

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE, 2018-2019
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

October 30, 2018

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: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Curtis

Guests: Winnie Ko and Chad Witkemper

- 1) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of October 16, 2018 (File #1)
 - a) Motion to approve (M. Chambers/L. Brown); **Vote 8-0-0**
- 2) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of October 23, 2018 (File #2)
 - a) Motion to approve (K. Games/M. Chambers); **Vote 7-0-1**
- 3) Administrative Reports:
 - a) President D. Curtis
 - i) No report (absent).
 - b) Provost M. Licari
 - i) University officials will confer with city officials at 4pm today to talk about solutions going forward regarding Homecoming, specifically “the walk” and Tent City. As something that straddles responsibilities between the city and the university, it will take a partnership between the two. We will see how it goes, and I can provide an update in the future.
 - ii) As you know, the Associate VP Inclusive Excellence has an interim in the position. I have been prepping for the search to replace Leah Reynolds and have been meeting with the interested groups. I met with the Pacific Islander and Black Faculty & Staff, and I am meeting with others this week. I am getting good feedback. I have taken many notes, about 9 pages in just two meetings. It is all good information. I think the search will be better going forward for it.

iii) There were questions regarding the approach to faculty salaries. The existing model is in effect which might delay salary letters, but not affect the salaries, as they will be adjusted per normal policy. I wanted to make sure that was understood by everybody.

4) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) I have a couple of short announcements today before we move to our single action item and other business:

Following the discussion at Senate, it is certainly apparent that it is in everyone's interest for departments and colleges to be comfortable with the expectations we have laid down for them regarding merit pay. The FAC letter has now been distributed across the university. The provost has agreed to prepare a similar statement on behalf of Academic Affairs. Many questions at Senate addressed issues that only the provost can answer. Hopefully, an administrative equivalent to the FAC memo will help keep departments moving forward. It would be unfair of me to dismiss out of hand some of the concerns about the new merit-pay model that have been raised. At the same time, I can confirm, based on where I have sat during the past four years and more, that the majority of the complaints about the BR process in the past had to do with the EE category. These were often complaints about "arbitrary" decisions, exclusions, or limitations imposed from above. Whether it proves to be an effective solution or not, the decision by Senate last year to remove the EE category from the BR and empower departments to make decisions about merit pay at the local level was designed to address exactly these complaints. Should the new model fail to satisfy, next year's Senate can tackle the issue again.

The officers and the provost talked yesterday about long simmering concerns raised by chairs about the process of hiring adjunct faculty, a process that effectively requires them to be rehired every semester. The provost has agreed to make the necessary changes at the administrative level to simplify the process. On our side, we will also have to make an adjustment to the Handbook language regarding adjunct evaluations. We will ask FAC to consider language that keeps the process within departments.

- b) Our guests today will present the proposal for a BS in Sport Management. We will then go to reports and end with an Executive Session. The discussion of the salary model will be put off until next session.

5) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) M. Chamber: I heard that there has been some hullabaloo over an ISU social media posting through Communications and Marketing. A vet (and alum) reported seeing a Hamas flag in a picture of ISU Saudi students, and was unhappy about this. It appears that the photo was doctored by someone, because the student who posted the original photo has said only Saudi flags were in the picture. Chris McGrew told me about this, and said the student who posted the original photo has sought help from Public Safety. SGA and Student Affairs are apparently working with the student.
- i) M. Licari: I have not heard of this, but if it were credible, it would be everywhere.

- b) K. Games: Last year, the FCTE with the Writing Center and University College, hosted a writing certification program for faculty. You had to attend certain mornings and implement changes in the fall, and then turn in a report. Part of completion was a one-time pay stipend as an incentive, but it appears that it is not upon completion. There appears to be a delay in the one-time pay. Can you tell me why there would be a delay with a one-time pay?
- i) M. Licari: I have no idea what you are talking about, so I want to make sure this question gets to the right person.
 - ii) K. Games: I have emails and Dean Maule is mentioned.
 - iii) M. Licari: I would reach out to the FCTE Director.
- c) K. Games: We have heard rumors about moving Athletic Training services to the Athletics Department. Are those rumors, or plans?
- i) M. Licari: No, we are not doing that.
- d) C. Ball: What is the status of the merit pay document? Was it sent to deans with a note from the Provost?
- i) M. Licari: They have not heard from me yet, but there were good discussions at senate and what was said went out to the deans. I can write a formal letter. Tim and I have talked about it.
- e) B. Guell: The newly announced Multifactor Authentication for Office 365, I understand it is needed, but can we have assurance that it will be minimally intrusive.
- i) M. Licari: Yes. It only took 15 minutes to get it all set up.
 - ii) B. Guell: Once you do it on your device, are you good?
 - iii) M. Licari: Yes.
 - iv) B. Guell: I heard it will involve a separate email password that is distinct from the portal password.
 - v) M. Licari: No. Not exactly, you can choose how to get the second identification. There is an app or it can be texted to you. It is up to you about how you want it to come. First, I did texts, and then I used the app to set up my iPad. It was easy.
 - vi) L. Brown: Do you have to verify every 24 hours?
 - vii) M. Licari: No, but tonight I am going to try fully powering down and making sure it still works.
 - viii) T. Hawkins: Is testing happening now?
 - ix) M. Licari: Yes, they did the entire ORR office last week.
 - x) T. Hawkins: Will those of us without a cell phone remain uncompromised?
 - xi) M. Licari: Yes, there is another way of doing it if you do not use a cell phone. After further discussions with OIT, this system will only need to be used once on personal devices such as laptops, cellphones, and tablets when using Office 365 Apps, such as Outlook. The separate email password that was mentioned is only necessary if you use the basic email app on your cell phone or tablet and sync it with Outlook. In that case, you can continue to use that app and the new separate

password, or switch to the Outlook app which may be easier. If you do not have a cell phone or tablet in which to receive the authentication code you can get a call on your office phone. More details will be coming out, and if you have any questions you can contact the helpdesk or your OIT area representative when this rolls out and he/she can assist you.

- f) M. Cohen: I attended the online exam proctoring training, and it was very encouraging. I really encourage all faculty to take a look at that. Everything I saw was very good.
 - i) M. Licari: Good, it is actually a requirement that we provide a way that students at a distance are the students we think they are. I will pass the comment along. Thank you.
 - g) B. Guell: The salary model thing was resolved, so I do not have to bring it up later, but I think it would be useful at a future informal for me to talk to you about how close we came to a salary disaster. It is very hard to undo. I think people around this table need to know not only what it is and does, but also how expensive it is for the university to continue to do it this way. The administration may want to go in a different direction and the more people who know what this model is the better. We need to do it before the end of the year.
 - i) T. Hawkins: The advantage of doing it today is it would have been on the record.
 - ii) B. Guell: I can do it at a formal meeting with a light agenda.
- 6) CAAC Item: Winnie Ko, Chad Witkemper (see curriculog)
- a) B.S. in Sport Management
 - i) Motion to approve (L. Brown/M. Chambers); **Vote 9-0-0**
 - ii) C. Witkemper: This idea started more than 8 years ago, before I even arrived. We were told by the HLC to limit the number of majors, but Susan Powers said that is no longer the case. This will create a standalone Sport Management major. It will be using the same CIP code, so that already exists. The idea came from the rise in popularity of the program here and nationwide. Nationwide offerings are growing and we wanted to present ourselves at a higher standard so we can compete in Indiana and be a powerful Sports Management program. This proposal started three years ago, so it has been a long process, but we are excited for it to be here. The numbers, in our opinions support the separation. The graduate program is already a MS of Sport Management, and we would like an undergrad program to reflect that. In addition, for our student's, their resume no longer says "recreation," but "sport management" which is what most of their classes were in anyway.
 - (1) W. Ko: Now each can have their own majors, separate from the existing program.
 - (2) C. Witkemper: Nothing is changing; we are just separating recreation and sport management into two programs.
 - (3) B. Guell: Will we get BS Recreation here soon?
 - (4) C. Witkemper: No, we just stripped out the sport management part so it is just a program change.

- (5) B. Guell: Okay and a change to an existing program is done at the CAAC level.
- 7) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:
- a) AAC
 - i) M. Cohen: The data for the staffing report is coming, the chair is asking for it. The next meeting is Nov 9. My department has called a mandatory department meeting at the same time, what is the protocol? Do I need a sub?
 - (1) T. Hawkins: No, just ask the chair for a summary. You can also send them anything you wanted to report.
 - b) AEC
 - i) R. Peters: No report.
 - c) CAAC
 - i) L. Brown: I was absent from last week's meeting because I was out of town, this week they met and there was one proposal which was approved. It is taking the degree "Health Sciences" and renaming it "Public Health." They are also requesting a change in degree from BS to BPH, Bachelor's in Public Health.
 - d) FAC
 - i) B. Guell: FAC met to discuss three of its charges to get background on them, specifically the request to provide specifics on the Deficient Performance section of the Handbook. Nobody was sure what the concern was, if it was dates and timing. John Pommier is a chair and is someone who might have a need to use such a section, but has never used it. Since he has never seen it, he volunteered to read it and report to us if it is sufficiently clear enough that a novice could read it and follow its steps.
 - (1) L. Brown: I think it was relating to the language that chairs must provide personnel committees with information regarding faculty discipline.
 - (2) B. Guell: There are multiple elements. There could be a circumstance where a department chair needs a letter to be in a personnel file and how it gets there. What are the requirements that it be a personnel file document? Chairs cannot claim letters to themselves to have any P&T weight. FAC is looking at circumstances for clarity in those sections.
 - (3) L. Brown: The question is, does a chair have to share with the personnel committee?
 - (4) B. Guell: When I helped write it I intended it to mean: a department chair gets an allegation, goes informally to attempt an informal resolution, then if then the problem reappears you have to go to the personnel committee for the purposes for writing the letter. When the letter has to be written there is a personnel committee role. Before that, you do not have to bring them in. You have an option, you are not compelled to go there first.
 - (5) R. Peters: It says "May be provided..."

- (6) B. Guell: "May" is needed for the personnel committee to be weight so it is not X versus Y. The faculty member can miss embarrassment if it is resolved at the informal stage.
- (7) L. Brown: The chair can provide evidence.
- (8) R. Peters: That is the next section, if it was not fixed evidence can be provided.
- (9) B. Guell: So it goes informal, written, then personnel.
- (10) L. Brown: Should the faculty member being disciplined have the option to have the information not go to the personnel committee?
- (11) B. Guell: They have the option to quit. The policy allows faculty members to waive their rights to have evidence examined. Letters goes straight into personnel file. Should we consider this at FAC?
- (12) L. Brown: Yes.
- ii) FAC also drafted a constitutional amendment for officer succession. If the chair leaves then the vice chair would take his/her place and the senate would hold an election. If an EC member wins it, we would fill that vacancy the way we previously recommended. We would do the same for secretary. That is the current drafting for succession.
- (1) M. Cohen: Why would the vice chair be elected and not promoted from who ran previously?
- (2) B. Guell: Officers are of the entire senate and not just EC. There are other ways of doing it, but this is what the current draft is.
- (3) L. Brown: Officer elections are done on the fly and there would be no record of who lost officer elections.
- (4) B. Guell: Or in some cases, like last year, there was a coin flip and there is no record of that.
- (5) L. Brown: In some cases, like when I was elected as vice chair, there was no one running against me. We would have to open it up anyway.
- (6) T. Hawkins: We can debate language further when it comes up.
- e) FEBC
- i) K. Games: Met last week. They are taking on parking for the TFA again, but in a different way. Currently, TFA are not eligible for payroll deductions. That is the approach this year. FEBC will also be following up with Katie Butwin for some of the data regarding pay inequities that we have discussed here before. They are also following up with Diann McKee regarding reporting of salary info from FEBC.
- f) GC
- i) C. Ball: Met on Oct 17, and approved cleanup language in the graduate catalog regarding dissertation committee membership. They also approved two program revisions: MS Genetic Counseling and Master's in Public Health.
- g) SAC

- i) M. Chambers: I organized a meeting with the three officers of the committee and we sat down to talk about what needs to be happening. They have put out a request to schedule additional meetings and people are responding to that. SAC will be meeting next Wed, then Nov 28, and Dec 5. We now have SAC representation on all SEM related committees. Everything is moving ahead and the chair is more comfortable.
 - h) URC
 - i) S. Phillips: The committee ranked eight proposals and the top three were funded. I am not sure what the amount is, but they are reserving half of the money for next year.
- 8) Executive Session
- a) Motion to move into Executive Session (M. Chambers; S. Phillips); Vote 8-0-0
 - b) Motion to move out of Executive Session (M. Chambers; R. Peters); Vote 8-0-0
- 9) Adjournment at 5:11 pm.