

#19

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

March 5, 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

Members Absent: None

Ex-Officio Present: S. Powers

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

Guests: Lisa Spence-Bennett, Virgil Sheets, Susan Powers, Katie Butwin, and Carol Wetherell

- 1) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of February 19, 2019 (File #1)
  - a) Motion to approve (M. Chambers/C. Ball); **Vote 8-0-0**
  
- 2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins
  - a) The president and provost are out of town today. President Curtis is on her way to Washington for an alumni event. The provost is in Indianapolis—at the legislature, to be specific—as the budget discussion moves to the Senate.
  - b) The budget continues to be the primary issue of concern for the campus community. We know the following: The administration is asking for some immediate fiscal retrenchment, and painful cuts are currently happening around the university; The final budget will not be known until the State completes its work in April; both the current cuts and the uncertainty are creating reasonable anxiety among faculty and staff; the senior administration appears to be making a good-faith effort to be transparent about the framework for its budget decisions, as Diann’s Senate presentation in February indicated (and, let me note that the provost met with chairs yesterday for a similar purpose); yet, there is reasonable expectation among faculty, staff, and more junior administrators for a better sense of the constraints within which we must operate going forward; and, finally, the message from the president and provost remains optimistic—to the effect that the situation at ISU is not at crisis level, that there are many reasons to be optimistic about the future, that the hard work of all members of the community is appreciated—and will pay off—and that we cannot cut our way to success.
  - c) There are some contradictory messages here. We still see searches being approved; we have assurances that budget considerations will have minimal effects on the instructor

ranks; and, we see the president's continuing commitment to a 1.5% salary increase. Yet, belt-tightening is currently taking place around campus (especially in S&E budgets), and there is no way to avoid the fact that such cuts will have some impact on instruction, staffing, and morale.

- d) During our public and private discussions with the senior administration, the officers and I will continue to emphasize the need to protect the primary academic mission of the university. I also want to recognize the value of the role played by the members of the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate. The questions you pose and the answers you demand can go a long way toward providing much needed clarity and clarification during these challenging times.

### 3) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) B. Guell: I have a calendar regarding Spring Break. If we are no longer trying to line up with the VCSC can we go back to the old schedule?
  - i) S. Powers: On our 19-20 calendar, Spring Break was placed at the end of March as a guess. We assumed it might line up with the VCSC, but they are no longer going to be earlier than the first of April, which we cannot line up with.
  - ii) B. Guell: That is too late for us. What is the value for not putting it in the middle of the semester (two weeks earlier)? Why allow it to be so late if it is not lined up with VCSC?
  - iii) L. Brown: And the 19-20 calendar was established before we knew what they were going to do.
  - iv) B. Guell: Yes, so why can we not change it back?
  - v) T. Hawkins: I support the principle, is the practicality still there?
  - vi) S. Powers: The BoT would have to approve it, but Spring Break does not affect as many things as the fall does so it could work. For me, having it at the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> week always works better. It's problematic to guess on the VCSC. I am on the calendar committee for the school corporation now, but I am only one voice in many. I have no prediction what they might decide in the future.
  - vii) B. Guell: I respect the VCSC's choice to put one end at Easter weekend if they can. I heard from Linda Maule, that there is a level of concern in having it so late it is not in the best interest of our students. If we cannot line it up for faculty/staff & their children, then we should make it better for our students. It should be biased towards our students.
  - viii) L. Brown: Especially if we have more 8-week classes, it makes for a nice break if spring break comes at the 8 week mark.
  - ix) B. Guell: Yes, it is hard if you are one or two weeks into a term.
  - x) S. Powers: The 20-21 calendar has been generated. It has been given to the provost and to the cabinet. There are two options—end of March or after the first 8 weeks.

### 4) IT update: L. Spence-Bunnett

a) Thank you to all faculty for participation with multi-factor authentication (MFA). It has given us improved results with email security and is making a difference. I hope at end of the week to have a self-service capability. I still have around 100 who are not signed up and many of them are off campus. We hope we can handle that through self-service. It is important to move as fast as possible. We thought we could not get this changed without in person consultations, so I appreciate the time commitments and patience. We hope by the end of March to have everyone done. We have been working towards improved support for the Apple/Mac environment. We have a contract for Apple Care so we get some initial assistance. There will be some staffing reassignments in OIT to do more. We never intend for tech to be so visually present in your lives. We have good tools, but they have been very present lately—especially O365, MFA, and the Windows updates. We hope we are close to the end of a series of changes, but I am not sure I can say that because of the security environment so please be mindful of that. We understand we have asked you all to do a lot of things in the last year. We appreciate the patience and good participation as we have moved through the changes. In regards to SEM, there are areas of planning for us. We are working on the enterprise Request for Proposal for a new customer relationship management system. Analytics will be big from a new technology standpoint, as well as mobile capabilities, online education, and contributions by OIT staff toward career readiness and point instruction opportunities. We want to support academic programs through our SEM efforts. In terms of major tech changes, we have to start thinking about the LMS. The current format of Blackboard will eventually not be supported when they move to Blackboard Ultra. Another option would be Canvas. The new architectures in these tools will provide us with improved capabilities to promote online the learning environment and analytics in that area. When we get to that point, there will be some real advantages to those.

i) B. Guell: For MFA—what we had been told at different points by different people has not always turned out to be true. For those without cell phones, they were told if you did it once you would not have to touch it again until you had to change your password. This weekend I got a requirement to do this on my cell phone and I thought for those without cell phones that would have a problem. Especially if they were told they could once their machines were recognized as safe devices. Is it the case that we are working toward an outcome where you do not have to own a cell phone?

(1) L. Spence-Bunnett: Yes, that is the next version. It will be an Office 365 Microsoft application, but broader in scope with different options where you can use an alternative email address, instead of a mobile phone. The other thing could be a fob, something you can carry. That is what we are looking forward to next.

B. Guell: When—weeks, months?

(2) L. Spence-Bunnett: By the end of the calendar year, depend on staffing.

(3) B. Guell: What if a faculty member is in a foreign country this summer and is not able to access their email because of MFA.

- (4) L. Spence-Bunnett: If you do not have a mobile phone, we are not requiring that you use MFA. For this version of MFA there are two conditions a mobile device and use of technology outside of your office. If you have a mobile device and you operate it outside of the office then you are set up with MFA.
- (5) M. Chambers: We should remind you if we are traveling.
- (6) L. Spence-Bunnett: Yes, and you have to think about export control as a procedural reminder.
- (7) B. Guell: Is there a way to remove it, or use an office phone as a backup device. Can you strip MFA?
- (8) L. Spence-Bunnett: Yes, we can turn it off for any individual or the entire campus at a moment's notice.
- (9) M. Cohen: Can individuals call for help if they cannot access accounts?
- (10) L. Spence-Bunnett: You can call and it will send you to the operations staff, they can turn it off. In an emergency, we should have the capability to do that fairly quickly.
- (11) K. Games: The other day, I could not get on the app, if you use the portal to access your O365 it is every time.
- (12) L. Spence-Bunnett: Yes, if you go through the web-based portal. If there are situations that are just not right, you are probably not alone, so please call us when something is not working. With more people using MFA, there has been a reduction in security events. We will not be 100% on this – we will have some exceptional situations where the MFA technology we have now does not work for a particular person, and we will have to address those. Even with such exceptions, we are still much more secure, and that is okay.
- (13) T. Hawkins: How many are there (without cell phones)?
- (14) L. Spence-Bunnett: There are two of you that I know of and a few in facilities. So three or four people.
- ii) M. Chambers: There have been news stories from this morning about hacking, mostly related to naval tech. I do not see ISU as being very vulnerable except maybe the CoT. Along with MFA, are we able to keep track of the CoT if there are hacking attacks by China or N. Korea?
- (1) L. Spence-Bunnett: I have not talked to our security staff about that yet. We have great support from IU and other external security support groups. We are on all the message boards and we can read those to understand how to react. Matt Jenkins is our lead security engineer and he does a great job.
- iii) B. Guell: Can you talk more about the LMS.
- (1) L. Spence-Bunnett: I guess the big question is Blackboard. There is no firm timeline, but we need to contemplate the next generation of LMS architecture so we are not stuck with old tech when there is something else we could do. I have many concerns that I have expressed to the provost—we have an enormous

investment in Blackboard. Some things may not translate or some will translate more easily to the next environment. Part of the discussion has to be if all of the new things that can be done are worth throwing out all of the things that currently exist. We have to look at the cost benefit and make migration plans to minimize impact. Looking at other institutions that have gone through a transition it is likely to take at least 18 to 24 months to move. It does take a lot of time. On the other hand, you do not want to make it last forever. I hope that we could have a small group of faculty take a look at the options and evaluate what those benefits are that we would hope to achieve. We should do that whether we plan to move soon or not so we can make a judgment whether these new capabilities are of interest to us. Then we can make a careful decision. Our decision may be “thanks we will stay with Blackboard for now” or “here is the timeframe and let’s understand how we may move to something new.”

- (2) S. Neiheisel: From a SEM perspective—the need for a comprehensive approach to IT is a foundational piece of the SEM effort going forward. RFP, analytics, online experience—to Bob [Guell]’s questions they are imperative and imbedded in any conversion process. We need to make sure we are using the best program with the best cost benefit, etc. I hope the focus on IT is a comprehensive institutional solution. Those doing IT are being recognized as the process moves forward. We need to respect that they will be address those issues and they will be addressed by the professionals. At a minimum, a move is three years away. The concern is to potentially sidetrack a more major issue for a concern that your questions will be addressed. If we try now to answer those all the other pieces may not proceed at the pace they need to proceed.
- (3) T. Hawkins: Would that be three years from now or in three years, we start transitioning.
- (4) L. Spence-Bunnett: We want to start doing the investigation, because these things are big efforts. So we want to start well ahead of time. If we started today, the first thing you would do is look at the marketplace to see what is there and that takes time. Then we would write up a proposal, which also takes time. It then takes more time to prepare to move the campus including testing, training, and migration. It would be two or three years before we ask people to start changing.
- (5) B. Guell: I have no objections to having a group of people evaluate whether it is worth it, but in my mind, I do not care what the professionals think the right LMS is. It exists for faculty to work with students. If the faculty test it and it offers better possibilities for pedagogy than the other one than that is how to sell it. The decision maker needs to have full support of faculty behind the decision whether or not the professionals recommend it.
- (6) L. Spence-Bunnett: OIT would be very mindful of all of those types of considerations. We would propose and manage the project in a way that makes

sense to faculty, minimizing the impact and move to meet goals you want to achieve. I have already stated that the way to start is to work with a group of faculty to look at the benefits of moving. We would also help faculty move through the process. Sometimes with security, and something like MFA, we do not have a choice on the timeline. We had to handle quickly it because of the risk. But in a project like an LMS migration, we absolutely would take the time needed. Good professionals would not handle an LMS change like we have to handle some security-related changes. That is not how we operate.

- (7) K. Games: I remember the Pearson conversation last year, there was talk of integration, etc. that revolved around enrollment management. I think this sparked memory of the Pearson concern and which is not have the support from faculty. It reminds us of that attempt.
- (8) L. Spence-Bunnett: It is time or past time for a well-chosen group of faculty to look and see what is out there. After that, we can make a determination, and we would then need to be very careful that we position it from a time perspective so it does not get in the way of other SEM efforts. It is really good that we do not yet have a date from Blackboard regarding when they will stop supporting the current version. We have some flexibility. We should be more informed. We should then say if we see there is value in a new program or not, then think about when we would start that effort. This is a conversation involving faculty and what we are doing to achieve our other SEM goals. It is not harmful to what we really need to do today.
- (9) L. Brown: Eventually Blackboard will insist that we move to BB Ultra, so there would be no choice later. It will be BB Ultra or something else.
- (10) L. Spence-Bunnett: True, but when they announce that date, Blackboard has to give you time. They have not even announced a date.
- (11) B. Guell: Everyone does that, but the new software has always read the previous files. A company cannot do that or they fail.
- (12) S. Neiheisel: That is not true. I worked at a company has done that. This will be looked at in a comprehensive way. We cannot build a LMS without faculty.
- (13) B. Guell: And they are still in business?
- (14) S. Neiheisel: Yes.
- (15) B. Guell: Here when we moved from Banner, IA was going away completely so I understand that, but thousands of person hours were flushed down the toilet and we were exactly where we were with a new software.
- (16) L. Spence-Bunnett: There are procedural improvements to be gained sometimes when you transfer content. We will try to get as much as we can.

- (17) T. Hawkins: I think we are on the same page in regards to a faculty-driven investigation. Starting that this spring or fall would be fine. It sounds to me that we can agree that is one place we can be constructive.
- (18) L. Spence-Bunnett: Yes, we would appreciate your take on what new architectures can offer and what it takes to move.
- (19) B. Guell: Much of what I mentioned, are technical questions such as whether or not I would need to re-film videos, or regenerate content. We would need to figure out how many hours it would take to reproduce lost content.
- (20) L. Brown: Documents will transfer over.
- (21) S. Neiheisel: We cannot divine the future, but faculty driven investigation and decision is key. With both of those, you will get a good fit.

5) GC Item: see curriculog

- a) Deaf/Hard of Hearing Licensure Program: C. Wetherell
- b) Motion to approve (L. Brown/K. Games); **Vote 9-0-0**
- c) C. Wetherell: I run the Bloomberg Center and the state ask us to develop this. We have a program for visual impairment. You would have to hold a teaching license already and it is a 2-year program. You would then have the credentials to take the state test to be able to become deaf/hard of hearing licensed in Indiana. There is a shortage here and all over the country. It is a great niche. There are seven courses, and in the last semester you take two. It is all online, but there is a face-to-face component in the first semester.
- d) S. Powers: The state came seeking it. It is not a certificate, but a licensure. The state asked for it so we are assuming they will approve it when we take it to them for approval.

6) FAC Item: V. Sheets (File #2)

- a) PTOC revisions
- b) Motion to approve (R. Peters/M. Chambers); **no vote taken on this motion**
- c) V. Sheets: The EC charged us with resolving what can be appealed in terms of decision-making. FAC felt that you could appeal during a contract period, but not at the end. We wanted clear language on what could and could not be appealed. We clarified it there and in PTOC's responsibilities. On the version sent with the meeting materials, the red language denotes changes we were suggesting. Today at FAC, we came up with new language that clears it up even more. In section E we just suggested wording it in a clearer fashion, but it does not change the meaning. With the updates from today, section E would be changed to this. Section F would be a statement at the end of E.
- d) T. Hawkins: Do we have unanimous consent to consider section E that was passed today, without section F?
- i) LB: So Section F would disappear?
- ii) VS: Yes, we would put it at the end of E.

- iii) K. Butwin: So it is not substance, but so the two sections are coordinated. It is clear that the natural expiration of appointment was not subject of appeal. The only thing is we have non-continuation and recommendation of termination. We need to be consistent. I was worried about inconsistency or confusion.
- iv) B. Guell: Can we add as part of this motion, add it to 305.18 but insert in 305.19 before the last sentence.
- v) V. Sheets: Before appeals?
- vi) B. Guell: Between committee and appeals.
- e) B. Guell: Motion to copy the new FAC language to go in 305.19.4 between committee and appeals—unanimous consent requested. (Motion seconded, M. Chambers); **unanimous consent**
  - i) L. Brown: I do not like that idea. I am bothered about denying an appeal if it is ineligibility. The difference is there is a need for you still, but different if you are ineligible. I have gone through the process as a chair and found those labeled as ineligible should have that due process.
  - ii) B. Guell: That is an excellent point and I think we need to have that discussion, but the insertion motion is to make it consistent. I think then we need to vote on that and then debate the underlying philosophy.
- f) K. Games: From an employee’s perspective, in terms of future employment—at the end of a 3-year term if they are ineligible, does that have implications on future employment with the university?
  - i) S. Powers: If they are qualified degree wise.
  - ii) L. Brown: But if they are found ineligible does that affect it?
  - iii) K. Butwin: This is performance based, right?
  - iv) L. Brown: Yes, and there really should be that extra layer of appeal if it is a performance issue.
- g) V. Sheets: If you put not subject to appeal or PTOC review it sounds as though those are two different things.
  - i) B. Guell: Appeal is so there is no reference.
  - ii) V. Sheets: You say this and then go back to appeals it make it sound like something else is out there.
  - iii) B. Guell: Should we strike “PTOC review?”
  - iv) T. Hawkins: Where? In “Are not subject to appeal...?”
  - v) C. Ball: Would this change be in section E?
- h) B. Guell: What we should be asking is if you agree with FAC’s position that faculty members who are ineligible for reappointment whether they have access, or are you are agreeing with last year’s PTOC that they did.
  - i) C. Ball: What are the options?
  - ii) M. Cohen: Does it come from the college to the provost?
  - iii) B. Guell: The provost makes determinations of eligibility.

- iv) S. Powers: Yes, he does. It goes all the way up. That is why you get a letter directly from the provost.
- v) B. Guell: Is there potential for a last PTOC review before the end of a contract? Liz has expressed views that there should be if they are found ineligible. At the end of a 3-year appointment there is no expectation or no guarantee that employment would continue.
- vi) L. Brown: I have many instructors, and unless there are budget cuts or a major performance issue, the expectation is they will continue.
- vii) C. Ball: Are there other possibilities?
- viii) S. Powers: They can get another appointment.
- ix) L. Brown: Yes, but they need to be found eligible for that to happen.
- x) S. Powers: Well, if the department does not put the paperwork through for another appointment, they are just done.
- xi) T. Hawkins: Without speaking for the provost, I should note that he does not believe that the university can accommodate an expectation.
- xii) B. Guell: For department chairpersons, there is an expectation to keep well performing instructors short of financial issues.
- xiii) S. Powers: There is no promise of permanent employment.
- xiv) B. Guell: This is not for tenure track or tenure track-like faculty, but for contingent faculty that is less flexible than lecturers are.
- xv) L. Brown: Yes, and what happens if they are rendered ineligible?
- xvi) K. Games: Are they honorably or dishonorably discharged?
- xvii) B. Guell: There is nothing in the hiring process that would prevent a terminated instructor to be rehired as a lecturer or instructor in a different department.
- xviii) L. Brown: It would have to go through the dean, provost, etc. Would they not still be ineligible?
- xix) B. Guell: It would have to go through Academic Affairs and I am not sure a check would be done.
- xx) S. Powers: I would assume you would check, at least the hiring department chair would.
- xxi) L. Brown: It is the whole “ineligible” thing that I disagree with.
- xxii) M. Cohen: Can that term “ineligible” be used for budget constraints?
- xxiii) B. Guell: No, this makes a determination based on quality of work.
- xxiv) S. Powers: Ineligible is not based on resources.
- i) V. Sheets: We will have the lecturer language here next week, there is a statement that if they are ineligible they are only in that department and it is only for one year. Could that be a way to solve your issue?
  - i) L. Brown: I do not think so. For T-TT when it goes to PTOC, they have that right to appeal.
  - ii) K. Butwin: In the third year, is there any review?

- iii) S. Powers: Yes.
- iv) K. Butwin: Okay, but the appointment is ending. I think you need to think about decision points.
- v) S. Powers: You could be appointed to senior instructor and then later not be reappointed.
- vi) V. Sheets: The appointment letter is purposefully vague.
- vii) M. Cohen: What if, after year six and something happens at the provost level that causes the ineligibility. In that type of event is there some type of relief?
- viii) S. Powers: If there are any divergent reviews there is a meeting with the provost. Short of knowing something egregious that the reviews do not, in that case the provost is good to react to the reviews.
- ix) M. Cohen: In a review, it would be seen.
- x) S. Powers: The provost takes reviews into consideration.
- xi) M. Cohen: What about future administrators?
- xii) S. Powers: That person would not last long if they didn't listen to departments.
- xiii) L. Brown: You could say the same for people being denied tenure; we still let them have that final look-see at PTOC if they wish to appeal.
- xiv) R. Peters: It is the same, only different. There is no guarantee, ineligible or eligible you are still not employed.
- xv) M. Cohen: Someone moving on wants to mitigate the situation.
- xvi) B. Guell: Are you equating FT-TT with instructors.
- xvii) L. Brown: They are not the same.
- xviii) B. Guell: What is wrong with the link between instructors and lecturers?
- xix) L. Brown: We can talk about that next week when we get that language
- xx) B. Guell: Well, it is coming.
- xxi) V. Sheets: The dean will be the stopping point for lecturers.
- xxii) B. Guell: We have not had a lecturer force the issue; following your logic, a lecturer could do that.
- xxiii) K. Games: I think the distinction could be regular and non-regular faculty. For whatever reason, to give distinction or to allow for representation, instructors are regular faculty. That is the demarcation line. Regular versus truly contingent faculty. In the end, you are still unemployed, but do not know how it will be used.
- xxiv) S. Powers: You are not appealing to your keep job, just to leave on good terms.
- xxv) L. Brown: They are appealing the ineligibility determination, whether they may have a new contract. If found ineligible, they could not be employed later.
- xxvi) V. Sheets: If my department determines they are ineligible, I am not going to hire them.
- xxvii) S. Powers: But it goes on the permanent record.
- xxviii) L. Brown: They need the potential to say I am being "honorably discharged."

- xxix) B. Guell: So if I am an instructor at the a 3-year term and a new lecturer is much better than me, can they get rid of me in favor of the more qualified and better person?
- xxx) L. Brown: Would you be ineligible if he/she was not available?
- xxxii) B. Guell: For financial and enrollment reasons the default would be the instructor, but if the position is now open, could you hire someone into it?
- xxxiii) K. Games: Are you eligible to reapply?
- xxxiiii) S. Powers: The department would have to repost the position.
- xxxv) L. Brown: We do not repost the position and do a search if they are eligible and we are going to give it to them.
- xxxvi) B. Guell: Currently the letter does not say subject to money, enrollment, or the absence of someone who is better.
- xxxvii) K. Butwin: That is during the term of appointment.
- xxxviii)L. Brown: Maybe there is something wrong with the letter.
- xxxix) C. Ball: If there is no guarantee, it says possible versus not possible. Change the letter.
- xl) S. Phillips: If they are eligible and they hire someone else, he/she cannot complain?
- xli) M. Chambers: When would PTOC be involved?
- xlii)M. Cohen: After 3 or 6 years, the review is early.
- xliii) S. Powers: Decisions from departments have to be made by March 22. Faculty have to be notified.
- xliiii) M. Chambers: Well they would still be employees since the third year is not yet up.
- j) T. Hawkins: This went through FAC unanimously?
- i) V. Sheets: Yes, there was discussion. I can personally see Liz's concern and see we can do it better with the lecturer stuff, even though we are not giving them the basis of appeal.
- ii) C. Ball: Instructors and senior instructors are lumped together, there could be oversight to let a senior instructor appeal ineligibility.
- iii) S. Powers: They are reviewed in the BR. After 6 years, you are reviewed biennially, so every BR it is either at the end or in the middle of an appointment.
- iv) B. Guell: How do you not re-appoint at the end of a term?
- v) S. Powers: Do not hand them the new contract.
- k) BG: Liz [Brown] should make a motion to recommit with instruction to send this back to FAC to work on the PTOC appeal.. Then vote as is with it being internally consistent.
- i) T. Hawkins: What if other issues emerge at the lecturer level? Can it go back to FAC with that specific request? Can we send it back asking them to perhaps address her concern?
- ii) V. Sheets: You want the ability to appeal the eligibly but not the appointment.

- iii) L. Brown: Motion to return to FAC and to address the language to allow instructors who are deemed “ineligible” the ability to appeal to PTOC. (Second, C. Ball); **Vote 7-2-0**
  - iv) K. Butwin: It might be better to approach this holistically.
  - v) V. Sheets: I would rather have the lecturer stuff come forward and then go back at the same meeting.
  - vi) T. Hawkins: We also need the provost at the table.
- 7) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:
- a) AAC (M. Cohen): They are working on the staffing report and the provost review. They are collecting people for the review committee.
    - i) K. Butwin: I have not heard anything back about the selection. There needs to be three faculty members and one needs to come from the EC.
    - ii) B. Guell: Does the exec member need to be an officer or non-officer?
    - iii) T. Hawkins: It could be anyone.
    - iv) B. Guell: Who would nominate the person to represent exec?
    - v) T. Hawkins: It is a self-nomination, just email Lisa Phillips.
    - vi) B. Guell: Has anyone volunteered? If no, Mike [Chambers], I suggest you.
  - b) AEC (R. Peters): No report—done.
  - c) CAAC (L. Brown): They approved a department name change—the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice would like to change to the School of Criminology and Security Studies. Then there was a minor change in the Music Ed major, which is not coming to us.
  - d) FAC (B. Guell): Today they took up the lecturer stuff. They referenced the textbook policy discussion should be coming forward with the TOC eliminated. You are being told you cannot use materials performed by college SAC so that TOC would not exist. Adoption language would all be struck because now the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year are not in physical form. Fit into section B waiver to not have an adoption period. It is pointless.
    - i) L. Brown: How long you have to keep the same book.
    - ii) S. Powers: We still have Title IV rules.
    - iii) B. Guell: They are also working on a policy that would bring together policies from 310.1 and 323, regarding a mid-semester takeover by a different faculty member and the rights to adjust the syllabus. Policy 321 says what you cannot do, but not what you can do.
  - e) FEBC (K. Games): Amy Demcheck and came talked about wellness initiatives in HR. They have been reviewing the benchmark in faculty composition, FT-TT has gone down, but is still in line with policy 305.11.1.3.
  - f) GC (C. Ball): Approved a revision to MFA degree. GC is going through the feedback from the program review sub-committee. They started a discussion about the

ombudsperson as it relates to graduate students on campus. They are looking to see if additional services can be offered.

- g) SAC (M. Chambers): Did not meet last Friday, but there was an email vote on whether to approve language that makes SAT/ACT scores optional—it was approved. Submitted scores would still be used for placement and scholarships.
- h) URC (S. Phillips): Meeting tomorrow to review the current applicant pool.

8) Adjournment at 5:17pm.