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Members Present: Y. Bai, L. Brown, B. Bunnett, M. Chambers, M. Cohen, D. Cooper-Bolinskey, K. Games, J. Gustafson, T. Hawkins, M. Hutchins, D. Israel, B. Kilp, J. Kinne, A. Kummerow, X. Li, J. Liu, N. Nichols-Pethick, J. O’Keefe, A. Payne, L. Phillips, J. Potts, B. Roberts-Pittman, A. Solesky, S. Stofferahn, J. Weust, M. Williamson, E. Wittenmeyer, K. Yousif.

Members Absent: S. Buchanan, E. Gallatin, L. Henson, M. Howard-Hamilton, S. Kopaczewski, F. Stewart

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley

Guests: C. Chao, G. Bierly, W. Banks, S. Powers, J. Powers

1. Memorial Resolutions
   1. D. Israel:

John L. McEntaffer passed away peacefully in Cape Coral, Florida on October 30, 2017. He was a member of the Economics Department of Indiana State University from 1966 until his retirement in 1991.

John earned a BS at Iowa State University in 1961, an MA from Boston College in 1963, and a PhD, also from Boston College in 1965. John came to ISU as an Assistant Professor in 1966 and was granted tenure in 1969. He was promoted to Full Professor in 1987.

Dr. McEntaffer taught microeconomic theory and was an early practitioner in what later became known as Forensic Economics. He served as a consultant and expert witness for almost all of the attorneys in the Wabash Valley over the years.

He was a skilled craftsman and was active with the group who made Pioneer Days at Fowler Park successful. He also enjoyed mechanics, building his own sports car from a kit.

Professor McEntaffer is survived by his wife of 57 years, Vicki and his daughters, Bente Brauer and Kari Hiatt.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to his family its sincere sympathy and condolence, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication that he gave to his students, the faculty, and the university.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Bradley
      1. None (absent)
   2. Provost M. Licari
      1. The Library held it sesquicentennial event last Thursday, “A Way with Words.” It was very successful. Thanks to them and the Department of English for their collaboration.
      2. PT workshops were well attended and provided good guidance. We held one last week and another yesterday. Department level changes need to be finished by the end of February so FAC can look at them by the end of the spring semester.
      3. The Power of Reading and Math summits are next week. We are glad it has been expanded to include Math. It is great to be able to work with K-12 students, especially local kids.
      4. Pearson was here on Monday. The president and I, and Ken [Brauchle], wrapped up late Monday. We decided to pull the plug. Pearson will be writing a report for Deborah [Curtis] summarizing what took place earlier in the summer and fall. We are not moving forward at this time.
2. Support Staff Report: E. Phillips
   1. None
3. SGA Report: T. Smith
   1. None
4. Temporary Faculty Advocate: T. Tesmer
   1. [Read the following statement]. It is virtually inarguable that temporary faculty contribute significantly to the teaching force at Indiana State University. What is more, there remains a considerable discrepancy between full time faculty and temporary faculty remuneration. Still, temporary faculty are required to pay the same dollar amount for parking that full time faculty pay which means that, comparatively, temporary faculty assume a much larger financial burden to park on campus than their full time counterparts do. Therefore, the temporary faculty asks the Faculty Senate to consider waving the parking fees for all temporary faculty at Indiana State University commencing with the 2018-19 academic year. I am well aware that I am not the first TFA to bring this up. Since it continues to emerge as an issue for temporary faculty and has never been resolved I felt as though it was my responsibility to bring it up again. I am new and I am not sure what has been discussed in the past, but I am happy to present this.
      1. T. Hawkins: I am very happy to have a line item to discuss this and then endorse, but the Senate cannot make those changes itself.
      2. M. Licari: If you would like to discuss parking rates, you can talk with Diann McKee.
      3. T. Tesmer: Again, I was not sure where to begin, but this seems to be a recurring issue.
      4. J. Kinne: Last year, FEBC recommended something similar, the issue went to the Executive Council and then to the parking committee. I am not sure what happened with it. We did look at the cost and it seemed like it [parking rates for full-time faculty and staff] would not be affected much.
      5. M. Chambers: Can the Senate pass a resolution to endorse the request?
      6. L. Brown: Yes, we can do that.
5. Chair Report: L. Brown
   1. A vote went out for the constitutional-level changes affecting sections 245.3.3.5 and 245.3.3.6 of the Handbook. The changes passed. Out of 511 eligible voters, 285 voted, (over the 40% needed) and 270 voted yes. The changes will now go to the BofT for its approval in December.
   2. Thank you to the faculty who attended the Pearson meeting on Monday. People asked good questions and faculty governance was well represented. Thank you to the four committees that have been working on this. I am happy to hear that it has been put on hold.
   3. As everyone knows, we have a new president, Deborah Curtis. I know transitions can cause some anxiety. I am pleased to say that she plans on attending Senate and Executive Committee meetings, both informal and formal, in the spring. Hopefully this will give us a chance to get to know her and show her how shared governance works at ISU.
6. Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes of October 26, 2017
   1. Motion to approve (J. Gustafson/ K. Games); Vote: 26-0-2.
7. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. L. O’Laughlin: I am here representing Graduate Council. We would like to read our response to one of our charges, which was to look at changes that occurred over the summer affecting the College of Graduate and Professional Studies’ graduate check out procedure.

[Read the following statement] During our meeting on 9/29/17, Graduate Council discussed the June 29, 2017 e-mail from the Registrar regarding the reassignment of tasks previously allocated to the College of Graduate and Professional Studies to the Office of Registration and Records and/or the Home Colleges. In addition Provost Michael Licari met with Graduate Council during our meeting on 10/13/17 to discuss these proposed changes. Although the discussion with Provost Licari was very helpful, members of GC continue to have some ongoing concerns in regard to the manner in which the changes were made as well as the lack of input from faculty governance in regard to the changes. Thus we would like to take this opportunity to provide our input to our colleagues as part of the process of shared governance.

The overarching concern that Graduate Council would like to express is that an e-mail sent from an administrative office (Office of Registration and Records) should not trump or supersede policy and procedure established through the process of shared governance. Graduate Council has found that the June 29th e-mail from ORR does both of these things, even if the original intent was not to do so. Graduate Council also holds that, given current policy, most of the changes proposed in the June 29th e-mail from the Registrar should not be implemented; many of the reassigned duties should remain with the College of Graduate and Professional Studies.

Graduate Council would like to provide some recommendations about each of the bullet points included in the June 29, 2017 email (please see attached copy of the e-mail for reference). The overarching intent of our recommendations is to avoid adding another layer of review to the procedures/processes as the changes outlined in the email appear to do (e.g., ORR or Associate Deans are added to the list of individuals/offices making decisions or processing forms).

Graduate Council Recommendations on proposed changes outlined in 6/29/17 email from ORR:

1. Under the section titled “Academic Colleges will Acquire Graduate Authorization of the Following Areas” Graduate Council recommends:

* Home Colleges be granted change of grade approval authority. This change does not contradict current policies and makes sense given change of grade processes used at ISU.
* Home Colleges not be granted Scheduling Authorization and Overrides. Current policy is that CGPS is responsible for scheduling authorization and overrides and adding Home College review would include a step that is not necessary.
* Graduate Council is unsure what “assist with graduation-related issues” means in the context of the June 29 e-mail. Graduate Council recommends that CGPS be charged with “Graduation-related Issues” consistent with current policy.
* Graduate Council recommends that graduation exceptions in MySam not be granted to Home Colleges. Rather, we recommend that graduation exceptions continue to be handled by CGPS as described in current policy (see Graduate Catalog).

1. Under the section titled “The Office of Registration and Records will Acquire the Following Responsibilities” Graduate Council recommends:

* Regarding “Graduate Reporting,” Graduate Council is unsure of the intent of this change, but has no concern with the Office of Registration and Records coding data.
* Graduate Council recommends that Graduate Checkout Review not be moved to the Office of Registration and Records. We recommend that Graduation Checkout Review remain with the College of Graduate and Professional Studies, as exists in current procedure and practice.
* Graduate Council strongly recommends that transfer responsibilities not be moved to Office of Registration and Records but rather remain with the College of Graduate and Professional Studies as described in current policy. To the degree that transfer paperwork and coding our databases require the Office of Registration and Records involvement, Graduate Council recommends ORR involvement in that capacity.
* Graduate Council clearly recognizes the need for the Office of Registration and Records to be involved in Degree Auditing.
* Graduate Council recommends that the Office of Registration and Records assist with Graduate Student Commencement, as suggested in the June 29 e-mail.

In closing, Graduate Council would suggest that future changes to policies and significant changes to procedures in the domain of graduate education must adhere to the robust process of Shared Governance at Indiana State University. The June 29, 2017 e-mail referred to in this memorandum countermanded established policy, and created confusion as well as perhaps delays in processing paperwork. Confusion and delays have a negative impact on graduate programs and graduate students. It is Graduate Council’s hope that our recommendations can help the Senate and our Administrative partners adjust policy to the advantage of Graduate Education at Indiana State University. Lastly, Graduate Council strongly recommends that ISU maintains a robust College of Graduate and Professional Studies lead by a Graduate Dean who advocates and implements the University’s mission of quality teaching and creation of knowledge.

* + 1. D. Israel: So is this a memo that was widely distributed? It is a bit difficult to follow. Where did the memo go?
       1. L. Brown: It was sent to the departments and read at EC. I can send out the memo through email if need be.
    2. K. Yousif: Have you had a response?
       1. M. Licari: We have had a lot of conversation.
       2. L. O’Laughlin: Yes, but we wanted it to be read into the minutes especially given the change in the presidency.
    3. B. Kilp: What was the outcome?
       1. L. O’Laughlin: There was agreement with what was stated in the memo.
    4. J. Kinne: Has anything changed since the summer?
       1. M. Licari: Yes, the summer email that came out of ORR is moot. GC, Susan [Powers] and I have had many discussions. Workflow at the college-level would change. There are two sentiments I agreement with: I am not interested in doing anything that would result in changes to CGPS policies and I am not interested in dissolving the graduate college. There might be some further discussion with GC about how things will work but I have no philosophical disagreement with what was stated in the memo.
  1. M. Chambers: The Tribune-Star ran an article about Anthem on Sunday. Apparently, to discourage people from using the ER for non-emergencies, it is going to refuse some claims. According to the report, a woman experiencing abdominal pain was instructed by a medical professional to go to the ER, Anthem refused to cover the expenses even though she was diagnosed with a ruptured ovarian cyst. She was left with a four thousand dollar bill. The articles states that Anthem “said it *may* cover a patient who arrives with chest pains that turn out to be indigestion instead of a heart attack.” I think the ER is obviously a good place to go if you have severe pain. I am wondering if Anthem is going to adopt these restrictive measures in Indiana, perhaps we should reconsider it.
     1. L. Brown: We can invite Candy [Barton] to come and talk about it.
     2. A. Solesky: I went to the open insurance meeting on Monday and discussed it with Candy. She is aware of it and there is an appeals process. The policy is mostly to stop people from going to the ER for colds. She might be putting something out about it.
     3. C. Olsen: If I am correct we are self-insured so Anthem is just processing the claims and not paying them.
     4. M. Chambers: Yes, but we may still be affected.
     5. L. Brown: We will ask Candy.
  2. J. O’Keefe: I am concerned about my graduate students. They will not be paid during Thanksgiving break so they miss a week of pay and we are not able to ask them for help grading during that time.
     1. L. Maurer: That might be true. I know that we do not pay them over Winter break. We need to talk to Chip Rogers. I know over some breaks that a few departments hire their graduate students as regular student employees. We cannot do much about it, maybe we can put it in their offer letter.
     2. K. Games: In my department our clinical GA’s are not expected to work during Thanksgiving break and everyone is aware of that.
     3. J. Gustafson: Is there a system to pay graduate assistants every two weeks?
        1. L. Maurer: They do get biweekly pay checks.
        2. J. Gustafson: Can we spread their pay over 12 months like we do with ten month faculty?
        3. M. Licari: No, not for hourly pay.
        4. L. Maurer: They have to be here and swipe into Kronos to get paid.
        5. M. Licari: The regulations have to do with the 20-hour rule and the Affordable Care Act.
  3. D. Israel: Can we get an update on tenure track searches? Are there any coming before Thanksgiving?
     1. M. Licari: Many have been approved, some are pending.
     2. B. Kilp: Are you waiting to announce them all at once?
     3. M. Licari: No, some are already happening.
     4. K. Yousif: I guess it is that lack of transparency that concerns us. For example, when we look at curriculum proposals, we have to consider what searches that will be approved.
     5. J. Kinne: Can we get an update periodically?
     6. M. Licari: Yes, we can ask the deans to do that as well. It is no secret, you can login and look at the open job searches. I cannot say anything about the positions that have not yet been approved.
     7. K. Yousif: For example, I cannot call the College of Technology and say “Did you get the three lines you needed to deliver your proposed program?” There is no way to follow up on how the curriculum changes that were approved are moving forward.
     8. L. Phillips: Is there anything we can do as officers? If we are approving curriculum can we somehow report on related searches and bring that to the discussion?
     9. L. Brown: Are we talking about previously approved items?
     10. J. Kinne: Maybe a report from Academic Affairs on the searches that are going on and what is happening with requests.
     11. A. Payne: As someone who got a program approved, but have no faculty for it yet, I am interested in the flip side. The program was approved but the search was denied somewhere along the line.
     12. B. Kilp: If it was approved by the BoT, that is as high as you can go.
     13. A. Payne: I would like to know how everything is going.
     14. T. Hawkins: If it gets to that point that we are approving programs without faculty we can simply stop approving programs.
     15. M. Licari: This goes along with the point that I have been making. We are in need of a long-term plan. If we grow like we want to, then we need a road map not only of how we are going to get there but what we are going to do once we are. A better plan would go a long way in helping everyone understand how their program fits and help the administration be more transparent about how resources are deployed. I remain committed to that strategy. I can put this on Deborah’s radar. That would help the Senate make decisions about curriculum development.

1. CAAC Items: C. Chao, G. Bierly, K. Ward
   1. Approval of Entrepreneurship Minor; Vote: 27-0-1.
      1. Motion to approve (M. Hutchins/J. Kinne)
   2. Approval of Human Capital Management Minor; Vote: 27-0-1.
      1. Motion to approve (A. Payne/J. Kinne)
      2. C. Chao: These are both part of the management minor revisions. All management majors must complete a minor. The Entrepreneurship Minor will focus on launching a new venture, business ideas, market research, and business plans. The Human Capital Management Minor considers internal and external organizational concerns such as labor and strategic investments in human capital. Over the years the program has been asked to offer these two concentrations. We did a survey of all business freshman and found out that 80% would likely or very likely consider these two minors. In addition, they align very well with the expertise of our existing management faculty.
      3. K. Yousif: I see that management 444 has three to four prerequisites which is a little concerning. Are they part of the management core?
      4. C. Chao: Yes, and this can be a bit confusing to those not in the department. They have to take 210 then 444, 371 is taken by all business majors. Essentially there are two required courses before they can take 444.
      5. K. Yousif: So they are already in their core?
      6. S. Powers: They are not electives.
      7. C. Chao: Credit requirement for non-majors it is 21 credits, for business majors it is 15 credit hours.
      8. S. Powers: A lot of the non-majors that might pick this up already have those classes embedded so they would not have to do the full 21 credits.
      9. K. Yousif: The second concern is relying on 351. It is only offered once a year, one section. Is that going to meet the demand?
      10. C. Chao: Students have a long list of possible electives so they will not be solely relying on this class.
      11. D. Israel: I thought I had heard talk of an interdisciplinary entrepreneurship program. Do you see this as something that can work across disciplinary lines?
      12. C. Chao: Yes, we hate to add additional prerequisites for this reason. We added some basic business classes for anyone who is not in the department, they will need some basics. The department chair is working on reaching out to other departments.
      13. Y. Bai: Is there an increase in the need for computational accounting and business analytics? Should we create new classes?
      14. C. Chao: No. We have many faculty who have areas of specialization in these or similar topics. Students could get more robust training in analytics through a seminar or special topics class.
      15. E. Wittenmeyer: I do not understand. Would it not be a burden for an engineering student to take these prerequisites?
      16. C. Chao: It is really up to the specific student to pick up the minor, but it is not required of them.
      17. J. Kinne: Do you list it as 21 credits, do they not have to take them all?
      18. C. Chao: Yes.
   3. Honors College Proposal
      1. Motion to approve (J. Gustafson/T. Hawkins); Vote: 25-0-3.
      2. G. Bierly: This proposal is to transition the current Honors Program to an Honors College. The first part of the proposal explains why, the second what it will entail. First, it would offer significant advantages for both our honors students and the university as a whole. The National Council for Honors Colleges (NCHC) identifies benchmarks for well-developed honors colleges. A college is recognized as being large in scale with many offerings. The current program meets all the honors college requirements set by the NCHC. I was at the national meeting last week and came back more convinced now than ever. Our growth alone is reason enough to move to an Honors College as the number of students has tripled in the last decade. Prospective high achieving students will recognize that a college is a better investment than a program. Student success is always important, of course, and moving to a college will enable us to engage with more students and will help us with retention and graduation rates. It will also raise our profile internally. This proposal also requests two new staff positions and an upgrade of another. Assistant Director to Director, adding an Assistant Director to do programming, and adding a Coordinator or Faculty Fellow to review theses, help students with research and professional development, and apply for external scholarships. An Honors College would require us to develop a formal faculty governance structure. A small council from the general honors core faculty would handle curriculum. Finally, we propose maintaining our current relationship with Residential Life with an entire hall and parts of two others as living-learning communities. I have talked with Dean Maule about assigning a few University College advisors to honors students, but they would still report to the University College.
         1. B. Bunnett: Can you describe the coordinator and faculty fellow positions?
         2. G. Bierly: The problem with a faculty fellow is that faculty might find it a hindrance on their scholarship. Currently the culmination of honors curriculum is a thesis. It is usually completed during the student’s senior year, with about 100 students per semester and growing. They are strongly encouraged to have faculty mentor but I currently serve as their advisor. That’s a large load to deal with. Having someone who could communicate with them, meet with them in groups more than I can do now would be very helpful. The person could help the students apply for Fulbrights, outside scholarships.
         3. B. Bunnett: Would a fellow do this for a semester? A year?
         4. G. Bierly: Whatever would be agreeable with Academic Affairs. It would come with a stipend and release time.
         5. B. Bunnett: So it would not be indefinite? You would recruit every year?
         6. M. Licari: No, not for just a year. They would just get comfortable once they are about to leave. It would be two to three or four years at a time, I would imagine. Consistency is key. Having a faculty fellow is useful, but part of the challenge is that it would become most of their work.
         7. G. Bierly: It is tricky to find a faculty member for one semester and even harder to find someone to do it for years.
         8. B. Bunnett: Would the teaching load would be lessened for the faculty fellow?
         9. M. Licari: Yes, we have done that. It is a standard model.
         10. B. Bunnett: If it were to be a significant part of their work it would keep them from contributing to their home department. It is benefiting the honors college, but it would be hurting the home department.
         11. G. Bierly: That is exactly why I pitched it as a staff position. I agree that faculty should be involved because the position involves guiding research but I have had mixed results with this in the past. It all comes down to the connection that the student makes to the mentor.
         12. D. Israel: AAC considered borrowing an issue but endorsed the move to an Honors College to give it a higher profile. But there is still a real concern for the lack of faculty. To be start something new without being sure we have faculty is hard. We already have staffing issues in many departments. Is this the model that others use? If we had a system to have faculty from various departments mentor students, would that work better?
         13. G. Bierly: We are trying to be respectful of faculty time everywhere and the inability or ability of students to connect with mentors. Not all colleges have a thesis requirement and we are pushing the envelope with that. I am sure there may be other models for distributing mentorship that we have not considered. My tendency is to push them towards that but not mandate it.
         14. J. Gustafson: The underlying concern is that there would be a staff member advising theses. That seems inappropriate. It would help if we had a coordinator who was not connected with the research requirement then spread the research advising out to the faculty, make the work count toward PT requirements.
         15. G. Bierly: The level of the two positons should probably have been flipped. The coordinator should probably have been the higher of the two.
         16. J. Kinne: If you had $50,000 for the faculty fellow position, would that money go to their department for release?
         17. K. Yousif: Is there any reason why you are not asking for faculty? You have documented the growth, the burden associated with departments having to lend you people, and the heavy thesis load. We should up the proposal. Why can’t you have a faculty hire for Honors?
         18. G. Bierly: My sense was that it was a nonstarter in the environment in which the proposal was developed. I am going to continue to press that.
         19. K. Yousif: We approve curriculum at all levels and we either approve it without the legs or we say we are going to give the legs and then we do not. As a Senator I am frustrated.
         20. M. Licari: We need to take this issue, the exchange of faculty resources for money, up in the spring. I obviously like the grander vision. We need to take incremental steps.
         21. T. Hawkins: We may have to sometimes use our leverage in response to hypothetical programs. We have to decide where the tipping point is. There is symbolic value in the proposal. This step allows us to ask for faculty in the future. This is all less wishful thinking if we have the college than the program.
         22. A. Payne: So the current director’s position will change to dean. There will be, then, a new director and an assistant director?
         23. G. Bierly: Director to Dean is a title change. There will be an upgrade from Assistant Director to Director (the position which is currently held by Laura Froelicher) and, in addition, I am asking for two more positions.
         24. A. Payne: Why are these positions deviating from the Associate Dean model?
         25. G. Bierly: No reason, it might just be my wording in the proposal.
         26. M. Licari: It is not so much a deviation but an acceptable or appropriate structure, a bit of a semantics. The Honors College structure would be similar to that of the University College.
         27. M. Chambers: Hearing that you have doubled the number of graduates in four years, and I know these are not necessarily new students coming in, if we make it an Honors college the numbers would grow. We would need faculty and revenue would be coming in.
         28. G. Bierly: Yes, but currently they are your students in the academic colleges. We have most likely ridden the enrollment wave the university has experienced. The growth will require a more aggressive borrowing model.
         29. M. Licari: The larger vision is to use the strength and growth of the college as the basis for requesting resources.
         30. A. Kummerow: I would just like to say that we spend a lot of resources on remediation, it is refreshing to see resources spent on the other end of the spectrum.
         31. Y. Bai: Are the majors STEM or other?
         32. G. Bierly: In our entering classes in the last few years the top majors are: Nursing, Pre-med, Elementary Education, Business Administration, Psychology, and Athletic Training.
         33. J. Kinne: Total represented is dozens, yes?
         34. M. Licari: At least.
         35. E. Wittenmeyer: My concern is, again, the lack of faculty. Our department is down faculty, I see no reason why it will go up. This model will tax faculty if departments are not compensated for release time. I enjoy helping the students, my grandson is an Honors student here, but there is a certain amount of time you have to give them. They are doing good research and they need a good mentor. Hard to tell departments that we have the growth, but not the faculty.
         36. L. Brown: The work is already there. Students are already being mentored, taking classes, and doing conversions. The work will be there regardless of whether it is an Honors College or an Honors Program.
         37. M. Licari: Again, this is the same issue I talked about earlier. We need a road map to handle growth and its effect on faculty and staff. Our enrollment target is independent of the Honors College proposal.
         38. D. Israel: If we keep adding entities, then maybe when we add we should be thinking about what we can get rid of? This might be related to FEBC’s charge to look at remuneration for directing theses and dissertations and conducting independent studies. Maybe we can have a staff person do everything mentioned but not the research and thesis advising. It will be hard to pull faculty away.
         39. B. Bunnett: I am entirely supportive, but were you [J. Gustafson] proposing that there would be a staff positon and pull faculty to be fellows/mentors.
         40. J. Gustafson: Yes, we believe the person would need the proper credentials to direct theses, like teaching.
         41. G. Bierly: The coordinator would handle daily communication, find faculty mentors, and hold group meetings. We would not have disengaged faculty. The coordinator would facilitate conversations between students and faculty mentors. Whether coordinator or faculty fellow, the role would be the same.
         42. J. Kinne: Would it be helpful or harmful to mention the resource question?
         43. M. Licari: I am supportive.
         44. J. Gustafson: This is just procedural, but we did not see a report from CAAC. AAC reported and voted to endorse.
         45. A. Payne: CAAC did not write up a report, but voted to approve 6-0-2.
2. Adjournment at 5:09pm.