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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2017-2018

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

April 10, 2018

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

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

Ex-Officio Absent: Provost M. Licari

Guests: Lindsey Eberman and Katie Butwin

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Curtis
		1. I just came from Indianapolis from an ICHE-sponsored address on higher education. I was the one of two presidents there, the other president was speaking on a panel. Members of the governor’s cabinet were there. There were panels, speakers, professional development opportunities, all dealing with higher ed. I will always be there and am wondering why others were not. How can we learn from the talking heads if no one is there to hear them? Some of the information we heard may lead to policy, we need to know what they are talking about.
		2. There was a lot of discussion about workforce development. ISU does a lot of that, may be that was why I was there! it was good to hear how it is being talked about. The Chronicle of Higher Education’s Scott Carlson was there, a journalist, not an educator.
		3. It was a bit frustrating hearing people out of business, journalists, telling you what you need to do. The president of Ball State told them to walk around a campus to see what a university environment is like today. People seemed to be stuck back in another era. They were talking to us about making connections between industry and business, a lot of which we already do. The CEO from Suburu, Pres from Ball State; a representative from Ivy Tech. The CEO form Suburu talked about internships. We need to think about the number necessary and how we can provide them for all of our students.
		4. We need a culture shift, to be a national model. If employers commit to receive students in training, we can provide them with the student who’s ready to be trained in the specifics of the particular industry, a student who’s ready.
			1. L. Phillips: This is part of a huge shift. We used to provide well rounded students, businesses did the specific job training. The culture has shifted, higher ed is expected to do more and more of the job training.
			2. D. Curtis: We are talking about where the resources come from. Employers want us to be making connections around the state but we need to connect with specific workforces. Our Scott CofB is doing this every day. I would love some help in developing a message. I am inviting and challenging you to help me.
			3. L. Brown: Think about preceptors in the medical field and in student teaching. Those schools and institutions are taking on and helping students, investing in that future work force. Maybe some of those other companies need to have that kind of an attitude. That is how we help train that next generation of workers.
			4. D. Curits: Business/industry should speak to their peers. We do this all the time. The point I was making is that this is a state issue, how do we create an infrastructure that facilitates this kind of cooperation? We have one person traveling around the state and telling us what to do. We know what to do, help us. We are doing more now than we ever have before, we need help facilitating that work not being told how or what to do.
			5. L. Brown: Yes, [business/industry] needs to step up
			6. L. Phillips: Businesses will continue to expect more of us if they do not see some value in their own investment, and then they can conveniently blame higher ed for not preparing the workforce.
			7. D. Curtis: We should be lifting up skills like collaborating, critical thinking, showing them how our students do that. We may not want to talk about assessment again but we have to show them, specifically, how our students have learned those skills even though they may not to specific to a certain company’s requirements.
			8. B. Bunnett: About two and a half years ago, there was an exercise here on campus in preparation for new strategic plan. I was part of the career readiness discussion in which it turned out there were different meetings going on about workforce development with local employers about non-specific job related skills was they wanted in employees. There was not an expectation we would do that [on the job training]. They lamented that these soft skills were lacking in our graduates, referring to ISU specifically. Communication, decision making, character issues they lacked discipline, did not come to work on time, lacked commitment, teamwork. Those were the sorts of things that were lacking. As well as other cooperation and leadership skills and the ability to process different types of information.
		5. D. Curtis: This is an open request [for help, suggestions, ideas].
			1. A. Kummerow: Coming from healthcare, it is harder and harder to find suitable placement. We are starting to see things like ‘are you going to pay the preceptors?’ No, we are not hiring. It is a good model, but does not play out for every profession. For some degrees, these are reasonable models to look at.
			2. D. Curtis: Healthcare is ahead of us. Their models have come to us as well. Doctors are now responsible for outcomes rather than treatment. They reference lifelong learning, knowing how to stay on top of new information. We should be focusing on a learner-centered education and be promoting masters degrees, certificates, and continuing education. We should think about the trajectory of the learner, from high school through mid-career and tap future employers, tell them they are a part of this too. A lot of them are for-profit, they should use their resources to build up their employees.
			3. L. Brown: We should track learners to see where they end up, identify at one point their progress stops.
			4. D. Curtis: It takes a lot of the time, it is developmental. We have a high number in Indiana with some college. Many people come as freshman, it does not work out, but they return years later. We need to pick them up and give them the opportunity to re-enter and acquire whatever they need.
	2. Provost M. Licari
		1. No report (absent).
2. Chair Report: L. Brown
	1. The provost is out of town at an HLC conference so we do not have a report from him today. The goal today will be to get through BR; Lindsey [Eberman] will be joining us. Mike Chambers could not be here; he had a previously scheduled engagement at this time. The task force is in agreement with this document.
3. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of April 3, 2018
	1. **Motion to approve (M. Hutchins/T. Hawkins); Vote: 8-0-0.**
4. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. B. Bunnett: How are senate elections progressing?
		1. L. Brown: They are done. Morgan [Brown] sent out the results yesterday.
		2. B. Bunnett: When will we know who is running for EC?
		3. L. Brown: Thursday.
		4. B. Bunnett: So if nominations and voting happens right there, will the candidates have a chance to talk?
		5. L. Brown: Yes, also statements of intent will be posted online just like we did for the general election. The new senate is meeting informally tonight to meet and talk informally about running for EC.
		6. B. Bunnett: I have a suggestion for the meeting tonight. If the purpose is for candidates to mingle, maybe if you could ask if these people who would like to run for EC if they would like to say anything to the group as a whole.
		7. L. Brown: I could do that. I have heard from some people who are interested.
		8. T. Hawkins: That was not part of the official call out for this gathering so those who could not come could be at a disadvantage. I am not sure that is fair to those who will not be in attendance.
		9. L. Phillips: There will be time on Thursday. Tonight is the time to ask questions and talk.
		10. B. Bunnett: Are we expected to go?
		11. L. Brown: No, it is for the 2018-2019 senate, but Tim and I will be there because we are serving next year. We can talk about officer positions and EC. I already planned to do that.
5. Biennial Review (BR) Discussion

**Motion to approve FAC version of BR as advised by the task force and amended by the EC (T. Hawkins/M. Hutchins); Vote: 7-0-0.**

* 1. L. Eberman: The task force met on Friday to continue to review the document. We adopted the FAC language for *meets expectations* and cleaned up ex director language. We spent time discussing *exceeds* and if it should be included. We ended up removing it. The draft you see does not include it, it makes it all a lot cleaner. The task force was 50/50 on whether to include it, it is a pat on the back but we also agreed that it leads to a lot of conflict.
	2. L. Eberman: Deans evaluate all, colleges only if a faculty member is not meeting expectations or there are irreconcilable differences within the department.
	3. L. Eberman: We added a due date for the remediation plan and I suggested we strike lines 132,133 because they are clarified elsewhere.

\*\*A detailed line by line discussion ensued. Of significance were discussions about the removal of the exceeding expectations category and of merit pay from the BR process. Executive committee members added language that helped to clarify the nature of the chairpersons’ BR and clarified deans’ and departments’ roles in the process.

1. Standing Committee Reports [next week]
2. Adjournment at 5:16pm.