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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2017-2018

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
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Approved

Members Present: L. Brown, B. Bunnett, T. Hawkins, M. Hutchins, A. Kummerow, L. Phillips, B. Roberts-Pittman, S. Stofferahn

Members Absent: None

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

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: N. Rogers, S. Powers, L. Spence, L. Eberman, K. Butwin

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Curtis
      1. Let me tell you what I have been up to. Yesterday, I spent 12 hours in Indianapolis with Greg [Goode], who is a fast walker, especially in the cold, so I definitely got my workout in. I am getting to know people, Greg is well connected. It was good to meet people who think highly of the work you do here.
      2. As far as predicting what the legislature might do, it feels a lot like reading tea leaves or crystal ball gazing. We are going to be in Indianapolis as many Mondays as possible.
      3. In March, we will be traveling to D.C. and meeting with the firm that represents us there, Network Financial Institute. We will working with the Indiana Principal Leadership Institute and lining up opportunities. We will also hold an alumni event. There are quite a few Indiana State alumni in the D.C. area.
   2. Provost M. Licari
      1. Saturday is the sophomore and up advising summit that Josh [Powers] is hosting. I will be there to kick us off and to listen to ideas about how we might better reach students after they move out of University College. This is a partnership event between Academic Affairs and the SGA.
      2. We need to start thinking about getting ready for the Higher Learning Commission accreditation. The review team will be back on campus in 2020-2021, which is really not that far away. Susan [Powers] and I have put together a committee and hope faculty leadership and folks here can help out. Obviously this is an institution-wide effort, everyone will be participating.
2. Chair Report: L. Brown
   1. On Monday, I received an email from Dr. Hsiao’s [her memorial resolution was read on January 18th at Senate] daughter. She was inquiring about her mother’s work with Faculty Senate and in Department of Economics. Morgan [Brown] is going to work on compiling a master list of chairs. Katie [Sutrina-Haney, ISU archivist] said, from her knowledge, no such list exists. Morgan will be able to use her Master’s degree in history-skills to dig through the old minutes and hopefully compile one.
   2. I heard from several faculty about issues with the ‘Responsible Employee’ training emails. The email message came straight from Skillsoft, some of us thought it was junk mail. If you did click on it, it was difficult to navigate.
      1. T. Hawkins: First, I had to go back and double check the email from Leah [Reynolds] to make sure Skillsoft was real. Also, it was difficult to figure out if you had completed it correctly or fully.
      2. M. Licari: The circle turns green.
      3. M. Hutchins: Then you can go to the picture and print out the certificate.
      4. M. Licari: I agree, I would never have clicked the link. We are trained to be aware of phishing attacks. It was not very clear.
      5. L. Brown: I had just read Leah’s email so I was expecting it.
      6. M. Licari: Perhaps we could have a better way to communicate.
      7. L. Spence: It is cryptic process.
      8. S. Stofferahn: Several people did not get the prompt. I do not remember receiving it at all.
      9. T. Hawkins: Everyone should have received it by now.
      10. S. Stofferahn: Who should I contact about it?
      11. L. Eberman: I had some GA’s who have not received it yet. We were told to contact Kale Walker in HR.
      12. L. Brown: I was surprised that it was not more detailed with more videos or a set of questions to answer at the end.
3. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of January 16, 2018
   1. Motion to approve (A. Kummerow/T. Hawkins); Vote 8-0-0.
4. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. A. Kummerow: As part of the College Assessment Committee and with accreditation coming up, can we get update on the Assessment Coordinator position?
      1. S. Powers: Yes, it is moving back to full time. The recent part-time status was to accommodate the current employee in that position. The position announcement is up, applications will be accepted until it closes February 5th. Denise Collins is chairing the search committee. In the meantime we are searching for a faculty fellow to serve. We have had five applicants for that and it closes tomorrow [Jan 31].
   2. B. Bunnett: On October 17th we discussed a white paper about fostering a positive faculty environment, written by Dave Nichols and I. Several suggestions came out of that discussion, I compiled a list [handout]. What is the status of some of these?
      1. L. Brown: Maybe we should take the time to look at these and then come back to follow up. Mike and everyone else are not going to be able to read through it right now and come up with answers. We can bring this back next week.
      2. M. Licari: Yes, these recommendations are mostly for the administration, I will need to take some time and look at them.
      3. T. Hawkins: The only way Senate and/or Exec can act on any of these is to create formal recommendations, vet them, and vote on them.
      4. B. Bunnett: These are the things we said we would follow up on.
      5. T. Hawkins: Yes, but we did not take a vote to follow up in any kind of active sense. If we want to do that, we have to go through the process to make it happen.
      6. B. Bunnett: You are not saying we will not actually follow up on this are you?
      7. T. Hawkins: If you want to follow up in any particular way then we have to vote on the list.
      8. B. Bunnett: Compiling this is not enough to take action?
      9. T. Hawkins: Not formally. To do this formally we have to vote on the items listed here. If we want the provost to take action on x, y, or z thing on the list, we would need to generate a motion that we agree on. If we want the weight of Exec behind this, we would start by charging specific committees to come up with a recommendation or resolution, we would vet it here at Exec, then ask for a vote/endorsement from Senate. Those are the specific mechanisms that allow suggestions to be actively followed up on.
      10. L. Brown: I think that we should do what Tim suggested. We should formalize, but not today and in the fifteen minute open.
      11. M. Licari: Most of these are expectations of my office. I am not prepared to weigh in today, but I am happy to participate in a discussion.
      12. B. Bunnett: The minutes state that they will be looked into.
      13. M. Licari: Yes.
      14. B. Bunnett: Yes, that is why I brought it up. It was three and a half months ago.
      15. L. Brown: We do not have time to do it today. Also, some things may to go to particular committees. I also think that some of these things are already happening. You have been organizing sessions for Chair’s Council and other things are happening. There is a lot here.
      16. B. Bunnett: Can it be an agenda item for our next meeting?
      17. L. Brown: Yes, absolutely.
   3. BB: The other issue I wanted to bring up is the constant rehiring of the lecturers. We discussed this in mid-November, we all know the problem. Lecturers are rehired every semester. It creates more work for chairs and is demeaning for the lecturers, some of whom have been here for years. Is there something we can do to make life easier for the chairs and the lecturers? That is problem we discussed in November, I thought Diann [McKee] was supposed to address it.
      1. M. Licari: Yes, HR is in her area. There are a few options. We could work with HR to try to smooth the process. Technically lecturers are coming to the end of their appointment and, of course, we do not always know if their positions will be ongoing. The other alternative would be to continue to use the system as established, but adjust the other auxiliary processes. Part of the concern has to do with OIT and security procedures, with access to Blackboard and email during gaps in appointments. There should be something we can do in the cases where the gaps are very short. I am happy to have those conversations. Any HR director worth their salt would be interested in this issue.
      2. A. Kummerow: I see this a lot with our clinical faculty who are hired over and over again with no intention of being full-time regular faculty.
   4. L. Eberman: Is there is any way Communications and Marketing can condense or reorganize our webpages? We had an applicant who found five separate places where information about our program was listed, and it was not consistent. If they are searching and finding conflicting information that could be a problem.
      1. L. Phillips: Is C/M the place to go?
      2. L. Eberman: For my issue, I think so, but information is listed through distance education and the grad school.
      3. S. Powers: We are bound to list some information in a certain way on the undergrad sites by ICHE [Indiana Commission on Higher Education].
      4. L. Brown: Could we have one place to update them all?
      5. M. Licari: Another issue is where we have some decentralized responsibility for structuring these sites. Susan, let’s talk about this tomorrow afternoon.
      6. L. Phillips: If everybody could just link to the department’s information, would that not work?
      7. S. Powers: Some of the department’s information might not be approved. We would rather the department’s link to the catalog so there is no hidden curriculum.
      8. L. Brown: Plus they might not be updated.
      9. S. Powers: Yes, we do not delete dead pages.
5. Discussion of the Career Readiness Initiative: Nancy Rogers
   1. L. Brown: I invited Nancy here to help clarify the expectations around career readiness so we can have one unified idea about what this is supposed to be.
   2. N. Rogers: The guidance has been consistent. The goal is each undergraduate major will be career ready and department’s will have those components in place for the freshman next year. There is a rubric of career competencies. Each program will match the major to the career competencies then develop tasks like writing resumes, cover letters, or holding mock interviews. We have provided a rubric with examples and some suggestions for assignments or things that might happen in a course.
      1. M. Licari: These are just examples of how these things might be accomplished. If there is a better way for your program, then go for it. I met with Theatre. They connect with their students through workshops and guest lectures. They hold a career fair opportunity and invite people in acting and the talent business. The workshops, guest lectures, and career fairs sends messages to students about how to engage the professional community. They also hold resume writing sessions and critique their students. It works for them and is sensible for them.
      2. N. Rogers: We have switched from the certificate to this model. We are not asking anyone to track everything every student has done. We are mapping it to the curriculum. Finishing the major you will have gone through a career ready program. What if they transfer in and didn’t take that course? It is ok, they do not have to back up and do anything. We want to make sure your program is career ready and the vast majority will have has exposure to all of the competencies.
      3. M. Licari: Another piece of this is to have this built in to your outcomes assessment, to have your student outcomes assessment regime include these career readiness objectives in your assessment mechanism.
      4. L. Phillips: Nancy, would these tasks be included a course that all majors take? Then what happens for the transfer students?
         1. N. Rogers: If you have a task in 101 and a student transfers in and doesn’t take 101, they do not have to back up just to meet that one competency. We are mapping by program and not students.
         2. L. Phillips: Every department is then required to offer a course in which career readiness objectives are included?
         3. N. Rogers: I assume they would do that. If not, you would have to track things done outside of class to ensure that it is getting done.
         4. L. Phillips: You are asking us to adjust our course syllabi or make it more explicit how what we are already doing in class leads to career readiness?
         5. M. Licari: That is not necessary. Theatre’s example is not part of a class, all of their career readiness activities happen outside of class. They expect that if you are in the department, you will participate. Students understand that some point they will write a resume and have it critiqued.
      5. S. Stofferahn: So it does not have to be trackable?
         1. N. Rogers: Not exactly trackable, no, but you have to demonstrate that you are doing it.
      6. L. Phillips: Would sending them to the career center be sufficient?
         1. N. Rogers: If it is required, but not if it is just suggested.
      7. S. Powers: You would add an additional column to the student outcomes assessment matrix. If one of our stated outcomes is career readiness, we will have to assess it. This is something for our future assessment coordinator. They can expand on it.
      8. L. Brown: This might be another issue for Foundational Studies, for FS courses. Not everyone knows which career readiness objectives are being addressed in those courses.
      9. L. Phillips: Why?
      10. M. Licari: They will be in every program.
      11. L. Phillips: So, without the career center, it falls on us.
      12. M. Licari: You all will have to determine what is appropriate for your students. Speaking as the chief academic officer and the provost, we do not want this to be watered down. These things have to have academic meaning because they are part of our programs. I am very supportive of this. We need to recognize that most programs are already doing this more than they realize.
          1. L. Phillips: I hear résumé writing. I do not do that in class and I do not want to.
          2. B. Bunnett: What about interview skills?
      13. M. Licari: You can so this with Foundational Studies. Or make sure they go to the career center. If it is too nuts and bolts for you than perhaps somebody else can take the résumé and cover letter writing over. But there is usefulness in articulating their degree.
          1. L. Phillips: Of course, yes, there is usefulness in them being able to articulate the value of their degrees but I do not want to spend class time editing résumés. Many of our students do not know basic history, the difference between the American Revolution and the Civil War.
          2. M. Licari: It helps the students present themselves. What did you do there? They need to be able to talk about it, there is a role to play in that.
      14. N. Rogers: They have made a huge investment in the degree. We owe that to them.
      15. T. Hawkins: Understand that each department has competencies for their majors. I want to know that the competencies are built into the curriculum by history colleagues and not outside sources.
          1. N. Rogers: We have identified career readiness competencies and how you would integrate them.
          2. T. Hawkins: Are we trusted by you to interpret them in our own way?
          3. N. Rogers: Departments will submit reports. If they seem reasonable then there will not be any challenge.
          4. T. Hawkins: So in our case what would be above and beyond? Our students are expected to read critically and write clearly? Every single history class has those already.
          5. L. Brown: That would fit the written communication competency.
          6. N. Rogers: Yes, do what you are doing. Just write it up.
      16. S. Stofferahn: We have talked about this at Chair’s Council. There is still a perception that we are going to have to track every student. For a professional development activity, if the department were to have an alumni panel there and an opportunity to talk with people in those fields would that be ok? The committee would make this opportunity available to all juniors and seniors. The fear is the linked required course work.
          1. N. Rogers: If it was simply making it available then they would all be going to the career center. Usually the ones that need it the least will take advantage. Do an alumni event, connect it to classes. Bring them into major class meetings. Make it an activity instead of going to class once or suggesting that they attend.
      17. S. Stofferahn: More something to do in a capstone class than to have students write résumés in a higher level class.
      18. T. Hawkins: If you chain this to their classes in some way, shape, or form then the curriculum is being diverted. If we are diverting from lectures to listen to alumni, we have gone too far. Why does the default have to be to grab them in class?
          1. N. Rogers: Curriculum is the only thing they all do.
      19. S. Stofferahn: In a capstone class we can hedge our bets and maybe require a career center visit and attendance at an alumni panel. We are obliged to keep them on track.
      20. L. Brown: This does not have to happen in every course. Perhaps in a capstone course and up the credit hours associated with the course to two. I want to represent faculty here, they should not have to feel that their time in the classroom is being taken away.
      21. L. Phillips: So much of this is put on faculty. We have an entire career center. We are not a vocational school and yet here is another layer added on to what we are supposed to be doing. How can I make my students career ready? I do not know exactly what the job market is going to be when they graduate. We cannot do everything and create mandates that make us responsible for yet another outcome. Most of this falls under the career center.
          1. N. Rogers: The career center has four counselors. They cannot serve everyone. They are they to help, to provide programming, résumé review. They cannot do that kind of work for every student we do not have the staffing capacity to do that.
      22. B. Bunnett: There are only a few faculty members here, but it appears they are concerned.
      23. N. Rogers: Their concerns are inconsistent.
      24. L. Phillips: If faculty were valued for what they are doing in the classroom then we would never be asked to do this. Administrators think we are fiddling around not doing anything, we can just add career readiness to the list. We are struggling with our students that do not have basic history knowledge, to layer this on is extremely frustrating.
          1. N. Rogers: I am a member of the faculty, I am married to a faculty member, I value faculty work. This boils down to teaching students to talk about what they have learned and how to apply it. We are not looking for a significant restructuring of curriculum but for faculty to help them think about their major in a more significant way.
      25. M. Licari: Students need to articulate the values of the degrees to someone who is hiring them. It might as well be a defense of a college education.
          1. N. Rogers: That is how AAC&U frames it.
          2. M. Licari: Yes, it is an academic priority. We need to help students articulate the value of college, we have that responsibility. As faculty, which I will include myself in for this conversation, we have a responsibility to our profession and our students so that when they graduate they have a good understanding of what they have done here. Why do we have to take Foundational Studies? Let’s help them understand the whole of what their college degrees do for them.
      26. L. Brown: I went last summer to a workshop about making things explicit, about helping students see how what they are doing in the classroom helps them in their careers, in civic life, I think that is what a lot of it is. We want to make it explicit to the students so they understand what they are getting.
      27. N. Rogers: We are not asking history to teach someone to be a banker.
      28. A. Kummerow: I am sympathetic to making sure departments are able to identify what makes their graduates career ready. It is different in professional programs compared to liberal arts.
          1. N. Rogers: Yes but I do not believe that has not been the case. I have not dictated what a department has to do.
          2. L. Brown: But the examples are being interpreted as what we have to do. We requested examples and now those are causing problems.
      29. S. Stofferahn: We do not really know what this is. The college has a rubric that all the chairs were given. The anxiety may be coming from certain things that have yet to be determined. Some of it was the résumés. Who, for example, is going to read them?
          1. N. Rogers: In the case of history, there are not as many students, so you may be able to involve the career center. Criminology has too many majors, they might have to opt for something internal.
      30. M. Licari: Did this conversation make it better or worse?
          1. L. Brown: I think it helped.
6. Information and Discussion of new Student Evaluation System: Susan Powers
   1. S. Powers: We are going to a new tool to administer the student evaluations. We paid very little for ‘My Class Evaluation’ and we got very little. So for example, if you were in History you only got your average for History evaluations. The new program is called ‘Blue,’ just by chance. It will be administered through both Blackboard and email. Faculty can assess it through both as well. Chairs can access it through the ‘Blue’ portal, Blackboard, and email. You can add questions. You will get university wide/department wide breakdowns. Your report will be emailed. But, the most beautiful change, I am 92% sure we can batch download course ratings and batch upload them into FAD. Even if fifty of them fail to upload, it is easier for me to upload fifty than eleven thousand. “My Class Evaluation” will still be around until April. I can go out and download all the raw data, but I am not sure if I can do a batch download that has everyone’s reports. With the new system the President and Provost can get access, IR, departments and deans can all get aggregated reports. It will have the same questions, you can add questions, it has a lot of features and tools we can use. We will be doing it this spring.
      1. L. Brown: Should we be telling faculty to archive their old data?
         1. S. Powers: In was in the newsletter.
         2. L. Brown: Some might not be reading that.
         3. M. Licari: We should make it clear in the musings and minutes.
      2. L. Brown: They will need it if they have not already uploaded it to FAD.
      3. S. Powers: My concern is that the kinds of things I get from that are not searchable. I would be searching through pdfs.
      4. T. Hawkins: How do we archive?
         1. S. Powers: Just download and save as a pdf.
      5. A. Kummerow: What if I have archived them in my FAD? Will it still be there?
         1. S. Powers: If it is a pdf, yes. If it is linked to something, I cannot promise it will be there.
         2. A. Kummerow: If we re-run FAD you cannot get to it. Some people cannot get to it.
         3. S. Powers: If it saved as a pdf and uploaded it to FAD it should be there. Some people upload web links to their drive, which will not work.
      6. S. Stofferahn: If someone forgets, can we get those out of your massive download?
         1. S. Powers: Contact me. The problem with IOTA was that there were 80 different surveys. We could search for their name and give them the raw data. I will check to see if they can batch download all of the reports.
      7. L. Brown: So we should tell people they had better do it sooner rather than later.
         1. S. Powers: I do not want to download just in case and end up going through 5,000 files, but I can help.
      8. A. Kummerow: Will the tile go away on the portal?
         1. S. Powers: We will have to work on it taking it out of the system.
7. Discussion of 900s changes: Lindsey Eberman and Lisa Spence
   1. L. Spence: [Re: Section 932] This was the issue that stopped us in December, data security. We updated Section 932, added classifications of data, and added a matrix describing specific kinds of data. There are four categories of data, the matrix tells you where you should store them, where you may never store them, etc. For example, public information can be stored anywhere but private information may never be stored on a personal drive.
      1. L. Brown: The matrix is there?
      2. L. Spence: Yes, on the OIT website. We stopped with the discussion of data stewards late last year. When we have a breach of student data, maybe something dealing with HIPPA, we need to be able to identify someone who knows the law relating to that kind of data breach. That person can ensure that training is offered, similar to our FERPA training. In a security incident we can call in that person since they are aware of the regulations. We created some procedural documents to handle this, the data stewards are no longer written into the policy. Incident response, which had been defined in a whole separate new policy, was shortened and combined into the data security policy. It is all in one now. Are there any comments from the team that talked yesterday?
         1. L. Eberman: I feel good about it, it explains exactly where to go and what to do.
         2. L. Brown: And it is not scattered in different places.
      3. L. Spence: Katie [Butwin] did a lot of good work earlier on moving us to this policy and looking at other institutions.
      4. K. Butwin: 932.3 is gone and we have moved everything up.
      5. L. Spence: Access control is a high level statement. We brought it into this policy, 932.5, where we note what an incident is. By this we do not mean just a virus or malware. A data security incident might involve the loss of data, the exposure of data, including print materials that contain institutional data. Whether discovered by outside sources or by you, 932.5.3 states that you have to report it.
         1. A. Kummerow: For example, “I lost my computer, it has this on it,” you will know how to report it.
      6. L. Spence: Yes. And we would like things reported in hours not days, not wait a few days then look at the website to see what you should do next. I think we talked about having some kind of ticket system then we would have alerts and workflow based on the report.
         1. T. Hawkins: Is 48 hours considered hours or days?
         2. L. Spence: Days. That is two days.
         3. T. Hawkins: That is vague. What if I am in Cusco in June and I lose my computer and cannot report that right away.
         4. L. Spence: I do not know how explicit or precise we can be.
         5. T. Hawkins: Can we say “As soon as possible?”
         6. L. Spence: But that could be interpreted differently. Some might think “ASAP” is when you get back to the US but to me “ASAP” would be as soon as it happens.
         7. K. Butwin: That’s another issue. If you are traveling out of the U.S., you should not be taking that sensitive information with you. We need to know about any highly restricted data loss.
         8. L. Spence: Let’s talk about what happens when there is an incident and it is a policy violation. Chairs, deans, Katie, a lot of people will be talking about it.
         9. K. Butwin: We need to know.
         10. T. Hawkins: If it goes in the handbook and there are ramifications, we need to know what the ramifications are.
         11. L. Spence: I am reluctant to say 24 hours if you can do it in 2 hours. We need to express urgency. “ASAP” does not express urgency.
         12. L. Eberman: An example from Katie, there are instances when you can pull an email back within a certain amount of time. ASAP is not urgent enough, it does not convey that, if you report in two hours’ time, we may be able to get the data back. Maybe a clause about urgency. A specific time frame helps people not mess that up.
         13. L. Spence: We could try to be precise and more explanatory to say look we need you to tell us as quickly as possible. It is urgent or critical that you do, explain why we are asking such, give some context.
         14. L. Brown: Our group can think about that over the coming week. Then when it comes back we can address it.
         15. L. Spence: Maybe something like “as quickly as possible, it is a matter of utmost urgency.”
      7. M. Licari: You all should regroup and bring it back.
8. Standing Committee Reports
   1. AAC
      1. T. Hawkins: AAC will meet on Thursday. The agenda includes reviewing the minutes of the most recent BoT meeting and the staffing report.
   2. AEC
      1. A. Kummerow: No report (charges completed).
   3. CAAC
      1. M. Hutchins: CAAC approved the following at its January 23rd meeting: the Aviation Management Major, Professional Aviation Flight Technology Major, ENVI 461 was approved for FS Credit, the MIS Major, and the move of the Social Welfare Minor from Social Work to Multidisciplinary Studies.
         1. L. Brown: The last one is the only one coming here, right?
         2. M. Hutchins: Yes.
      2. M. Hutchins: Today CAAC reviewed several items in Earth and Environmental Systems: the Geography and Sustainability Major, the Anthropology Major and Minor, the Environmental Geoscience Major and Minor, and the Geology Major and Minor.
      3. M. Hutchins: We have five or six things coming next week. We are reaching out to an alternate as Linda Sperry is stepping down.
   4. FAC
      1. S. Stofferahn: FAC met but appeared not to have quorum. There is no official report this week.
   5. FEBC
      1. B. Bunnett: FEBC met last week and had a full agenda. There were two main issues including the Anthem ER situation. Members wondered if there was sufficient communication from HR about the changes. The other issue was the staffing report.
         1. L. Brown: I will double check, but I thought HR/Benefits did send something out about Anthem?
         2. M. Licari: Yes, they did.
   6. GC
      1. B. Roberts-Pittman: No report [had left the meeting].
   7. SAC
      1. A. Kummerow: I reached out to Dan Coovert. SAC has a meeting on the second Monday of every month, the next being Feb 12th.
   8. URC
      1. L. Phillips: URC will meet soon, applications are coming in.
9. Adjournment at 5:22pm.