

#14

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE, 2018-2019
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

January 15, 2019

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Approved

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

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Curtis

Ex. Officio Absent: Provost M. Licari

Guests: Katie Butwin and Kristan Williams

1) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of January 8, 2018 (File #1)

a) Motion to approve (K. Games/M. Chambers); [Vote 7-0-1](#)

2) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Curtis

i) Over break we took our trip to Florida, it was busy with 23 events in 6 days, and I came home with a cold, but we brought \$380,000 back so it was worth it. We started in Tampa followed by Orlando, Sarasota, Naples, and Boca Raton. Someone asked what has changed since last year and I cannot even imagine what I said having only been here for four days this time last year. We took some video as well. This time we were very specific in asking for money, and I am happy to say we have had some good hits. March 13 campus will have its first "Day of Giving." Most institutions have these. We did it in athletics in the fall, and it went well raising \$153,000 with 100 new donors. Our goal was only \$100,000. This will be for the entire campus and is March 13. We talked about it loud and strong in Florida. Andrea Angel has set some anchor gifts set up for challenges. We have talked to the deans and a lot will be going towards gap scholarships. These help students who after financial aid are only being held back by a small amount, for example \$1,200. This semester we had a handful of seniors who hit that wall and we are trying to help them. We need funding to do that. Other priorities include dollars to support programs such as study abroad and the Charles E. Brown African American Center. We have many black alumni who have done well and remember their experiences there. My goal is to get that

endowed. We have anchor gifts and matches. We got a pledge to match \$250,000 for bridge the gap scholarships. I am pretty excited about that. Some folks in Florida were just writing \$10,000 checks. My one question is, in the past, have we been asking for donations? I am happy to report people are stepping up. We will rethink the Florida visit next year, 6 days with 23 events is inhuman. We need to be strategic, have smaller group events and make direct proposals. As we talk with the deans, it was suggested we start with one faculty member joining us and what he/she might be able to share. We took Coach Mallory with us for 3 days and he talked about the football program, but it would be helpful to have at least one faculty member and see how it goes. I believe alumni would want to hear.

(1) T. Hawkins: Who went on the trip?

(2) D. Curtis: Too many went last year. This year we had, Andrea Angel, Todd LaComba, Nikki Simpson, Rex Kendall, me, Diann McKee was unable to go, Teresa Exline, and the provost joined us the last couple of days in Naples. It was about right, but it needs faculty. I talk about you all, but it is different for a member to be there. So give some thought to whom you might like to go. He/she will not ask for money, but just share what they do in scholarship and with students.

ii) Tomorrow, I go before the Ways and Means Committee, it is the fourth presentation in the cycle. We are asking for \$18.4 million for Dreiser renovations, and an increase in degree length, specifically for Nursing and our IPLI item. I hope that the latter will be put in the base budget; I think it will be added, but we are not counting on it. Our request is far more modest than our peers so I feel confident. Last week the governor presented a budget with no capital dollars, which was scary, but he was talked off that ledge. We will let you know where it goes; this process will be wrapped up by middle of May.

b) Provost M. Licari

i) No report (absent).

3) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

a) Greetings to all on the first day of classes. I hope (should it apply to you) that everything went smoothly. Our agenda today will be built around the latest report from Katie regarding the status of the Policy Library, as well as other issues that may be in the purview of the Legal Counsel. We recognize that in the absence of the president and provost, we may not get complete answers to all the questions that might arise from these discussions today. Katie is surely up to the challenge.

b) Before moving on, let me provide some updates. Regarding the Search Committee for the Ombuds, I have received positive responses from Jodi Frost, Jennifer Todd, Ed Gallatin, and Jessica Clark—nothing to date from Melanie D'Amico. We will take the names of those who have confirmed, along with Bob, to Senate on Thursday.

- c) Regarding the ISU representative to the ICHE Faculty Nominating Committee, John Conant has agreed to serve, if confirmed. We will take his name to Senate on Thursday as well.
- d) The officers met with Katie on Friday. The Policy Library was the primary issue on the agenda, which we shall discuss shortly, but we did venture into other matters. One topic was email retention. There is as yet no final resolution, but I have also talked with Lisa Spence. It is fair to say that, with fair accommodation for any security challenge that might remain and an understanding for the need to encourage appropriate management practices, we will move away from the strict retention parameters that many have criticized. Detailed proposals are pending. I will keep you posted.
- e) Diann McKee attended the pre-Exec meeting yesterday to outline the early thinking behind the administration's budget planning for fiscal year 2019-20. We know this is a budget year for the State, and all of our funding indicators are positive. Only a couple of the budget recommendations from the relevant parties are in at this point (the Commission, the governor, not the legislative committees), so we are far from knowing what our state allocation will be. Considering the present enrollment challenges we are facing, Diann talked about the need to be conservative for the upcoming year. More details will emerge following the first University Budget Committee meeting—sometime in February. I asked that any planning include a clear list of priorities—with low priority items receiving disproportionate attention when considering any cost-saving actions. It is important for the campus community to know what the administration will continue to prioritize and invest in, as we undergo fiscal adjustments. I am satisfied that the faculty instructional budget will continue to receive the highest priority. As the picture clears up, we will plan to have Diann visit Senate.

4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) B. Guell: To answer your question about being asked directly by the institution for money...my answer it zero. I have never been asked.
 - i) D. Curtis: That is what I thought.
 - ii) L. Brown: I have never been asked either.
 - iii) B. Guell: Do we have an anchor for faculty?
 - iv) D. Curtis: I do not believe so, talk to Andrea [Angel]. She would be delighted to hear from you. On a side note, Andrea is very professional. I think everyone will enjoy working with her. I was with her during the presentation when she got the big win in Florida and it was great.
- b) R. Peters: I had a conversation with a senior instructor who asked when are faculty supposed to be back on campus. He had been here all through break, so it was not an issue, but a general concern. I went to the academic calendar online and it is not here anymore. It was noted on the 17-18 calendar, but not 18-19. I struggle to say be here this day if it is not there.
 - i) B. Guell: There used to be handbook language which said it was one week prior to the start of classes. It was removed because it was viewed in conflict with the way pay was done a couple of years ago. We used to get out first pay on October 1 and it

- is now September 1. All letters went out with an August 1 start date and never defined the start of fall and spring.
- ii) T. Hawkins: The officers have discussed this matter with the provost. It is our understanding that faculty should be on campus the day classes start.
 - iii) D. Curtis: Should it say that?
 - iv) B. Guell: It has been an ongoing debate, we have gotten nowhere.
 - v) T. Hawkins: It has bounced around this table many times. Someone else recently asked me, and I reconfirmed with the provost—it is the first day of classes.
 - vi) B. Guell: Some colleges have meetings during the old understanding, a week lead in, and I do not know anyone that had a problem with the old definition. It gives time to have beginning of semester meetings. Once we did have a chair who had a desire to have meetings outside of a reasonable schedule, but he/she is no longer here.
 - vii) M. Cohen: Our January start date used to shift depending on the calendar.
 - viii) B. Guell: Yes, and it stopped hovering a few years ago. We are permanently in the teens of January.
 - ix) M. Cohen: Yeah, it was about 3 years ago that we started early.
 - x) B. Guell: Yes, it was pushed back for Nursing.
 - xi) L. Brown: It also makes it easier for faculty to be back.
 - xii) B. Guell: I have no problem with it, and it was run up through governance. This year is as early as we can conceivably start.
- c) M. Cohen: This fall there was some top down communication, are we going to continue with that moving forward?
- i) D. Curtis: Our communication process is in the works.
- d) M. Cohen: Tim, you mentioned that in pre-exec you heard about the budget, are we going to be hearing here soon from Diann [McKee]?
- i) T. Hawkins: We are planning for 19-20. The final budget will be shaped by enrollment and the state allocation. We are not near knowing what our allocation from the state is going to be. The process has only begun. All of the different recommendations have to be reconciled. It will not be until the end of April/beginning of May. This spring will be about slowly moving towards knowing exactly how much money we have, getting a sense of what that final number will look like, and planning for the fiscal year that starts in July. How she is envisioning the 19-20 budget, I do not want to be specific, because the numbers may not be real. I do not want to pin anyone down. The general attitude was the university should feel confident. Because of our performance indicators, the state should be nice to us compared to previous years as long... as the formula does not change. In terms of enrollment, we need to cushion that loss. We will need to be conservative about how much we intend to spend.
 - ii) D. Curtis: We are not hitting it and did not hit it last year. Diann [McKee] budgets a contingency every year and we wiped it out this year. We are not in enrollment

growth anymore. Headcount, such as college challenge, is not enrollment growth, and it is not a revenue increase. I will share though, seeing what happened where I came from, that Indiana is not a desperate state making cuts.

- iii) B. Guell: Learn everything you can. Through the president's announcements, meetings, we will talk about where we are with SEM. We can smile if the legislature leaves their formula alone. We will get some significant money, but we have been riding a fortunate wave and the elements are no longer there. We need to be prepared for harder decisions than we have been in the past few years.
- iv) D. Curtis: It is not that there is not revenue to be gained. It is simply, not as many students will appear as 18 year olds on campus. We have been growing online and need to continue to do so. We have masters programs that need to be recruiting instead of just waiting for students to contact them. Some have done that. It is pieces like that which help us chart our course.

5) Legal Counsel Update: K. Butwin

a) Policy Library

- i) T. Hawkins: We talked about the issue that Bob Guell raised, which was ownership of the policy or management of the policy. Bob, you were not at the meeting, but we were trying to channel the concern. Our conclusion was that "responsible" party implied ownership that is not reasonable.
 - (1) K. Butwin: Or authority over individuals which was not intended.
 - (2) T. Hawkins: What we want the screen to do is be productive. This contact would act as the "manager" and be there for the regular review process. We want a regular person to find info, and reduce the numbers of steps to get answers. It would minimize places to go. If it is that user-friendly then I think we are doing what she wants to do.
- ii) K. Butwin: This is really an evolution, which will happen over months, or even years. I am asking those involved to keep updating their own info and I appreciate the shared governance support. It is a much better product and process than what we had before. Everything will be changing next week. The A-Z will change, and the old Handbook site will be offline. Our programmers built us this site so it is easy to make the links and update information. It is already formatted as a text box, which means that there are limits. We will try to work with this format and make some changes then see what is working and what is not working overtime. I would like to introduce Kristin Williams; she is working in the Office of the General Counsel and has a communications background. She will work on keeping this updated. That responsibility is built into her job in our office. We will review on a systematic basis, unless we need to make a change more quickly, on a 3-year rolling calendar. I showed a draft to the cabinet. They are considering when and how they would like those policies to work so we can unveil that soon. I encourage us to talk about some

of what Bob has brought up in the 3-year plan. On the site issues, I like the term “policy administrator” instead of manager. Responsible office would be changed to policy administrator. We are investigating if we are able to add a second policy contact. We have yet to find out if that is an easy fix. Related policies and information, those things are really links. Over time we have to figure out if people are using them or not. Some of that will be driven by how accurate the links are. If our users and we are noticing those links are outdated then the policy contact people are going to have some work to do. Do you all like “policy administrator?”

- (1) B. Guell: How would it be operationalized in a section that is one place and it does not belong there?
 - (a) K. Butwin: They cannot possibly be the final decision maker in every policy.
 - (b) B. Guell: If a faculty member does not know what he/she will be paid in the summer, which is policy 505.12, would it be the provost or HR?
 - (c) K. Butwin: Right now, it would be HR, but there are more than what you identified out of 505, I think we need a faculty compensation policy in the 300s that supplements what is there. There are important things in 505 for everyone on campus including faculty. I would not put it in 305. As we go through policies, we are going to pull some of these apart. It will make it much more user friendly if we do that. That is the one where I found the most faculty specific and faculty only sections of a policy. I am struggling with 501, all of them apply to everyone. We are not going to go down a path of having vision specific policies so we have different base levels of conduct. To get to the heart of it, who is the responsible office/administrator, I really need one.
 - (d) B. Guell: 505, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, those are all the money ones. They could all be collapsed in the same solution.
 - (e) K. Butwin: In regular review we need to look really carefully and ask, is that is this the right place for the policy?
- (2) B. Guell: 501 is overarching and I do not have a problem with that idea of it staying, but HR would have to have a change in culture. Typically, they do not handle faculty related matters. If they are going to change their behavior, then leaving them there is fine. For faculty personnel files, there is a reason there is a committee.
 - (a) K. Butwin: Where having multiple policy contacts works, but only one responsible administrator. It does not mean they make the decisions, but they facilitate discussions about changes.
 - (b) B. Guell: VP level?
 - (c) K. Butwin: I kept it at the cabinet level.
 - (d) B. Guell: What about a chief of staff?

- (e) K. Butwin: That would not be the person to call though. These policy contacts need to know what to tell people. Need to know where to go. The administrators are a group of people to facilitate these discussions to which we are clearly involving Academic Affairs, etc. then have links. Also in 305, in policy history we added in information about policy 399: Interpretation. The reality is if you just have a question and which be easily answered you go to the policy contact.
 - (f) B. Guell: Would these emails go directly to the provost instead of to Jennifer Keller. Could we create different emails?
 - (g) K. Butwin: In other areas, it gets you closer to where you want to go. We can talk to Mark and Susan about that to see if there is a way that they would like to handle it. 505 is the most glaring example of faculty only policy. Mark weighed in on that. It ended up being lumped to compensation, but a supplement related to faculty pay would work.
- (3) B. Guell: Would this be a charge to FEBC? Or would Katie go there and bring it up?
- (a) T. Hawkins: It is the latter. She can bring a proposal to FEBC, explain it and run it back to us more fully formed.
 - (b) B. Guell: What do I take to faculty with 570? 503 and 504 have specific faculty meaning. Particularly 504.
 - (c) K. Butwin: 503/504 need to be on the cycle early. 504 is professional consultant service, in which we encourage faculty to serve, but we do not want the conflict. I do not know who should be responsible and I do not think they are drafted well and meaningful to begin with. These are real issues, but we have to think about what we want to get out of it.
 - (d) B. Guell: We never reached a satisfactory conclusion.
 - (e) K. Butwin: We have history and a lot of debate that will have to happen. We should put it on the list and go through the process.
 - (f) B. Guell: FAC meets next Tuesday, should we put it on the agenda.
 - (g) T. Hawkins: Ask Virgil [Sheets] how he sees the rest of the semester.
- (4) K. Butwin: We will have a Qualtrics survey about the new Policy Library. It will be on the homepage.
- (a) B. Guell: Are you keeping the old content?
 - (b) K. Butwin: The substance is the same, what is the concern?
 - (c) B. Guell: Never throw away anything I might need.
 - (d) K. Butwin: It is protected and we should be able to go back to it in minutes.
- (5) C. Ball: For the 200s, what is the plan for populating that?
- (a) K. Butwin: We will address that in the summers starting with academic policies in the catalog. There are some we are following, but we never had it

approved by the board. We have to see if they are division specific or BoT need approval.

- (b) B. Guell: It will include the .85 rule, and academic dismissal wait?
- (c) K. Butwin: All policies from AA and OGC together.
- (d) B. Guell: Does the Senate need to move for approval or will the motion from last month covered it?
- (e) T. Hawkins: There is no need to reapprove.
- (f) K. Butwin: Yes, but I would still make an announcement.
- (g) C. Butwin: Will the catalog need to be approved?
- (h) K. Butwin: Yes, we need to make sure this site has the most recent information. Be sure to check your catalog year so we do not mess people up.
- (i) M. Chambers: Can you put something there like, “to see the previous policy...”
- (j) K. Butwin: We want to avoid as much confusion as we can. I do not think these policies change, only specific curriculum might and that is not part of this. The answer is I do not think it would need to go to your committees, but bring an announcement here.
- (k) C. Ball: Grad Council was planning to look at catalog. Should they go ahead? It has been a point of discussion all year.
- (l) K. Butwin: Let me think about numbering plan and we can slot some numbers. The substance does not need to be different.

6) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:

- a) AAC (M. Cohen): No report.
- b) AEC (R. Peters): No report.
- c) CAAC (L. Brown): We has a strange issue come up. As you know we have a new Public Health major. Apparently, an associate dean in that college is approving those in the major to also have a Public Health minor despite the fact that the classes overlap. The department wants it to be in the catalog that you cannot do this. Susan Powers is going to work with CAAC and CAAC will develop a university-wide policy about this.
 - i) B. Guell: That is sneaky; students would avoid second a second Upper Divisional Elective for Foundational Studies.
 - ii) L. Brown: Yes, without gaining anything in return.
- d) FAC (B. Guell): No report.
- e) FEBC (K. Games): FEBC have met twice since our last meeting. Katie Butwin came; the committee would like to thank her. She talked about their charge looking into gender equity. They concluded that if Faculty Senate, FEBC, or the university wants to pursue a report this should be done by an outside firm because it is a sensitive discussion. Last year the data set was small and it seems as though the current salary model may have eliminated any potential gender pay gaps at the associate and full level.

- i) B. Guell: Not the assistant level, but it is eliminated quickly.
- ii) K. Butwin: If you are being discriminated upon in any category, not just gender, contact the Equal Opportunity and Title IX Office.
- iii) B. Guell: Is the suggestion of an outside firm for privacy considerations?
- iv) K. Butwin: I went to the meeting to get info about the scope and I did not come away understanding the universe here; is it all faculty, instructors, pre-tenure? We have to commit institutionally to fix them if discrepancies are discovered.
- v) T. Hawkins: It is just a rolling, general concern.
- vi) K. Butwin: It may be in the hiring process and some of that is being fixed at other institutions and businesses by not asking about prior salary history and stating what we will pay them for this position. We can have conversations about that. Another issue may be leave policies during tenure years. FEBC said that might be a FAC issue, but you all will have to decide.
- f) GC (C. Ball): No report.
- g) SAC (M. Chambers): The SAC chair resigned. Therefore, the committee is looking for a chair. The vice-chair, Steve Stofferahn is serving in the meantime.
 - i) T. Hawkins: Steve and I talked about that. I'm sure he is realistic.
- h) URC (S. Phillips): No report.

7) Adjournment at 4:55pm.