

#11

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE, 2018-2019  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

November 27, 2018

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Approved

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

Members Absent: C. Ball

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

Guests: Katie Butwin

1) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of November 13, 2018 (File #1)

a) Motion to approve (K. Games/M. Chambers); **Vote 8-0-0**

2) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Curtis

i) A week ago yesterday I presented to the State Budget Committee and so far all recommendations are to move forward. We are asking for \$18.4 million for Dreiser Hall, 2.5% on line items, and funding for the IPLI and Nursing. We are still waiting to see how performance funding will fall, but we should get the max since we have hit all the marks. We are staying front and center with our requests.

(1) B. Guell: Who are the losers with performance funding this year?

(2) D. Curtis: Not sure yet.

(3) B. Guell: It seemed like when we were losing the criteria would not change. I am wondering if/when IU and Purdue start losing if the criteria would change.

(4) D. Curtis: I have been watching our big cousins and they are opening their doors wider to get more freshman. Purdue is now inviting more first generation and low income, which is our thing! That is the way it is going. I thought we had the most students from Indiana, but Ball State is ahead of us there. We have to fix that. I did hear this time Purdue and Ball State's presentations, but I have nothing new to share. We are asking for the most modest allocation and that is why I am confident we will get it. So far so good, but we are only halfway through the process. What I was most prepared for in the nerve area were questions, but there

were hardly any questions. We were asked about dual credit, but we do not get as many students who have dual credit. The first time watching this I felt pretty good, and I felt even better this time. We are hitting the time mark and not going over with our presentations.

b) Provost M. Licari

- i) Last Monday, President Curtis presented to the State Budget Committee. It went well, and was well received. The other presidents who presented got sharp questions and that did not happen after her presentation so that was good. It was a very successful afternoon. I attended to be sure we are able to cover topics related to academics, but there were no questions I needed to answer. I was a successful silent appearance.
- ii) Last week, we again hosted the Reading and Math summits, which are professional development opportunities for for K-12 teachers. The Reading has grown over 4 years to include more than 400 participants, and I think we have finally outgrown the venue, which is a good problem to have. Math was in its second year, and there was a 40% increase in attendance. These very successful days were hosted in University Hall, and sponsored by Duke Energy. Through their support, we are able to offer for teachers, coaches, and principals professional development opportunities free of charge.
- iii) I have a Vice Provost EM search update: the search committee meets on Thursday and I will have their recommendation thereafter.

3) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) A hearty welcome back from Thanksgiving Break. I hope everyone feels rejuvenated for the final push. I will limit my comments today. My email last night provided an update on our revised plans. After the open discussion, we will move into a conversation about the Senate elections. We will then turn the floor over to Katie.

4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) L. Brown: I have a concern from a faculty member...In March, an International Music and Dance Conference will be here on campus. Classes associated with these subjects have been told to cancel so students can attend. Is it possible or appropriate for faculty to cancel for students to attend events, especially when they occur over multiple days?
  - i) M. Licari: We should not be shutting down departments for events. The other concern is that this is a question of faculty rights of operating classrooms and courses as they think they should. We should be careful with telling them they need to suspend their class. We should not engage in this.
  - ii) B. Guell: So a department or chair would not have authority to tell faculty to cancel classes, but what if the faculty got together and decided to collectively cancel.

- iii) M. Licari: Well what if I decided I do not like having to teach after Thanksgiving so I got all my Poli-Sci faculty together and said let's not teach...this is not far away from that.
  - iv) B. Guell: If we had an important speaker on campus, would we cancel class to let students go?
  - v) M. Licari: It would be hard to find a speaker with 100% support/a reason to say an event is important enough to cancel. I cannot support this.
  - vi) B. Guell: You are not naïve enough to know this does not happen.
  - vii) M. Licari: I know.
  - viii) T. Hawkins: To clarify, a chair cannot tell a department to cancel.
  - ix) M. Licari: No, he or she cannot wander in and say stop, we are going to do this instead.
- b) M. Chambers: I noticed on my way in that there is activity on the oil well on Chestnut, did something happen?
- i) M. Licari: I have no idea.
  - ii) B. Guell: We have been getting revenues and Central Presbyterian has been getting theirs as well. I would note that the smell of methane was noticeable for the first time. When it was authorized it was mapped, and there were two pools. One under central and one under Wolf Field. There were going to pump them and then access it from other directions. There are a number of pools that will continue to be tapped over time; my guess is they are moving on.
  - iii) M. Licari: I am not in the loop on that. If there are concerns about odors, I can take those into consideration.
  - iv) M. Chambers: I smelled it yesterday as I was coming onto campus.
- c) L. Brown: I know it has been brought up before, but the email retention policy was brought up at the CAS Chair's Council today. It is affecting some chairs especially in terms of alumni relations. They cannot retain those correspondence, keep track, and you do not always know what is going to be important to save. Emails are disappearing after 6 months and you cannot get them back.
- i) M. Licari: You can have your retention set to four years.
  - ii) B. Guell: Or move to the hard drive.
  - iii) M. Licari: Alumni records should be sent to the alumni office, especially if there is substantive and contact information. There are official and better ways to keep track than someone's inbox. There are solutions that we need to be following, relevant data should be put in the appropriate databases. Grant material and research material, should not be stored in email anyway. There are real reasons to not use email as a file depository.
  - iv) T. Hawkins: If there is really no flexibility on this question from the administration then I think we need another educational campaign. Instead of just saying sorry, this is how it is. It has been brought up by multiple people.

- v) M. Licari: Yes, we can do that and explain how to save to the hard drive or OneDrive and why.
  - vi) L. Brown: Some people currently dump everything into a four year folder.
  - vii) B. Guell: I think the institution's intention is we only have to go back 6 months so they can claim we do not have access, etc. It is a washing of hands at the legal affairs level rather than putting weight on emails. I stored everything in email as a professional for 30 years and now the thing that worked is the wrong way of storing.
  - viii) M. Licari: It is the right way for some of it.
  - ix) B. Guell: And so the institution's legal affairs do not need to dig through it.
  - x) K. Butwin: I am not afraid of what you have in your email from 6 years ago, but there would be millions of emails. If no one ever deletes anything, it becomes impossible to find anything. Research or institutional data needs to be in a safe environment, and email is not very secure. Those things that are institutional need to be in the safest location. That includes faculty assessments or other faculty data. They have to have a system where it is saved in a place other than one person's email.
  - xi) B. Guell: We fought this for a long time and you won, but let's just not repeat the untrue here; that it was never intended to be storage device when it worked just fine as a storage device.
  - xii) K. Butwin: Yes, but the volume is so much more now and that makes it not fine. We have to move away.
  - xiii) T. Hawkins: That would be separating individual needs and institutional needs.
  - xiv) M. Licari: I think another round of education on the subject is great. So Lisa [Spence] can explain how and why to store files in places other than email.
  - xv) L. Brown: Hard drives are not secure either.
  - xvi) B. Guell: There is nothing on direct hard drives; it is all cached.
  - xvii) K. Games: I think that some more information would be appreciated especially with the changes to the L drive from the H drive, and the use of OneDrive.
  - xviii) M. Licari: I will talk to Lisa Spence and suggest that we need a good, efficient way for redeploying information,
  - xix) T. Hawkins: Perhaps we can make it an annual thing especially when we have new chairs and are hiring new faculty and staff.
- d) M. Cohen: I was working on my FAD and it seemed to me that we put in our own university service. I think we might be missing the mark on senate stuff in terms of language. Should we continue with "member" of faculty senate? Or are we technically "senators?" It seems like there is opportunity to make our university service a little more robust. We could be more active in FAD by giving examples from the senate perspective, offering suggestions, and/or descriptions.
- i) B. Guell: We could give Susan Powers a list, but some of that stuff is locked. The FAD merges some pieces of data. Grade distributions and certain other pieces are locked in.

- ii) T. Hawkins: I can ask her if the info is just funneled into the database.
- iii) M. Cohen: Yes, especially for Senate, or a template for how to record it.
- e) M. Cohen: Also, there have been many solicitation emails from the bookstore, multiples per day.
  - i) Bob: It could be about turning in your textbook selections
  - ii) D. Curtis: I have been getting a lot from them, but they are coupons.
- f) T. Hawkins: Have the deans given info about searches across the colleges?
  - i) M. Licari: They are all at different stages because they launched at different times. Some have just been launched and others finished other nearing completion. It depends; there is no uniformity. It depends on when it is search season for the profession because some conferences are in the early fall and others are at different times.
  - ii) T. Hawkins: So the new process is off to a good start.
  - iii) M. Licari: I have heard nothing but praise and thankfulness. Everyone is pleased so far.

5) Senate Elections (File #2)

- a) T. Hawkins: With the shift in this year's Spring Break dates nominations would not close until April 5, elections would run until April 19, and then we would still have to schedule our new senator meeting, officer elections, and the exec committee elections. That is not a viable timeline. I am presenting this in the hopes we can set a date before Spring Break. We can move up it to where we are comfortable, I suggest March 15, if the handbook does not prevent us from doing that.
  - i) B. Guell: This fixes the issues and gives us the ability to extend it a week if need be. The reading of the handbook phrase "normally" gives you latitude. You can state that it has to be the 15<sup>th</sup> and why regardless of what comes in.
  - ii) M. Licari: Senators need to do a good job of making sure their college have enough nominations.
  - iii) T R. Peters: Our changes to electing when there are no alternates will satisfy that.
  - iv) B. Guell: People also need to understand that the Senate's agenda happens in the bodies of officers and exec. If you do not elect people on exec, you are shutting yourself out. That is what it is.
  - v) Hawkins: I will let the Senate know next week.

6) General Counsel Item: K. Butwin

- a) Policy Library (File #3)
- b) Motion to endorse (M. Chambers/K. Games); [Vote 8-0-0](#)
- c) K. Butwin: [[Katie demoed a draft of the policy library site](#)]. We are still on our production site, which is behind a firewall and not viewable yet. We are going to wait until January to release this publically. There was a lot of programming on the backend

that went into this. If you look at the tiles there are ones for policies “under review,” “recently updated,” and those that are “in development.” If you click on the policy tiles (100s, 200s, etc.) you will see the chapters on the left, the policy in the middle, and related information (responsible office, policy contact, related policies, process and procedures, policy history) on the right.

- i) B. Guell: Will these responsible offices only be at the VP level? For examples, OIT has sublevels.
  - (1) K. Butwin: Well OIT would be Academic Affairs. The specific policy contact will be whom you actually contact.
  - (2) B. Guell: What about where there is intersection from responsible offices, such as in 512: summer school compensation, there is an intersection of payroll and a VP.
  - (3) K. Butwin: We cannot possibly list every overlapping office for every policy, but there will be an overall responsible office and contact.
  - (4) B. Guell: If a faculty member is wondering what the policy is with regard to how much they will be paid over the summer, if they call HR they are not going to have a clue or authority.
  - (5) K. Butwin: There are two answers: by setting up the responsible office, they will know what is going on and they should know whom else you should be contacting. Everyone should be using this as the primary source.
- ii) B. Guell: This brings up other circumstances such as moving things to where they belong. 512 should be in 300s.
  - (1) K. Butwin: I agree with you. This highlights a lot of what we should do with these policies. Good example is 590, which is called Miscellaneous, but it really pertains to coaching staff. We need to clean this up and we have the opportunity to do that. One issue that we have to be conscious of if we take the BoT 50 changes we have to take them the info on why. Once we set up the rolling reviews, we will get to all of them every three years. Then they can move around as needed. It is up to you all if you want to talk about moving that.
  - (2) T. Hawkins: We take responsibility over our part of this. It should be on our agenda.
  - (3) M. Licari: We need to prioritize some of these things.
  - (4) M. Chambers: Would this be a charge to FAC?
  - (5) B. Guell: SAC, FEBC. It is not just a FAC problem.
  - (6) M. Chambers: Or would it be for Exec?
  - (7) B. Guell: It could be a Christmas Break project for officers or they can assign it to an ad hoc group.
  - (8) K. Butwin: We would like to establish this to make sure processes move forward on a regular basis and we push out information. On Dec 12, we take this to the BoT with a schedule for a three-year review cycle. One of the reasons for the

responsible office is policies have not been reviewed because they had no owner, we need a senior level admin to be responsible.

- iii) B. Guell: Have you done what you need to do for internal references that change numbers. In 145, there are a lot of internal references to sub-clauses.
  - (1) K. Butwin: No, we have not done that yet. What I decided to do was not to muddy the waters with the trustees. They will approve renumbering and slight renaming. Then we will roll this out, make minor changes, and alert all governances.
  - (2) B. Guell: You should add to the BoT motion that the understanding of interim internal references need to follow wherever they were supposed to go. 145 to 245, which will not exist. Then you have the week after the board meeting to make adjustments.
  - (3) T. Hawkins: Add to that and we will endorse that as well.
- iv) L. Brown: There is a wrong number here. Are the policy numbers in the 200s just subtracted by 100?
  - (1) K. Butwin: Yes, that was a typo.
- v) K. Butwin: The biggest difference is policy 100 is shorter. It is about the policy library and has some history related to the handbook. It was a minor tweak. I am not trying to make big substantive changes. Once we move to this site there will be a regular review in a systematic way.
- vi) B. Guell: What about the policy on policies?
  - (1) K. Butwin: It will now be 126.2.1
  - (2) B. Guell: It is currently 226?
  - (3) K. Butwin: Yes. In addition, in the 100, 200s, and 300s there are references back to it.
- vii) B. Guell: So if you have two competing offices, such as a grievance across employee or student groups that would seem to cross VP units.
  - (1) K. Butwin: Yes, we will have to have an owner, but we can add another policy contact.
  - (2) B. Guell: Yes, I can imagine two different VPs having authority over the same policy.
- viii) K. Butwin: Right now, there are not jumps within the policies and some are very long. I have to pick my battles with communications because they have done a lot of work, but do want some within the policy itself. There will be a search bar above related information on every page, a print function and it will be set up for mobile. I will find out about how the printing will look when it comes out.
- ix) B. Guell: Can we eliminate the nomenclature of articles 1-10 in the constitution? It is a duplicated numbering scheme. Would that fall under editorial changes, or is there is a method where you make the announcement and it just happens.
  - (1) T. Hawkins: I can make that announcement.
  - (2) K. Butwin: I am considering noting those in history so we can track them.

- (3) T. Hawkins: The cleaner the better and it should not be a problem for anyone.
- x) B. Guell: This is a significant improvement. Thank you for your efforts.
- xi) K. Butwin: The intention is to send people here. For example, when we have an HR policy they need to link to this and us to them. It is more functional so we are going to be using it.
- xii) K. Games: In A-Z, will this be under policy library or handbook?
- (1) K. Butwin: Both.
- xiii) M. Licari: We have not had a systematic review and that is why we have policies that have not been looked at and do not know who is responsible.
- (1) B. Guell: Are we going to fix the obscure place and fashion of 912? A department chairperson, dean, or faculty member would not know where to go.
- (2) K. Butwin: I agree there is an opportunity to put information in about who is responsible and where to go, "Did you know...?" There has to be communication and policy contacts need to be aware.
- xiv) T. Hawkins: You can come to Senate, but going beyond that, this goes live in January so is somebody designated to go and communication to a larger group of chairs. Do we have a manual that chairs need to know? Who can put that together?
- (1) K. Butwin: I have a draft. In addition, I am hiring, the position has been posted for a coordinator for the university policy library and contact to do that kind of presentation. I agree we have to think about who we are going to reach and how. I can do some of it but not much.
- (2) T. Hawkins: It is remarkable how many faculty have never looked in the handbook.
- (3) K. Butwin: You all have to figure out how to reach faculty in your departments/colleges.
- (4) B. Guell: For some the discovery process has been breaking rules they do not know exist.
- (5) M. Licari: We can deploy via chairs councils so they can go back right away into department meetings. Information will get lost, but there needs to be that first try to raise some awareness. There will be a drive out of curiosity if nothing else.
- (6) T. Hawkins: Academic Affairs should have a list of what needs to be addressed.
- (7) L. Brown: That goes for staff also.
- (8) M. Licari: Yes, it is a university wide resource and other VPs have their own structures.
- xv) B. Guell: I urge the "related information" sections should be two iterations closer to accurate before it hits a wider audience.
- (1) K. Butwin: I am visiting all the responsible offices with their contacts to make sure they fill this in.
- (2) B. Guell: We need a way in which we offer insight to Katie about what she should put on the right. In January, it would generate more blowback.

- (3) K. Butwin: It was supposed to be in better shape and it will be by Dec 14.
- (4) B. Guell: The BoT exercises authority over the center column and do not need to know that the right column is not correct right now and that by the time it rolls out the whole things needs to be two iterations closer to correct.
- (5) T. Hawkins: Katie can sit down with the officers before classes start and see if we approve of what appears.
- (6) K. Butwin: We will have a feedback loop that we create. There will be a systematic method of getting that information. I would like to invite staff council reps to that sit down as well to have that conversation one time.

7) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:

a) AAC

- i) M. Cohen: Their next meeting is December 7, and the provost will be joining us. They are working on the staffing report. It also sounds like there is going to be a need for new members.
- ii) M. Brown: I already sent names to Lisa Phillips in case there is a need for new members.

b) AEC

- i) R. Peters: No report.

c) CAAC

- i) L. Brown: No report.

d) FAC

- i) B. Guell: I did not attend this morning's meeting.
  - (1) T. Hawkins: They passed revisions to 350 language, and will be bringing it here next week.

e) FEBC

- i) K. Games: No report.

f) GC

- i) C. Ball: No report.

g) SAC

- i) M. Chambers: Meet tomorrow.

h) URC

- i) S. Phillips: No report.

8) Adjournment at 4:53pm.