

#20

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2018-2019

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 12, 2019

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Approved

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

Members Absent: C. Ball and K. Games

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Curtis

Guests: Debra Israel, Steve Neiheisel, Jason Trainer, Virgil Sheets, Katie Butwin, and Shannon Barton

- 1) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of March 5, 2019 (File #1)
 - a) Motion to approve—pending corrections (R. Peters/M. Chambers); **Vote 6-0-0**
- 2) Administrative Reports:
 - a) President D. Curtis
 - i) No report (absent).
 - b) Provost M. Licari
 - i) We both missed last week's meeting as we were in Indianapolis presenting to the Senate Appropriations Committee. This was our fourth and final presentation as part of the university's budget request. It was essentially a reprise of the same basic presentation we have been giving. The committee was happy with the presentation and we got out of there with no questions, which is encouraging. The commissioner presented before us and the committee asked her many detailed questions. It seems they were in the mood for questioning, so for us to get none was reassuring.
 - ii) Wednesday, we had the NFI Insurance Policy submit in Washington DC. There were students there as well. The students helped put on the summit as part of their professional development in the program. This has become a signature event for the university giving us national attention and a national positive reputation in that industry. It is very impressive, a good project for students and a great event. Our

students participate in the planning and by attending they can build their professional networks.

- iii) Monday, I met with the department chairs and had a frank conversation about enrollment and the budget. I hope it was useful. As we move forward, all of us here we have agency—we can actually do something. The state of Indiana is not hostile to higher education. On the whole, elected officials are supportive of higher education and understand the importance of it. It is largely up to us, going forward. Jason [Trainer] started 9 days ago, so he is a seasoned veteran now!
- iv) Give to Blue Day is tomorrow! Tim, please say something as you planned to—it is good for everyone to hear from faculty leadership on this. There are a number of ways to help the university. Thanks to Bob and Susan Guell for their donation and the challenge to raise money for the Bridge the Gap Scholarships, which address retention challenges and help our students afford to stay in school. I have my own challenge to generate interest in donating to Experiential Learning and Undergraduate Research. If we reach 10 donations, it will trigger a \$5,000 annual donation from Kirsten and myself. There is not a bad way to donate to the university. Be engaged tomorrow, follow along, and share your support on social media for events and the activities. The whole point is that tomorrow is a fun and engaging event.

3) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) A few minor updates to share with you today. First, from John Conant, the ICHE faculty representative nominating committee had its organizing meeting today. The application deadline will be Friday 4/19 and the application materials will be available soon. John will serve as the person to answer questions about the application or process for anyone from ISU who is interested in applying.
- b) Second, tomorrow is Give to Blue Day, which is self-explanatory. As this is an inaugural initiative, not to mention a very good cause, I hope and expect that we will see wide faculty participation. There are multiple venues for giving, so find the one that most appeals to you.
- c) Third, the nomination process for Senate elections closes on Friday. We are still looking for candidates from CAS and SCOB, though additional nominees for every race are welcome. Please encourage your colleagues to run for Senate. Elections will be held the following week in advance of Spring Break.

4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) B. Guell: It has been hinted that a significant portion of budget cutting will occur through S & E rather than through personnel cuts. This is good especially for the short term to meet a target, but terrible if we believe we are 2-3 years in a hole. Money has to be replaced at the spend rate, that is a cut you get to do in 2020 and no other time. Then, you will have to put some back and quickly.

- i) M. Licari: Budget cutting is always yucky and you wish you did not have to do it. It will not be entirely done through S & E reductions. There were a number of staff positions that have been open that will not be filled for example. Use of one time money does allow for a couple of things—you cut the base and spend as nothing happened, or cut and figure out how to stretch one-time money as you need to. In the coming fiscal year the budget will be down because of a forecasted enrollment drop. Going forward, there needs to be enough initiatives and activities in place to offset the enrollment so we do not feel the frustration we are this year. It is a mixed strategy essentially. It is not right to say we are taking 100% out of a certain area. It is a balanced strategy for the deans to work around.
 - ii) T. Hawkins: I think we can assume that the budget cuts this year were not as strategic as they could have been. Maybe it could have been thought out a little bit more. What does that mean for next year, will there be a more strategic approach?
 - iii) M. Licari: I will let President Curtis speak for herself on allocations, but in Academic Affairs, after having conversations with the deans, the narrative has been as we look to make strategic investments how do we do that with as much transparency as possible. With that, we can have a better conversation about allocations. Out of SEM there will be things we will have to do that we will have to spend money on and we will have to have conversations to make that happen.
 - iv) T. Hawkins: Next fall could there be some advanced conversation with the university budget committee, which was missing this year. It did not meet until the spring; I think we could work ahead and use that time to toss around ideas.
 - v) M. Licari: I can certainly make that suggestion. We would have to have a conversation with President Curtis in advance.
 - vi) B. Guell: Some departments have an enormous savings in S & E budgets. Sweeps all the time cause hallways to be filled with copier paper, but taking five or ten percent off does not cause radical change like 100% would. They are not to be treated like piggy banks, but to support students, faculty, and staff.
 - vii) M. Licari: There is a lot of room for strategizing.
- b) L. Brown: Since there will probably be no money for merit pay next year, if that is the case should we go through the merit pay exercise?
 - i) M. Licari: Correct, probably no, but that is a real question. This pressure is off.
 - ii) B. Guell: When there is no money for merit pay that is how procedures go to the grave. No one remembers to process and we spend another six months making a new one.
 - iii) M. Licari: I would say continue with the process with the expectation that we will return to it quickly. I am highly supportive of it, and prefer it to other systems. I would like to see us get back to that. I understand frustrations, but if we do not push, I think we run the risk of it falling into disrepair.
 - c) B. Guell: Are we going to continue with the Bradley salary model?

- i) M. Licari: It is not in the budget. At least in the faculty budget I am getting from the deans.
 - ii) B. Guell: It will start to create inequities that currently do not exist.
 - iii) M. Licari: That is linked to merit as well. Speaking for myself, I believe it is important to recognize merit-worthy faculty work. It is also important to maintain salary competitiveness. I understand the model and support it, but for this coming fiscal year I have not seen it in the dean's budgets.
 - iv) M. Cohen: Do they know there is an option to put it in there?
 - v) M. Licari: Yes, it is in their wheelhouse, but it would mean sacrificing in other ways. I do not disagree; it is just that I would rather take the year off moving forward.
 - vi) B. Guell: I will respectfully disagree; you are the boss.
- 5) AAC Item: Provost Review Committee selections
- a) T. Hawkins asks for unanimous consent to add voting on the Provost Review Committee Senate representatives to the agenda: **unanimous consent**
 - b) Motion to approve AAC slate (S. Phillips/L. Brown); **Vote 6-0-1**
 - c) T. Hawkins: We need to vote on the three faculty members slated to represent the Senate on the Provost Review Committee: Mike Chambers (CAS), Bridget Roberts-Pittman (BCOE), and Erik Southard (HHS).
 - i) B. Guell: Can you convey to AAC the high quality of the slate.
- 6) FEBC Item: D. Israel (File #2)
- a) SRC Family Hours
 - b) Motion to approve FEBC recommendation (L. Brown/M. Chambers); **Vote 7-0-0**
 - c) D. Israel: We are recommending a change to the family hours during the fall and the spring. Currently, during the fall and spring family hours are only Saturday and Sunday. It is our recommendation that Friday evening be added. In addition, Saturday and Sunday are only until 5pm and we are recommending extending it to 7pm. Jen did a lot of work on this, working with the head of the SRC. They looked at the hourly usage on scan-ins. These hours are proposal based the usage so they are reasonable for them to accept. You would still have to pay the 8 dollars for your 14 year old for example to go. We are not saying there should be changes in prices, but as a family friendly sort of thing, it is to encourage exercising with the family so we are hoping they could extend it a little bit. It is the first of many we hope we can bring to you since right now we cannot root for better salaries; we are hoping to be a real example to other universities in our benefits.
 - i) T. Hawkins: So this is not mandate, just a recommendation.
 - ii) D. Israel: I was not sure what avenue to take with this, so we went with a recommendation.
 - iii) L. Brown: We are endorsing it, basically.

7) SAC Item: S. Stofferahn (File #3)

- a) Test Scores
- b) Motion to approve the SAC proposal (L. Brown/M. Chambers); **Vote 6-0-1**
- c) S. Neiheisel: The simple explanation is we needed to review admission standards. There was a fairly comprehensive plan developed out of a subcommittee of SEM, it went to SAC with issues related to student placement, Ivy Tech partnerships, and making test scores optional. The subcommittee revised it and they parsed those pieces out so there was more time to consider them all. There was strong support from SEM and SAC that test scores be recommended as optional. They were not formally used in admissions requirements itself, but were used in course placement and scholarships. We looked at records and there were only 642 missing test scores. Their admission was held up for a piece of paper used for other purposes.
 - i) B. Guell: SAT verbal scores were used for ENG 101 and 107 placement. What is the plan for that?
 - ii) S. Neiheisel: Susan [Powers] and Linda [Maule] are in charge of that, but they said they have alternatives. Admissions will continue to search for it, but a student will not have to have them to be admitted.
 - iii) B. Guell: I am fine with that, but what are the alternatives?
 - iv) S. Neiheisel: I do not know the specific alternatives.
 - v) B. Guell: Does Sarah [Wurtz] know how many will be affected?
 - vi) S. Neiheisel: I am not sure, but we will communicate that.
 - vii) B. Guell: So they will still need scores for the Honors College and scholarships, but for admission, it is not dependent; they will not be prevented being admitted to ISU.
 - viii) M. Cohen: This will be told in advance.
 - ix) S. Neiheisel: Yes, there will be a change in communications.
 - x) B. Guell: This is a trivial number of students, but what about students that have a mild learning disability. Their grades might be enough, but they are clearly not college ready. Are we going to do anything to look at transcripts more readily to identify students in special needs tracks? Are we concerned about that?
 - xi) L. Brown: Did they have a core 40?
 - xii) B. Guell: No, it was when core 40 was just coming up.
 - xiii) S. Neiheisel: Core 40 requirement remains in the policy.
 - xiv) M. Licari: If they are coming with a disability, they can document it and we can accommodate it.
 - xv) B. Guell: If the core 40 filter is really good and applied it does not matter.
 - xvi) K. Butwin: Is it a policy?
 - xvii) S. Neiheisel: It is a catalog statement. It brings practice into alignment as far as admissions criteria.
 - xviii) K. Butwin: My question was about putting it in the policy library.

- xix) B. Guell: This is an important type of issue that had not really been handbook-like, but because we are putting the catalog in the Policy Library, it changes the Senate and the BoT's role in the process.
- xx) M. Licari: Yes, for the better.
- xxi) B. Guell: This is the first time it has come up since the changes.
- d) S. Neiheisel: In addition, another change is it to require non-degree seeking students to reapply each semester. In terms of policy, it would be nice to bring them at the same time.
- i) L. Brown: So they do not have to pay a fee and admissions does not deal with it.
 - ii) S. Neiheisel: Yes, right now they have to apply each semester.
- 8) Department Name Change: S. Barton, D. Woods (File #4)
- a) School of Criminology and Security Studies
 - b) Motion to approve the name change (L. Brown/S. Phillips); **Vote 7-0-0**
 - c) S. Barton: The proposal outlines our desire to change the name and go from a department to a school. It will help with recruitment, scholarships, community outreach, and academic distinctiveness. We previously added two majors (Intelligence Analysis and Cyber criminology & Security Studies) and now as they have been put into place we have discovered in trying to market to students that the name and what we offer does not match. We are running into it at conferences as well with prospective faculty; cyber people ask why we are there. Other programs that contain Intelligence Analysis do not have distinctive programs like ours; they are concentrations. That makes a significant difference for us. This went through our FAC council. We think the change to “school” will do the same for us as it did for the School of Music. There are no structural changes. The key difference is we have distinct programs and subcategories. We would like to advocate distinction. Why keep Criminology in the name, because we are paying homage to where we came from. Security Studies encompasses both Intelligence Analysis and Cyber criminology and is common nomenclature.
 - i) B. Guell: Is there a section of the handbook that defines the standard for a school?
 - ii) S. Barton: No, but this is our understanding. Our model was nursing.
 - iii) B. Guell: I thought if the entity has multiple departments for example, it then warrants the title.
 - iv) R. Peters: In 2009, I was chair of CAAC. We were asked to develop the definition of a “school” at ISU. The definition was supposed to be in the CAPS manual but it is not there now. Ever since I received this proposal, I have been looking to try to come up with this. [R. Peters handed out the definition CAAC developed in 2009].
 - (1) L. Brown: I remember this when School of Music went through.
 - (2) R. Peters: I knew if there was going to be a School of Music there would be another.

- (3) B. Guell: Obvious they meet terms 1-3, and 5. I would like to hear something about term 4.
- (4) S. Barton: I did a search on the College Confidential webpage and came up with 1,000 college or university with programs. We took out 2-year programs or for profit universities. There were 956 left, with 95 “schools.” These distinctive categories had masters or PhD programs, a specific research agenda, and/or divisions with separate programs within them.
- v) M. Chambers: I understand why you are including the term “security studies” in the new name, and do not have a problem with that, but I do want to caution you that it might cause some confusion. In Poli Sci, when we talk about “security studies” it generally means more military studies, things like nuclear weapons, which are not things that this program will be covering. Students or faculty looking at your new school may be confused about what you do and what you cover.
- (1) S. Barton: In Intelligence Analysis, we are targeting military studies. We do teach how to identify where nuclear weapons might exist.
- (2) M. Chambers: Okay. I still think some of what is typically considered “security studies” may be outside of what you folks cover, so I just wanted to alert you about this potential confusion.
- (3) S. Barting: In recruiting faculty as well, for either Cyber criminology or Intelligence Analysis, we have been including Poli Sci and Public Administration in the search.
- d) B. Guell: I have a request of Mike [Licari], to have a conversation with Jack Maynard about why (CAAC 2009’s definition of a school) is not in the handbook.
- i) K. Butwin: I cannot find it in the board minutes at all.
 - ii) B. Guell: I do believe these are the last one of these we are going to discuss.
 - iii) R. Peters: I do not agree; there will be more.
 - iv) L. Brown: Yes and we should have the current CAAC endorse it.
- 9) FAC Item: V. Sheets (Files #5-6)
- a) 305 revision, evaluation of lecturers
 - b) Motion to approve the FAC proposal (L. Brown/S. Phillips); **Vote 7-0-0**
 - c) V. Sheets: We are responding to your charges. It is our thoughts to end the review in the department if possible, but not to go higher than the college. This is for PT faculty, for lecturers. The department personnel committee and chair will do a review and can invite a portfolio to be submitted, but the review can be done without one. When they do their review, if they agree, great, and then the dean will make the notification. If they disagree and cannot work it out then the dean makes a decision. We changed the dates and made them closer to the end of the appointment period, which allows for more time for gathering information. Notifications will be a few weeks after the end of the term. If not eligible for reappointment, they have to sit out a year and then they can be considered

again. There had been a section for nursing which requires it at the school level. I spoke with Andre [Kummerow] to get adjusted language to cover their cases.

- i) L. Brown: I like it. I do have a grammar correction in 305.20.1.1.3.1.2: Inconsistent Recommendation; in the third sentence, “if the recommendations ~~are~~ are inconsistent they will meet in an attempt to come to an agreement.” It needs the ‘s.’ **Unanimous consent.**
- ii) V. Sheets: We know we do not have a status for this, but FAC proposed a one page form if a lecturer had non-teaching assignments. It allows department chairs and personnel committees to provide more clear and consistent feedback. We took it upon ourselves. Sarah [Monday] sent it to a couple of lecturers and those who responded thought it was favorable. It would not go in the handbook.
- iii) T. Hawkins: I appreciate the work. It required a lot of thought, and it responds to multiple requests for change. I think it is a positive one.

10) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:

- a) AAC (M. Cohen): No report.
- b) AEC (R. Peters): No report—done.
- c) CAAC (L. Brown): No report.
- d) FAC (B. Guell): No report.
- e) FEBC (K. Games): No report (absent).
- f) GC (C. Ball): No report (absent).
- g) SAC (M. Chambers): No report.
- h) URC (S. Phillips): The committee reviewed proposals and recommended funding.
- i) B. Guell: The subcommittee I am on submitted two names for the ombudsperson.

11) Adjournment at 4:31pm.