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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2017-2018

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 12, 2017

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

DRAFT

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

Members Absent: None

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

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: Candy Barton, Diann McKee, Lindsey Eberman and Polina Kanyuka

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Bradley
		1. Diann and I will be at the Indiana Commission on Higher Education (ICHE) meeting on Thursday to present the Hulman Center renovation proposal. Assuming it goes well, the State Budget Committee will meet on Friday, Sept 22. We hope our proposal will be on its agenda.
		2. Tomorrow is my fall address. It starts at 2:30pm in the Tilson Auditorium, please come and enjoy. It won’t be the penultimate, but the ultimate, address, there will be good news, exciting stuff. If you don’t go, you won’t know.
	2. Provost M. Licari
		1. The Intelligence Analysis degree (Criminology) is on the agenda for Thursday’s ICHE meeting. This is the final stage of approval. Susan (Powers) and I presented it to ICHE’s Academic Affairs Committee a few weeks ago, it was well received.
		2. Please support our students by attending the Student Research Symposium in the Library Events Area tomorrow from 10:00am to 2:00pm. Mostly undergraduates, they have done good work, their research is a good display of experiential learning.
		3. The Fine Arts and Commerce building renovation meetings continue, we’re now discussing programming needs. Chris Olsen is the point person. He’s working closely with William (Ganis, Art Dept) and Scott (Buchanan, School of Music). The Community School of the Arts is involved, too. Since faculty in the Community School of the Arts work with the public, the plans include moving them to the first floor so people coming to campus for the first time will have an easier time finding them.
		4. $15 million might sound like a lot but it will go quickly. The budget includes the renovation, furniture, etc. We will meet later this week to discuss where people will relocate during the renovation. The building will reopen in the fall of 2019.
2. Chair Report: L. Brown
	1. We’re close to having a Temporary Faculty Advocate. Two nominations came in, we’ll get that information from Virgil (Sheets, Psychology) tomorrow. I will bring the results to next week’s Exec meeting. The Provost will make the decision. We hope to have the representative at the September 21st Senate meeting.
	2. We changed the agenda today. We will be moving the 15 minute open discussion to the end of the meeting so that items that need to be voted on can be taken care of and anyone who needs to leave early can still vote.
3. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of September 5, 2017
	1. Motion to approve (A. Kummerow, B. Roberts-Pittman); Vote: 9-0-0
4. Update on Health Benefits: D. McKee, C. Barton
	1. D. McKee: Last year we made the decision to move from Cigna to Anthem, due to cost reasons. From a claims perspective, last year was not good but, because Anthem offers a wider network and deeper discounts, that decision is paying off. Based upon our analysis, we’re going to ask the Board of Trustees to approve a 2.8% increase in premiums. We would have faced a higher increase had we not switched providers.
	2. D. McKee: After being with Express Scripts for a number of years, we initiated a Request for Proposal (RFP) and decided to switch to CVS Health for prescription coverage. We’ll all be getting new Rx cards. Candy will be working with CVS to ensure consistency; you do not have to fill your prescriptions at CVS. We participate in IN’s Rx network, as do all public universities and the Vigo County (and other) School Corporation. IN went through a RFP process this summer and decided to switch to CVS Health.
	3. D. McKee: Other than the change in providers, there are no changes in the health insurance plan design. We will be adding a HIGH DEDUCTIBLE plan. Not having this kind of plan has become a recruitment issue. People have asked for it when interviewing because it’s available at other institutions. Based on our actuarial analysis, we predict about 10% of our employees will choose this option, this is a conservative estimate, we’ll know better in January. This is a consumer-driven option; IU, Purdue, Ball State offer it.
	4. C. Barton: If you look at the handout, we’ll see a $7-17 increase in standard rates (per month) with a similar increase in the tobacco surcharge. The high deductible plan is cheaper but it raises the deductible from 500/1500 (individual/family) to 2000/6000 (individual/family). The high deductible plan requires people enrolled to also have a Health Saving Account (HSA) within which seed money must be deposited to cover the deductible. Nothing will be paid until the deductible is met except for well-baby and preventative care.
5. D. McKee: The HSA is a little like an IRA or a 401K. It’s tax deductible and goes with you wherever you’re employed, it rolls over. It’s not administered by the University but by the HSA Authority (like TIAA-CREF). It’s different from the Flexible Saving Account.
6. D. Bradley: Will we still get the CVS discount on Rx if the deductible is not yet paid?
7. C. Barton: Yes. And, preventive care and well-baby are covered on both. Individuals can have money taken out of their checks before taxes and it goes into their health saving account. It is tax free and you can drop money in there, you can use it on medical coverage during retirement.
8. D. McKee: We will be bringing this proposal to the Oct 20th Board of Trustees meeting and we hope to start open enrollment Oct 23. We are also looking at some dates to have HSA representative come here so that they can meet with employees on campus. We realize this plan will not be for everyone.
9. T. Hawkins: How many are interested?
10. D. Mckee: We estimated 10% will be interested.
11. T. Hawkins: Will that have a negative effect on rates overall?
12. D. McKee: I would anticipate no, the use of HSAs could actually be positive. The more employees on high deductible plans reduces the cost of the plan even though there is less money going in to pay for the plan. Over time there will be a spread in these rates, may become less expensive over time.
13. D. Bradley: Without high deductible proposal, the 2.8% increase would have happened, right?
14. D. McKee: Yes.
15. D. Bradley: If everyone leaves the PPO, then it will affect the rate.
16. T. Hawkins: My concern is that this plan will draw enough people out of the plan and have a negative effect overall.
17. D. Bradley: The goal is to share the burden. Governance can intervene if everyone starts switching and the rates are massively affected. We need to be vigilant on what is going on.
18. D. Cooper-Bolinskey: If folks want to try it this year, enroll, and don’t like it, can they go back?
19. D. McKee: Yes, during next open enrollment. There are some special circumstances in which you can switch in the middle of the year such as new baby, adoption, divorce, marriage, but it is complicated with the HSA.
20. D. Bradley: If someone is going to go with the high deductible plan, they need to understand the HSA.
21. D. McKee: Yes. For example, if you are scheduled to have an MRI, you could go online and look at all kinds of providers and see the costs for each. There’s no difference in the quality. Those interested in high deductible plan have to be good consumers of healthcare. We tend to go where our doctors tell us even if we can get it cheaper somewhere else. We need to change our mindset.
22. D. Bradley: Can you change the rate of money you add to your HSA?
23. D. McKee: Yes, but the max is the max though, no choice, it’s driven by the IRS and the ACA. Call Candy or myself if you have questions.
24. A. Kummerow: Can we go ahead and send in questions if we have them?
25. D. McKee: Yes, and we are preparing information for campus distribution to inform everyone.
26. D. McKee: Also, remember there are spots for health screenings so please sign up.
27. FAC Item: Revision of 245.3.3.5: L. Eberman
	1. L. Eberman: The motion in front of you has been discussed by FAC. Some Colleges have unable to identify alternates and therefore end up with no representation on Senate. The language here eliminates special elections and combines language about vacancies. There was some disagreement among FAC members, some inconsistency in the general impression. We want to help solve the problem by making it easier for Colleges but we also don’t want people to be able to not engage in the normal election procedure.
	2. Motion to approve (D. Cooper-Bolinskey, T. Hawkins)
	3. T. Hawkins: The language appears to be more convoluted than it should be. (suggested language, will send to Lindsey and Lisa)
	4. L. Eberman: The College could run its own election if it is in their constitution.
	5. T. Hawkins: The College should offer the vacant spot to the next person on the list. If that can’t be done, then the College needs to define a process. Its constitution needs to explain how the College chooses a new senator.
	6. L. Eberman: FAC recommends removing the term “special elections.”
	7. L. Brown: If there’s a process identified, then you don’t need the special election piece.
	8. T. Hawkins: Yes, take that out. Move to next person, and if not, figure it out.
	9. L. Eberman: The College(s) with this problem will have some work to do on their constitutions.
	10. S. Stofferahn: If we do delete the 3rd option, and it takes forever to get something into a constitution, then it might take forever to fill a vacancy.
	11. L. Brown: If they are concerned about filling their seat then they will do it, If they aren’t, then they won’t.
	12. B. Roberts-Pittman: Does Senate not have an interest in making sure the entire senate is present?
	13. M. Licari: No, that’s on the College.
	14. B. Roberts-Pittman: It should be clear that the College is making the choice to void the seat.
	15. L. Eberman: It’s important that the solution solve multiple problems that will occur down the road.
	16. L. Brown: Would FAC object changes to this proposal?
	17. T. Hawkins: I would be willing to write it up.
	18. L. Phillips: Do we really want to say that the Senate will do nothing/not care if the College decides to leave the seat vacant?
	19. D. Bradley: If a College wants to be underrepresented then that is a choice.
	20. L. Eberman: We talked a lot last year about proxy voting and we all agreed that to be engaged is to be present and engaged.
	21. Motion to table (T. Hawkins, B. Roberts-Pittman); Vote: 9-0-0.
	22. B. Bunnett: Suggestion of a minor editorial change. 245.3.3.3 “one within one (1)Morgan will send the editorial change to Katie Butwin.
28. Standing Committee Reports
	1. AAC
		1. T. Hawkins: Planning to meet next on October 5th.
	2. AEC
		1. A. Kummerow: Melissa sent materials to Morgan last week to be made available online. The Dreiser issue has been sorted out.
	3. CAAC
		1. M. Hutchins: Met this morning and approved three minors: Entrepreneurship, Human Capital Management, and Textiles, Apparel, and Merchandising. The committee did have a question about how to move on with the charge pertaining to career readiness, they are waiting for data.
	4. FAC
		1. S. Stofferahn: Bob Guell will spearhead PTOC’s oversight committee. FAC will meet on Thursday, I’m assuming to discuss the revised language brought up here today. In addition, they would like to see how chair duties are evaluated.
	5. FEBC
		1. B. Bunnett: Meeting next on Sept 15th. Candy Barton is coming.
	6. GC
		1. B. Roberts-Pittman: Will meet for the second time on Friday.
	7. SAC
		1. D. Cooper-Bolinskey: Met Monday for the first time. Officers are as follows: Dan Coovert, Chair; Sandra Kohler, Vice Chair; and, Steve Hardin, Secretary. Joy O’Keefe will be the SGA rep. They will meet monthly.
		2. One question from the committee about charge #5 re: Midterm to Interim grades, what do they need to do with that?
		3. L. Brown: ISU just made this change last year, we’re asking them to evaluate whether the change has been effective. They should ask the students since they initiated the change, ask the SGA president to appoint students to SAC so they can weigh in. I will contact the SGA President to make sure they have students appointed to SAC.
		4. D. Cooper-Bolinskey: Was the purpose of the change from midterm to interim to gather earlier information so they can either drop (or work harder) sooner?
		5. L. Brown and D. Bradley: Yes
	8. URC
		1. L. Phillips: Will be meeting on Friday to do some training on a “dummy” grant proposals, discuss the software and the rubric.
29. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. L. Phillips: We had an inquiry about the effectiveness of student evaluations done through email. The return rates seemed to have been better with paper, only at 50% right now.
	2. T. Hawkins: To the extent that they are used, how should they be weighted on the biennial review if only 30% of students complete them and no one has left any comments? Has this been evaluated?
	3. D. Bradley: Are the return rates different for online v. on campus student evaluations?
	4. L. Brown: The response rates vary widely.
	5. D. Bradley: Is this a reflection of the interest of the faculty member?
	6. T. Hawkins: You can imagine situations where faculty have offered incentives in order to increase the number of responses.
	7. D. Bradley: Does a faculty member know if it done?
	8. T. Hawkins: Responses used to be 90-100% and now it is 30-40%. The default assumption is that, by emailing them, we solved the problem of not everyone responding, but that is not the case.
	9. D. Bradley: Student evaluations really only identify who’s really good or really bad. The idea is that most professors are competent and really bad scores are a signal for those who are not achieving as this is what we’re doing with the BR anyway.
	10. B. Bunnett: Are we getting a greater return?
	11. L. Brown: No. The benefit is that all classes are getting the chance to evaluate now, that was not the case before.
	12. M. Licari: Student feedback is just one piece of review. It comes in many forms from chairs, deans, and peers. We’re not going to rely on just this.
	13. D. Bradley: Actually they can be a direct piece. If a professor is getting good evaluations, that’s a direct observation, and the only one. In principle, I would say as long as those evaluations are reasonable that is the only piece you need. If someone is substantially different than the average, then the chair needs to investigate further. Comparisons are useful, but they are not used for determinations of ability. We’re not trying to get down to a decimal point of worthiness.
	14. B. Bunnett: If an issue comes up that we want to research further such as online versus paper evaluation can someone, or a committee, be charged with that?
	15. L. Brown: Someone can do it here, or send to FAC.
	16. D. Bradley: Talk to IR, Linda Ferguson or Patty, they might have some information.
	17. S. Stofferahn: Should FAC look into it, or Brian?
	18. B. Bunnett: I will look into it and report back, see what the research says about email/online v. in person evaluations.
	19. T. Hawkins: Have SAC ask students if they are happy with the evaluation process.
	20. D. Bradley: They are going to say they would like to know the results. We can’t publish them so that won’t happen.
	21. M. Licari: Right, all they can see is the grade distribution, but not evaluations. That’s usually enough for a student to make up their mind up about a class or a professor.

1. Adjournment
	1. Motion to adjourn 4:44pm