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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2018-2019

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 4, 2018

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Approved

Members Present: L. Brown, C. Ball, M. Chambers, M. Cohen, K. Games, B. Guell, T. Hawkins, R. Peters, S. Phillips

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

Guests: Katie Butwin

1. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of August 21, 2018 (File #1)
	1. Motion to approve (C. Ball/M. Chambers); Vote 9-0-0
2. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Curtis
		1. I was just in Indianapolis. We kicked off Hispanic Heritage Month on the state level and we will be doing the same tonight here on campus. It is great to celebrate those students and citizens in our state who are growing in numbers.
		2. Before my fall address, the Strategic Plan revisions will come out to you. I am looking forward to talking to campus coming up later this month on September 26.
	2. Provost M. Licari
		1. As you all know, today we had our third candidate on campus for the position of Vice President of University Advancement (VPUA). The previous two came the last two weeks. The search committee is meeting Friday morning to review feedback about the three candidates and review our own thoughts. At that meeting, we will craft a statement for the president. She will ask for a list of strengths and weaknesses of each candidate. It is in her hands to make the final decision. There should be a conclusion relatively soon.
		2. You are probably also aware that Leah Reynolds, Associate VP for Inclusive Excellence, has left to take a job in Cincinnati at Mount St. Joseph. She has done a really good job here, but her husband has been working in Ohio and it was hard on their family. It is sad, but not surprising. I plan on launching a national search for the position. I am in the process of assembling a committee. In the meantime, I have selected an interim: Brice Yates, Director of the African American Cultural Center (AACC). He has agreed to serve starting October 1. He needs to make sure his office is on a good course before leaving. In conversations with Leah, I feel as though ISU will be very competitive in the market when hiring for this position. I feel good about that. There is a lot of work to be done, but we are situated well to be successful in the search.
			1. T. Hawkins: What is Brice Yates’s background?
			2. M. Licari: He comes from the Student Affairs realm, Leah Reynolds did too. He is currently in the Educational Leadership doctoral program.
			3. T. Hawkins: Has he done this kind of work in the past?
			4. M. Licari: No, not at this level.
			5. T. Hawkins: Do we have anyone on campus with qualifications like Leah Reynolds?
			6. M. Licari: No, she did not either when she began. She did not have any investigative experience.
			7. T. Hawkins: Does anyone have investigative experience?
			8. M. Licari: Sure, Stephannie Gambill.
			9. T. Hawkins: I am just concerned since it is a sensitive job.
			10. M. Licari: Brice [Yates] will not be involved in investigations, Stephannie [Gambill] will. Actually, we are getting more closely to the ideal. The ideal would be someone committed to moving forward in terms of culture/condition, someone who is conducive to success, and attract/retain talent. That is hard to do when you are also serving in a regulatory role, half the time you are investigating and other half supportive. It is hard to pull off so the duties need to be separated.
			11. T. Hawkins: So there will be total continuity with Stephannie?
			12. M. Licari: Yes, Leah [Reynolds] was reluctant to give up the ‘Title IX’ role, so Stephannie [Gambill] will reclaim that role. Frankly, going forward this is the kind of division of labor that is good for campus anyway. Regulatory & investigative versus positive & facilitative voice. In that role, Brice [Yates] will be fine.
3. Chair Report: T. Hawkins
	1. Biometric screenings start September 11, so make your appointment.
	2. Speaking on behalf of Exec, I appreciated the opportunity to interview the candidates for the VPUA position. Having a chance to be present was important and helpful, since we were able to offer a faculty perspective. I think this was well received.
	3. We have an issue with one of our Standing Committees. For a variety of reasons, CAAC has lost some members early on and has burned through all of its alternates. I want to make sure that this committee remains as close to full strength as possible. Therefore, the officers went back to the spring interest survey to see who might be willing to serve and we identified Dan Clark [CAS, History]. I approached him about it and he agreed to serve. Since he was not on the approved alternate list, I would like to take the decision to the full Senate for official approval in September.
	4. In regards to the TFA position, we got the final tally at the beginning of last week and sent out the request for nominations right away. Unfortunately, we heard nothing back. On Friday we sent another request and received one self-nomination. Nothing has changed as of this date. The Handbook language is very explicit. Technically, the TFA should start on the Monday before the September meeting: September 17. The process is as follows: solicit nominations, send out a survey to gauge faculty support, bring those names with support to Exec, and finally forward them to the Provost with our recommendations. Right now, we only have one name to send out to the temporary faculty for vetting. We can do that and proceed. I have no reason to see why this person would not receive support. Then we could forward the name to Mike [Licari]. We would then be ready for the September Senate Meeting. Or, we could send out a third notice hoping we get someone else on the list, but that would make us go past September.
		1. C. Ball: It is not unusual to put one name forward. Are you concerned this person will not get support?
		2. T. Hawkins: No, that is not my concern; I know nothing about the candidate. The candidate can be vetted. The problem is with the number of nominations. We can go with one. In the survey, we can say we have only one person to choose from because only one person was nominated. Alternatively, we can delay the process in the hopes of getting a competition. That would mean we would not have someone until October, which is not what the system is set up to do.
		3. B. Guell: For years the TFA was almost always Susan Hoffman, because it was the senate’s choice. Recognizing a lack of democratic process, I was on the FAC that rewrote that process. By necessity to get to the September meeting it is rushed. The reaction has never been what we hoped it would be. I suggest to push with one and then charge FAC to reconsider the process. The way it used to be done, the Senate chair went looking to departments that hire a lot of temporary faculty to drum up support. The TFA was usually a member of Math, Communication, or English. That is not a terrible way to go. You could have those chairs give names in the spring of temporary faculty they know are returning.
		4. T. Hawkins: We will plan to send out the survey tomorrow and return next Tuesday to do our part.
4. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. B. Guell: (B. Guell produced a hand out that showed the HLC report from 2010 on SATs, IPEDs data on SATs from 2014 and 2016, and Blue reports data from 2009 to 2018 on SAT.) There is a debate on what our incoming freshman’s SAT scores really were. I do not get where the blue report numbers come from (because they are inconsistent with those reported outside the university. Those reported to and by the administration are 80 points higher than the university reported to the HLC and the U.S. Department of Education.) If we are aiming for much higher quality students then our measurable data should be consistently reported and transparently available. It is only printed in one report and sent to two people in its history of being generated.
	2. B. Guell: I had a chair ask me what the definition of a “working day” is. It is nowhere to be found in the Handbook. And the reason for that is former President Bradley refused to take the Senate recommendation to the Board.
		1. K. Butwin: That is not accurate, there are multiple definitions.
		2. B. Guell: There are multiple, issue-specific definitions. There is not one in the personnel sections. We need to settle on a definition. However we decide what it means is not important, but there needs to be a clear definition.
		3. K. Butwin: If this is in regards to a specific case, the more generous time period was given as the definition.
		4. T. Hawkins: Bob, can you provide me more details later?
		5. B. Guell: I do not have any more, a faculty chairperson ask me for the definition. In the past, we asked three FACs to create one, but it never happened. I did not know of a specific case. We may not agree on what it should be, but we should agree there needs to be a definition.
		6. T. Hawkins: The larger concept became significant during discussion in August. It was put on the FAC charge list and then taken off after more discussion. Katie?
		7. K. Butwin: I would be happy to return to the conversation, but I would like to prepare beforehand.
		8. M. Licari: We can talk about it Monday; I have some ideas.
		9. K. Butwin: I will put together information for that.
		10. T. Hawkins: Maybe that will help us resolve the issue.
	3. K. Games: What is the status of the Extended Learning leadership position?
		1. M. Licari: With Ken’s retirement, I was going to launch a search, but that was when I thought I had a Vice Provost for Enrollment Management (VPEM). Without that person, we went with an interim. I have yet to launch a search because it is tough to hire when candidates do not know who their boss will be. I have not forgotten or abandoned this. Also, the structure will not be the same. Samantha [Penney] is not reporting to me, but will be reporting to the VPEM, which is more important in terms of enrollment profile. What I want is to consolidate Enrollment Management efforts in one spot with communication, which is hard to do. That is why the reorg happened. It is not that I am trying to diminish the position; it needs to be a central part of our Enrollment Management strategy going forward.
		2. K. Games: Will the distance office still provide internal support to faculty?
		3. M. Licari: Yes, there will be instructional designers and will support faculty so they can be effective instructors of distance education.
	4. B. Guell: Today, in Holmstead 103, the emergency system would not stop alerting us after the test was acknowledged. The speakers kept telling us the tests were going on. It was loud enough to be heard and annoying, but not loud enough to be effective for an actual emergency.
		1. M. Licari: I will check into it; that is why we run tests.
	5. B. Guell: There needs to be communication to departments impacted by proposed curriculum changes. SCOB is planning to eliminate 3 hours of Econ, and communication has not occurred. It appears there will be a vote, but there has been no input from Econ. Whether it is justified or accreditation backed is irrelevant. This process requires discussion with impacted departments as well. They did not fill out cross notifications on Curriculog.
		1. M. Cohen: I know we are reimaging core.
		2. B. Guell: The associate dean said there is a vote in two weeks.
		3. M. Cohen: Of the entire faculty?
		4. B. Guell: Yes. It reminds me of SCOB getting rid of math requirements by taking it in house. There was no communication.
	6. M. Chambers: This is for those doing faculty evaluations for second years, if you do not have a second year it might not be relevant. Personnel committee members received a notification that evaluations were to be done by September 13; where did that come from? I know there has been a history of adopting software that dictates deadlines, but that is not the case. Is this a suggestion? No dates matter except the ones in the Handbook and the schedule of deadlines. On September 28, the evaluations leave departments to go to the college level. Candidates then have one week to respond to the decision. So is this a soft deadline to encourage committees to get their work done? In CAS that is the case, just intradepartmental deadlines to keep workflow.
		1. L. Brown: With CAS, it was pushed back two weeks so the chair has time to do the review.
		2. M. Cohen: We learned there would be no binders, for anyone.
		3. M. Chambers: I went looking on Academic Affairs website for dates, but there were no guidelines for the electronic system. I would suggest a quick guide. Chairs might not be passing this information along. If there is some kind of document because there are timelines for those submitting, but nothing for an evaluator.
		4. L. Brown: Workflow is new for most of us.
		5. B. Guell: Not for everyone, HHS did all last year for almost everything.
		6. R. Peters: And some in TECH.
	7. K. Games: Several students received an email from ‘ISU Pulse.’ It was a second amendment survey. Does anyone know if this is an official student org?
		1. K. Butwin: It is not an ISU organization, but a student org might have named itself that. If you want to send it to me, I can hunt it down.
5. Discussion: Textbook Policy (File #2)
	1. T. Hawkins: As a result of our informal discussion about the textbook policy, I thought it would be helpful if I pulled out 310 to give you a chance to decide whether you found anything you want to address. The related material I sent today, the email, was a specific concern from LLL. Whether this issue can be addressed here can be debated. It is helpful to see the ways in which our work is affected by the textbook policy. From my perspective, department chairs should not be stuck with a mess like this one from LLL. In my experience, something like this happens every year. There are always concerns about the bookstore not ordering enough books. In this case, students are being charged full price even though they are not getting the materials. It is unfortunate, especially for freshman, to start with this kind of mess. At least for publicity’s sake it is helpful to make everyone aware.
		1. M. Cohen: I can speak from experience; the Pearson issue is affecting about 400 students. It started with temporary access codes allowing them to read e-texts. After looking at the registration records, about 90% are on temporary codes, with a handful having acquired the access code from alternative sourcing (not the ISU bookstore). Pearson responded, allowing a 28-day temporary code that for what it’s worth is a move in the right direction. If we have a publisher who continues to has issues supply materials, faculty should have the ability to move on to a different publisher without violating policy.  Students did have material last week for my classes, the materials came in at the end of August.
		2. B. Guell: I ask that perhaps we should charge FAC to analyze the impact of the textbook policy. Then it can recommendations modifications that would be in the spirit of the policy but improve implementation. Did the Textbook Advisory Committee even happen?
		3. T. Hawkins: If you refer to the handout, most of the textbook policy, not including the language for the TAC (see below), is in the Handbook. Thus, for the last three years it has not existed.
			1. A: The Textbook Advisory Committee is composed of one regular faculty member from each College, a library representative, a business/finance representative, a bookstore representative, a records/registration representative, and a SGA representative. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs shall chair the committee. The members of the committee are elected to staggered three-year terms by the faculty of their representative colleges or appointed by the appropriate vice-president.
			2. B: The committee will meet at least twice annually to assess the effectiveness of the University’s textbook selection policies and to recommend any modifications that will result in improvements. The committee will submit an annual report of their findings to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
		4. K. Butwin: I can look at BoT minutes to see what they passed, but we just did a review to make sure what is listed is accurate.
		5. T. Hawkins: I went back to the original document, plus A&B, but the Handbook does not include it.
		6. K. Butwin: Will go back and look, it might have been before I was General Counsel.
		7. T. Hawkins: Bob, I think it is an appropriate charge for FAC.
		8. L. Brown: Also, ask FAC to look at three-year policy on textbooks. It is unreasonable to expect faculty teaching upper level courses to use textbooks chosen by others just because of this three-year policy.
		9. B. Guell: This is one of the things we participated in generating during the last five years that was the least satisfying. It started to become less relevant the minute it was passed. No one will be interested in enforcing it. If that is where it is going, we should put it to rest instead of ignoring it.
6. Standing Committee Liaison Reports
	1. AAC
		1. M. Cohen: Met Friday at noon and elected officers: Chair Lisa Phillips, Vice Chair Ahmed Mohamed, and Secretary Jon Bakos. They are scheduling a time convenient for the provost to attend.
	2. AEC
		1. R. Peters: Met on Friday, but I was unable to attend.
	3. CAAC
		1. L. Brown: Met a week ago and approved some music courses. Did not meet this week since there was no new curriculum.
	4. FAC
		1. B. Guell: Met and elected officers: Chair Virgil Sheets, Vice Chair Jessica Nelson, and Secretary Jennifer Inlow. FAC will be working every other Tuesday at 8am.
	5. FEBC
		1. K. Games: First meeting will be September 13; will meet every other Thursday from 3-4p (except when we have Senate).
	6. GC
		1. C. Ball: I have not heard anything since the availability poll; I can email Liz [O’Laughlin].
	7. SAC
		1. M. Chambers: Meeting tomorrow at noon.
	8. URC
		1. S. Phillips: Met last week on Friday and elected officers: Chair Xiaolong Li, Vice Chair Michael Williamson, and Secretary Julia Heath Reynolds.
7. Adjournment at 4:28pm.