expectations of conduct, rather than starting with negative behavior. We also added more definition to “hostile” and “intimidation” to clarify what the terms mean. Over time the definition has gotten clearer. We have enough information here for grievance committees to decide whether such behavior is occurring. Exec also cleaned up the document. Since you have seen it, I have added to the workplace management section. We want to make it clear that this is not the only way the university can deal with hostile/intimidation situations. This allows for people who feel they are affected by such behavior to file a grievance. R. Guell pointed out in November that we have Policy 560 for our support staff. This is old and needs to be cleaned up. That process is underway. There is one more thing to mention. In discussions with C. MacDonald, it was noted that current faculty discipline and dismissal procedures are in the Bylaws (Section 246.13). We are going to move that into the Handbook as its own policy, Section 351. Nothing will change but the number.
 - i) C. MacDonald: Our goal is to create a funneling process for faculty discipline, from letters of admonishment and into discipline/dismissal proceedings. We will make a minor change for those numberings.
 - ii) K. Butwin: If you go to the new website, it is much clearer.
- d) V. Sheets: If we move something from 246 to the 300s, that will change the route through which changes can be made. The Bylaws and Constitution goes through a different process.
 - i) R. Guell: There is a supermajority amendment process that requires us to go through a different process. When we move it, we will have to understand that we will have to live without the supermajority standard.
 - ii) C. MacDonald: If we do that, it will go through as is.
 - iii) R. Guell: What’s the logic for not moving the faculty grievance process out?
 - iv) K. Butwin: We have bylaws that have a lot of things in them. Bylaws should be about how you operate. It seems to me that if the 300 section is really about faculty duties and responsibilities, then discipline, dismissal, tenure, etc. should all be together. We can have more conversation about it.

- e) R. Guell: Also, we need to consider the supremacy argument that puts the university over the colleges in terms of the policies that are in the Constitution and/or Bylaws and not just in the Handbook. That will need more conversation.
 - i) C. MacDonald: We can give more thought to that.
 - ii) K. Butwin: That's an excellent point, and I would suggest that we have some opportunity to make sure the information is clear. Perhaps we need to think long term.
- f) R. Guell: Regarding the policy, I brought this forward to FAC in the fall with no expectation that it would pass. I did not expect it to get past the President or Provost. I am extremely pleased at where we are. This will help chairs.
 - i) S. Lamb: By its existence alone it will stop bullying. And, it makes a clear distinction about academic freedom.
 - ii) C. MacDonald: I think it is important. It shows that we don't condone such behavior. We will take the comments regarding 246 under consideration.
 - iii) K. Butwin: This will also be going to Staff Council.

11) FAC items

- a) 245 Constitutional Change
 - i) C. MacDonald: This serves as a first reading. It puts the Handbook in alignment with current practice. The standing committees will be confirmed April 28th rather than waiting until August to get them going.
 - ii) R. Guell: Did we already not pass a constitutional amendment and just miss this clause? It strikes me that we already passed this last year and that this could be addressed as a minor change done at Exec. Otherwise you will be asking for a university vote.
 - iii) V. Sheets: I agree. I thought we had started this practice last year and made sure not to do anything without permission.
 - iv) R. Guell: I am going to assert that Exec can do this as a minor change without a Senate vote.
 - v) C. MacDonald: That would be fine with me if that's the will of the group. I know that we did do something regarding timing last year.
 - vi) R. Guell: It was Section 245.3.3.3 – we changed the timing of elections to deal with this. It was passed in December 2015 by the Board.
- b) Biennial Review
 - i) C. MacDonald: We are starting conversations in here before Exec votes on anything. Exec is beginning to wordsmith things now, but we need to begin the conversation so we can send something to the Board in May. I will re-iterate that if you have something lengthy to say please send the text to T. Hawkins or S. McConnaughey.

We don't need a motion today since we are not voting on anything. You have received the "issues" list. You also have two drafts: one with edits and one that is a bifurcated copy.

- ii) S. Lamb: I have to leave for another meeting, but before I go I would like to express a concern that I have about the biennial review process. In the proposed process, the department chairs administrative service is only reviewed by the Dean. There is no room for input from the personnel committee of the department. The Chairs are answerable to the faculty. The chairs need input from the faculty. The duties of the chairs are well specified in the handbook. I strongly believe that the process needs to be changed to allow input from the departmental personnel committee concerning the quality of the administrative work accomplished by the chair of the department.
- iii) R. Guell: Issue #1: Create a bifurcated process for Instructors and Tenure-Track Faculty. We gathered from all possible sources concerns that were raised contemporaneous to the execution of the BR in the fall. We had several lists of concerns and issues. We drafted solutions to those issues. In so drafting, we put out a survey to all faculty to see if our issues were of general concern and if we tackled those issues well. In general, the survey results were between 85-95% favorable. However, we had two issues that did not approach this level of satisfaction: 1) the treatment of instructors and 2) evaluation of department chairs within the BR process. We engaged in conversations with the officers regarding whether the treatment of instructors would be better handled with a separate process. The argument for a separate process was supported by a sense that college committees were concerned about how to evaluate fairly between categories. The results of the BR were disproportionately unfavorable to instructors. The question is: Do you want a separate process for those who have 1-2 domains compared to those who have 3-4?
- iv) J. Kinne: You can separate that issue without separating the whole document. I am suggesting that you have one document.
 - (1) R. Guell: As the author who tried to write the changes into the document, I can say that it was easier to make a carbon-copy and add the relevant sections to the second. The easiest way to do the least harm to the document was to create two.
- v) A. Kummerow: It seems that we already have separate expectations for full and assistant professors. I don't know that I see a value in changing. You are already comparing apples to oranges. I am beginning to see instructors being pulled out of there. I don't want to create separate processes.

- (1) R. Guell: We have done a number of things in the last five years that have fully brought instructors into the regular faculty with rights of all kinds. This would be the first separation of that. The problem that we were trying to solve is that instructors were losing at the micro level. Instructors were being rejected as “exceptional” at the college level at a higher rate in comparison to their tenure-track peers.
- (2) A. Kummerow: I don’t see that as a problem in the process, but rather in the evaluation. The language in here is clear that you should only be evaluated by things you are responsible for. That should take care of the process. People are always going to evaluate unfairly, unfortunately. But that’s why I say that if you look at how full and assistant professors are viewed, you will see the indifference.
- (3) D. Hantzis: I agree with some of that. However, I disagree that assistant and full professors are being treated differently by the process. Faculty are not differentiated by rank in this process; they are differentiated only by position description. I would prefer that people who are exceptional in their assignment be found exceptional. I would rather not have two processes, but it is more important that those who are exceptional be recognized as so.
- vi) L. Phillips: If we are separating the processes does that mean we will have two separate pools?
- (1) R. Guell: It would be separated, and the pool would be about \$35,000 larger. The \$1,500 bump will be larger if we separate them. More people will be eligible.
- vii) N. Goswami: Thank you for your comments, D. Hantzis. It is dispiriting to hear as a junior faculty member that expectations are different. In terms of two tracks, we don’t want a separate caste system. But, in fact there is a caste system. Instructors are being exploited. The university should be creating tenure-track positions. No one is going to be evaluated fairly when the two groups are put together. Why should I have to compete with someone who doesn’t do research? In that respect I think the administration is avoiding the real problem. The sacrifices and guilt shouldn’t be ours, it should be the administrations’.
- viii) S. Stofferahn: Having chaired our department’s process, it would have helped to have a bifurcated process.
- ix) J. Kinne: Did you consider having the evaluation at the department level?
- (1) R. Guell: Yes. At the department level, the decision would be almost entirely the same. The problem with the tenure/tenure track group is that you most likely have more of them who are eligible. You have to make the decision to narrow the group. It would be the college committee’s job to determine the best. Most

of the real work is at the college level, because they are limited in the number who they can select.

x) H. Tapley: It really does seem to be an issue of perceptions. There is potential for bias with everyone together. I can see if one is juggling a lot, if they bring in grants, I can easily say that that individual is bringing value. I can also see how one teaches 5-6 courses bringing in good reviews. You have to do something to even the playing field. One thing you can do is have a training for those in these committees to assist with the bias. If you want to even the playing field, I think this is going to be necessary.

(1) R. Guell: That is on the list.

xi) B. Corcoran: I strongly support the bifurcated. As soon as we talk about money, I go back to when this was conceived originally. Are you seeing this process evolve into a merit-pay system? The original goal was to address those who were under performing. Are we leaving that paradigm and going to a true merit-pay system?

(1) R. Guell: This process was explicitly not about firing tenured faculty because it can't be. It is in the pre-amble to the document. It was about two things: 1) identify people in need of improvement (not firing them) for the purpose of mandating improvement; and 2) rewarding the few at the high end. As discussed, it was about doing those two things. What I've found after participating in the changes, almost all the red ink is about undoing malicious and/or mis-interpretations of the process. So, most of the red that you see here you can link to a person who did something wrong. That is bothersome because this document gets longer as we work to outlaw stupidity. That's the evolution I see.

xii) N. Goswami: I do believe part-time lecturers should be able to use the gym free of cost. It's unfortunate that the deans are not here, because I saw them rolling their eyes. The long-term question is what are we doing to help our colleagues get out of the purgatory that is the life of an instructor? How can they get on the tenure track?

(1) C. MacDonald: I understand your concern. I wish the administrators were here to hear it.

xiii) D. Hantzis: I don't know if the deans were rolling their eyes. I do wish more of our faculty were tenure track. I want to address B. Corcoran's point. When we had earlier reviews in FAC, there was in fact a great desire to have a post-tenure process. I don't understand it. I think when this policy attempts to do both things, it doesn't work. Some people did not believe that junior faculty or instructors would bother with the BR. However, since there is money involved people go for it. Faculty are saying why are we doing more than one thing? It's because we add money. I wish we had a separate process to recognize exemplary performance.

- xiv) C. MacDonald: I'm making a list of concerns like these, and we will send it to the next Senate chair. We have to have this go to the Board in May. Now we need to make it as good as we can. If we start planning in the fall of next year we can consider more radical changes.
- xv) J. Pommier: I have an issue with instructors being separated, as well. They are regular faculty. Could we work out something where people apply only in an "Teaching" category? The parameters would be that T/T faculty would have to meet expectations for scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service though could request to be considered for exceeding expectations in Scholarship/creative activity, Teaching, Service, or Balanced (all three). Instructors would be exempt from the categories that are not associated with their contract. Faculty that are particularly stronger in one area over another would be allowed to be considered for exceeding expectations. Such model would be helpful for faculty that hold responsibilities that do not reflect the traditional, balanced, T/T load responsibilities (i.e., primarily do research or primarily hold administrative role (service)).
- (1) C. MacDonald: That's a great comment that we will leave for the next chair.
- xvi) C. Paterson: Why is the BR every two years? It's like you said, when the current one ends, we have about 6.5 months to change. Why are we in a two-year process rather than a three-year process? Is that up for discussion?
- xvii) R. Guell: We were not charged with that. That is a non-starter with the administration.
- (1) D. Hantzis: We begged for it to be a three-year cycle, but basically it was a non-starter with the Administration.
- xviii) J. Kuhlmann: I want to know if you made a statement or an assumption that additional money would be put into this.
- (1) R. Guell: I was sitting across from M. Licari. M. Licari said yes, and D. Bradley also agreed. The amount is trivial.
- xix) D. Malooley: I understand the limitations. But I think that the current limitations lead to one per department in certain areas. That is disheartening because if you have two equally good candidates, the dean would have to determine who is selected.
- (1) R. Guell: There are basic premise issues we discussed before that we did not discuss this time, though we did talk about many things. This was largely because we held another unspoken assumption that the Biennial Review worked OK last time.
- xx) L. Brown: I think we do need to have serious discussions about who is participating in the BR. Either everyone participates or we limit it to tenured faculty and senior instructors. Everyone else gets regular reviews.

- (1) D. Hantzis: I agree. I support the bifurcation because instructors have different hiring practices and expectations. It's not unnatural to have differences. I like J. Pommier's idea. I expect we will be talking about that going forward.
- c) R. Guell: Issue #2: Scholarship will be removed from the relevant sections of the BR process for Instructors and the "irrelevancy of unassigned domains." In the bifurcated document, the issue of the irrelevancy of unassigned domains is not as much a no-brainer as you would think. Some faculty produce things of value that are outside their assignment. They are insulted when you ignore it.
- i) A. Kummerow: We have a small problem that may be unique to our department: some well-prepared faculty are not eligible to be tenured because they are not on campus. We have been told repeatedly that they are not eligible. I find that problematic.
- ii) D. Hantzis: Instructors make up half of my department. I serve on a college committee and we did reviews of forty-five or more files in CAS in addition to everything else we did. Many instructors chose to engage in service, but this was not part of their assignment. We need to make sure all faculty know exactly how they are going to be evaluated. It is dangerous to leave anything vague about this. I'm happy this section on relevance is here. An instructor who publishes a review is great. This should be celebrated. But, it can't be evaluated. I do think it will help when we have the information on who was evaluated.
- iii) J. Kuhlmann: Our instructors were hired to teach with a fifteen-hour load. Why would we allow any to go outside their assignment?
- iv) A. Kummerow: If it wasn't part of the contract, I wouldn't be here.
- (1) C. MacDonald: If your contract says you can only teach, then that's all you can do. We can only require you to do so much.
- v) D. Hantzis: I think that is why it will be good to have Senate see what is actually happening. How are departments filling their need without tenure-track positions?

12) Adjournment: 5:30