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Members Present: Y. Bai, L. Brown, B. Bunnett, S. Buchanan, M. Chambers, M. Cohen, E. Gallatin, K. Games, J. Gustafson, T. Hawkins, L. Henson, M. Hutchins, M. Jackson A. Kummerow, J. Kinne (on sabbatical), X. Li, N. Nichols-Pethick, J. O’Keefe, L. Phillips, J. Potts, B. Roberts-Pittman, A. Solesky, F. Stewart, S. Stofferahn, J. Weust, M. Williamson, E. Wittenmeyer, K. Yousif.

Members Absent: A. Czyzewski, M. Howard-Hamilton, D. Israel (on sabbatical), B. Kilp, S. Kopaczewski (on sabbatical), J. Liu (on sabbatical), M. McInerney, A. Payne

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Curtis, Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: Lindsey Eberman, Lisa Spence, Josh Powers, Katie Butwin, Nancy Rogers, Linda Sperry

1. Memorial Resolutions
	1. L. Brown: Mr. Darrell Franklin Swarens, 1945-2018

Mr. Darrell Franklin Swarens, 72 of Terre Haute, Indiana passed peacefully in his home on January 3rd, 2018.

Darrell was born on October 16, 1945 to Arthur & Mae (Jones) Swarens in the state of Montana. Before teaching here, Darrell attended Indiana State University as a graduate student, earning his Master’s degree in Elementary & Special Education. He worked as a Professor for Indiana State University for thirty-eight years starting here on September 1, 1969 and retiring on December 15, 2007.

In addition to his almost forty years spent teaching at Indiana State, as a young adult Darrell served in the Peace Corp. He was also involved with various organizations including the AIME, ISTA, and the ACLU. Lastly, Darrell had a great love for singing. He was involved with both the Terre Haute Choral Society and Indiana State Masterworks as well as local church choirs.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Mr. Swarens’s family its sincere sympathy and condolence, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication that Darrell Swarens 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. L. Henson: Mr. John H. Boyd, Jr., 1922-2017

The University Faculty Senate has received notice of the passing of Mr. John Harvey Boyd, Jr. He passed away on July 28, 2017, at the age of 94.

Boyd was a veteran of the Army Air Corps, in which he served from 1943 to 1946. Upon finishing his time in the military, John attended Indiana University-Bloomington. He obtained an undergraduate degree in 1950 and completed his Master’s degree in Journalism in 1955.

John’s career in journalism led him to various newspaper companies. He began his career with Acme Newspictures in 1947 following his military service. In 1953, John continued on to writing at the Pensacola News Journal until 1954. He later returned to Evansville, Indiana, where he had graduated high school, and began working for the Evansville Press in 1954.

John H. Boyd was an Associate Professor of Journalism and worked at ISU from September 1, 1971 until May 9, 1987. He retired with over fifteen years of service to Indiana State University. While here on campus, he was formally known around the department as John *H*. in order to avoid confusion with his mentor and peer Dr. John *A*. Boyd. John A. had hired John H. in 1971 to assume the leadership role as director of journalism at ISU, but the two men worked closely together to plan and implement significant changes in the university’s journalism program. They added a number of courses as they switched the program’s emphasis from the preparation of prospective high school teachers to the training of prospective professional journalists.

In addition to teaching at Indiana State, John had several lead journalism teaching positions, which included teaching at the University of Alabama, University of Evansville, Michigan State University, and University of Missouri.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Mr. Boyd’s family its sincere sympathy and condolence, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication that John Boyd 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. S. Stofferahn: Dr. James Robert Constantine, 1924-2017

Dr. James Robert (Bob) Constantine passed away on May 25, 2017 at his home in Austin, Texas. Born in Jeffersonville, Indiana on January 28, 1924, Constantine studied briefly at Butler and Syracuse Universities before serving in the Army Air Corps in England and southern France during World War II. Honorably discharged, he enrolled at Indiana University, where he completed his Bachelor’s, Master’s, and Doctoral degrees in rapid succession in 1949, 1950, and 1953. After teaching various American and European history classes for six years at Vincennes University and Indiana University-South Bend, Constantine joined the Indiana State Teachers’ College faculty in 1959. He was promoted to Associate Professor in 1962, by which time the institution had been refashioned as Indiana State College, and to Full Professor in 1965, as it became Indiana State University. Not just a witness to these important transformations, he dedicated himself to putting the institution on solid footing, serving as Chair of the Faculty Council in 1966-1967, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate in 1971-1972, and a founding member of the ISU Credit Union. Professor Constantine retired in December 1988 after twenty-nine and a half years of dedicated service to the Department of History and the University. Though preceded in death by his wife, Velva, in 2009, he is survived by two daughters, three grandsons, and three great grandchildren.

Having written his dissertation on the ideological underpinnings of eighteenth-century English abolitionism, Constantine, who considered himself a historian of ideas, embraced a wide-ranging scholarly agenda throughout his career. While early articles focused on the depiction of Africans in early modern English literature, as well as the impact that public libraries had on the cultural life of Hoosier pioneers, it was Constantine’s growing involvement with the Eugene V. Debs Foundation, starting with the successful effort to save the Debs house from demolition in 1962, that was to set the course for his most enduring work. As the Foundation’s Secretary (a post he held for twenty-one years), Constantine soon recognized that the labor leader’s papers were in dire need of proper archiving—a situation both enriched and exacerbated in 1967 with the bequest by Debs’ niece of thousands of additional letters to ISU’s Special Collections. Working closely with Library staff, Constantine secured a series of federal grants between 1979 and 1985 that allowed for several years of full-time editing. The results, which earned him wide renown among labor historians for his in-depth knowledge of Debs’ works, were, first, a twenty-one-reel microfilm edition of The Papers of Eugene V. Debs (1983), ultimately followed by the three-volume Letters of Eugene V. Debs, 1874-1926 (1990) featuring 1500 pieces of select correspondence (out of a corpus of over 10,000). A later compendium of 250 letters appeared as Gentle Rebel: Letters of Eugene V. Debs (1995). In recognition of this dedicated and demanding work, the Indiana Humanities Council presented Constantine with the Indiana Humanities Achievement Award for Scholarship in 1991. Reflecting on the occasion, Constantine remarked, “I think Debs’ life is a good lesson in the need to keep the door open to people with ideas. Even if we despise the ideas, they may turn out to have vitality. The Debs story is a case study in the futile attempt to suppress ideas that eventually take on a life of their own.”

As a teacher, Constantine is especially remembered for both high standards and great empathy for his students, always encouraging them to make discoveries on their own. One alumnus fondly recalls that “Dr. Constantine was sort of laid back yet palpably thoughtful and deliberate in his remarks. He never so much lectured in the traditional sense but, rather, took us on a walk through time and events, commenting as we ambled along on events, ideas, and personalities that shaped the intellectual and cultural heritage of the nation. In fact, his approach was one more of recollection, even musing, about what had occurred. He almost always sat at a table rather than stood behind a lectern and his ever-present cigar, whether lit or not, seemed almost a prop as he reflected on all that was within his purview. Soft-spoken and incredibly articulate, Dr. Constantine seemed made for his domain. We enjoyed—and respected—him tremendously.” Responding to students’ earnest calls for a more expansive and inclusive curriculum, he also joined with several colleagues to found the African and African American Studies program in 1972. In this, as with all of his endeavors, Constantine stayed true to his identify as an intellectual historian passionately dedicated to the “freeing power of ideas” that he so ardently admired.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to the Constantine family its sincere sympathy and condolence, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication that James Robert (Bob) Constantine 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.

*[Prepared and read by Steven Stofferahn, Department of History, College of Arts and Sciences, Indiana State University (March 22, 2018), with special thanks to the Debs Foundation and History alumni Patrick Rodkey (B.S. 2007), Jerry Liggett (M.S. 1968, B.S. 1966), and William Myer (M.S. 1972, B.S. 1970).]*

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Curtis
		1. After listening to the memorial resolutions, I am in awe of these examples of teachers-scholars-researchers here at ISU on whose shoulders we stand.
		2. I just came from spending the afternoon with Nancy Rogers at CANDLES. It was my first foray into the world of Eva Kor. What an amazing human being and treasure to have in this community. It has been an inspirational day.
		3. Last week we were in Washington DC. I attended the 14th annual Networks Financial Summit for insurers in risk management that ISU sponsors, it a phenomenal event. Dr. Linda Marrs-Morford was there representing the Indiana Principal Leadership Institute. We hope to grow its influence regionally and engage nationally.
		4. I met both of Indiana’s senators and its four representatives. I introduced myself and enjoyed hearing about ISU’s great reputation, which is national. I am honored to be in this position, especially at this time in ISU’s history. We need to continue to let our senators and representatives know about our mission.
		5. We also had an alumni event for the DC area, it was nicely attended. I am grateful for the opportunity to share what you do every day.
		6. We are getting ready for inauguration. The new documentary about Eva Kor and her message will be aired the week of inauguration here in Terre Haute. We need to celebrate her and our role here at ISU.
	2. Provost M. Licari
		1. I have two things much less inspirational that came to Exec via FEBC. First, was the request to pay faculty per head for dissertation and thesis supervision, for 699-799-899 credits. You can read the Exec minutes for more but I pushed back on this. Advising theses and dissertations is hard work but paying by the head is not the right solution. Much of the problem stems from the old staffing model, which undercounted graduate work. Moving forward with the new model, we will be able to better gauge our needs and appropriately staff those departments. We need to be smarter about how we manage enrollment, recruit, and staff so we can handle the students we are enrolling. My leadership team has been discussing this. I also worry about de-professionalizing the faculty by paying ala-cart or piece meal. We are professionals and we have a body of work for which we are responsible. Moving to being paid by the minute is not something I am going to be comfortable with.
		2. The second issue that came through FEBC was waiving parking fees for temporary faculty. Although this is not an Academic Affairs issue, I worked with VP Diann McKee and our Chief of Police Joe Newport and do not feel it is appropriate to move forward. There is a structure for refunds if someone works for half of the year and there are less expensive places to park, the remote lots for example. Our own SGA produced a study and video last year that demonstrated that we can by anywhere in 10 minutes or less, regardless of where we park.
		3. The search for a dean for the College of Technology is in the final stages. We had our first candidate on campus earlier this week, the second arrives here this evening and will be finishing up tomorrow. The remaining two are coming next week. The search should conclude quickly.
		4. The Vice Provost for Enrollment Management search is underway. We talked to our search consultant this morning, an ad has gone out. We will wrap up that search before the end of the semester.
		5. Lastly, I am chairing the faculty and staff giving campaign. It kicked off with a breakfast earlier in the week. The theme this year is three fold: increase participation, increase payroll deduction, and increase the number of first time donors. I speak to you as leaders of the institution. We all in leadership positions have a responsibility and obligation to demonstrate that we are committed to our ISU family. Please give and support our students.
2. Support Staff Report: E. Phillips
	1. No report.
3. SGA Report: T. Smith
	1. No report.
4. Temporary Faculty Advocate: T. Tesmer
	1. The one issue that I have represented for temporary faculty was parking, that was in response to temporary faculty who had contacted me after I was appoint as the TFA. The issue was remuneration, not availability. I appreciate Jeff Kinne taking the bull by the horns on this. Jeff, do you want to make a comment?
		1. J. Kinne: I have no comment.
		2. K. Yousif: I understand that the parking committee does not want to treat the varying levels of faculty differently, but I am wondering if we could be creative and find a solution. I spoke with Jeff [Kinne] about other possibilities, perhaps adding the parking fee into their salary without unfairly discriminating.
		3. M. Licari: Keri, your request for other creative solutions is fine. I was only in on part of the conversation, but if you want to continue to work with the parking committee I am sure they would be receptive.
		4. J. Kinne: I will be following up. When I attended its [parking committee] meeting for the first time, I presented and they said nothing. I asked about the financial implications [of waiving fees] and they said they were not considering doing so. I can go back and suggest other things. Has anyone here been on the parking committee before? [No]
		5. K. Yousif: We need a faculty representative on the parking committee, is it listed when we chose the committees we would like to serve on?
		6. L. Brown: No, there is a faculty rep, but the parking committee is not slated by the Senate.
		7. T. Hawkins: We will investigate.
5. Chair Report: L. Brown
	1. Reminder: Senate election nomination forms are due tomorrow, March 23rd at 4:30pm in Gillum Hall 103J. If you are not termed out consider running again. Encourage your colleagues.
	2. We are going to reorder the agenda a little. I would like the BR revision discussion moved to the end of the agenda to make sure we have enough time to talk about it without feeling rushed to get to the voting items. Is there unanimous consent for this shift? [Yes]
6. Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes of February 15, 2018
	1. **Motion to approve (J. O’Keefe/K. Games); Vote 28-0-2**
		1. J. Potts/F. Stewart/S. Buchanan: We were counted as present in the attendance section, but we were absent.
7. M. Brown: I caught it after they were sent out. Already fixed, thank you.
8. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. B. Bunnett: “I would like to describe an eye opening and depressing experience I had recently. On weekends for the last month or so I’ve been going door to door registering voters. This has taken me to some of the worst parts of town and I don’t mind telling you it’s a scene of abject bleakness - of blighted houses, squalor, and poverty. And many of the people living in those parts of town are leading a hand to mouth existence. They’ve told me that the slightest increase in their taxes means that they won’t have enough for food and health care.

I mention this because they need our help. The city and county need our help. And when I say they need our help I mean the help of the faculty at ISU.

We can make a difference. Let me give you a few examples of what some of the people in this room have done:

* Bridget and Lisa Phillips were instrumental in preventing the construction of a mega jail on the river next to the aquatic center. That jail at that location would have dealt a death blow to the community’s efforts to revitalize the Wabash.
* Liz, Andre, and Lisa Spence pressured the county government to conduct a full, independent assessment of the local criminal justice system. Their pressure stopped the county government from proceeding with its plan to build a mega jail that would have cost the community $120 million. That $120 million facility, a prominent jail expert has told me, would have been “cataclysmic” for the community.
* And I can’t leave off former senator Bob Guell who, with his fellow economist, Kevin Christ from Rose-Hulman, wrote an analysis of the taxes necessary to fund that jail and the adverse effect it would have on the city’s ability to modernize its high schools. That analysis was conclusive and it convinced many in our local government to rethink their priorities and to recognize that schools, not jails, are of greatest importance.
* Neither should we forget the work Nancy Rogers has done in leading the successful fight to get a voting center here on campus.

Those are just a few examples of what our colleagues have done. But I think we can do more. The members of our city and county government are sometimes well intentioned, sometimes motivated by their own self-interests, and sometimes nothing more than the tools of a cronyistic system. But one thing they all have in common is that they are amateurs. They’re realtors or business people or former trades men and women.

They too often lack the sort of skills that we, the faculty, have. Skills like critical thinking, research skills, the ability to gather and analyze large amounts of data, statistical skills, even project management skills

I’m very concerned about where the city is headed, and I’m similarly concerned about the effect its decline will have on ISU. We have a strong history of community engagement here at the university. I think we, the faculty, can do more. And that engagement has to take the form of greater involvement in local government.

I don’t just mean running for office. Rather, involvement like Bridget, our two Lisas, Liz, Nancy, Andre, and Bob have done -providing expert analyses, researching alternatives, reviewing the work done by our government officials, pressuring them to do the right thing.

The people living hand to mouth in those shacks need us. We, the faculty, can help them. And by helping them we can help raise up our city. And by doing that we can help to improve our university.”

* 1. M. Chambers: I know many departments are in the throes of dealing with scholarships. There are problems with the process. Things can be done to improve it. I have a colleague who was trying to review an application, the application included all sorts of personal data except the student’s name. I know some awards are based on unmet needs so that information is kept private, but if we do not know who they are then how do we know if they are even eligible? We have two majors in my department and the eligibility for some scholarships depends on their major, we need to know who they are. These are just some of the issues. Our administrative assistant could not print out the applicants’ names, so she had to record them all by hand. Beyond that the whole process these days, and it might have to do with the tax code, required us to provide alternates because if a student does not accept it or turn in a W-9 or write a thank you note they lose the award and it goes to the alternate. Students who are studying abroad might not be able to fill out the form in person in time to receive the award. In addition, not everyone knows to apply for them. Not all of the awards are showing up properly. We have an application process on the website and ‘The Branch’ has not included it. There needs to be better communication, perhaps a task force. My department is not the only experiencing these issues and not the only one that has questions.
		1. M. Cohen: I submitted a letter of recommendation for a student who had applied for a commuter scholarship, they never heard anything back. There is a communication issue.
		2. L. Brown: From my experience, it is a centralized process, we [Math Dept] have not dealt with these issues.
		3. M. Chambers: Due to the Foundation’s rules, our scholarships can pay out as little as $39. We used to be able to take some money from the department’s account and round it up to $100 or $150, but we cannot do that anymore. There should be a way to figure this out and make it smoother.
		4. M. Licari: I have been listening and taking notes. I can talk with Sarah Wurtz in Enrollment Management and have her walk me through step by step. Things happen, so let me see what I can sort out and bring back here.
		5. J. O’Keefe: I have worked on reviewing scholarship applications at the department and university level. Usually you can get a spreadsheet, but through ‘The Branch’ it is pretty clunky. Having to deal with data in that system is tedious.
	2. J. O’Keefe: I wanted to thank Morgan [Brown] for putting together the SAC survey regarding interim grading. There were 148 responses, we will be working with those.
	3. M. Jackson: I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank the administration for green lighting the safety and electrical systems upgrade project that will be happening in the New Theatre building this summer. We in the theater department are grateful for the opportunity to make our main teaching and performance space safer, while still acknowledging that future capital allocations will be necessary to upgrade the facilities in both the New Theatre and Dreiser Theatre. Because of the upcoming project, this summer 2018 season the Crossroads Repertory Theatre will be presented in the Dreiser Theatre for the first time. We will be producing *Steel Magnolias*, *Hairspray* (the musical), and *A War of the Worlds: The Panic Broadcast* (a radio play). Coming up in a little less than a month we will present our biennial collaboration with the School of Music, *Urinetown* (the musical) which will be performed in Dreiser Theatre April 12-15.
1. CAAC Items (see curriculog)
	1. University Foundational Studies: Learning Outcomes and Category Learning Outcomes **Motion to approve (J. Kinne/A. Kummerow); Vote: 27-0-1.**
		1. L. Sperry: We are proposing two pathways to fulfill the Global Perspectives and Cultural Diversity (GPCD) Foundational Studies’ requirement. A student could either take a two-sequence nonnative language at ISU to fulfill the GPCD requirement or, if they satisfied their language requirement in high school, take one GPCD course here.
			1. J. Gustafson: The proposal is to allow students to take nonnative languages for GPCD credit as well.
			2. L. Maule: Yes, but it is for those who did not meet the nonnative language requirement in high school. They will meet both their nonnative category and GPCD by taking language courses here at ISU. It applies to about 20% of our students.
			3. J. Gustafson: That makes sense.
	2. Middle School Mathematics Teaching Major (new program)

**Motion to approve (K. Yousif/J. Gustafson); Vote: 28-0-0.**

* + 1. L. Brown: We were asked to create this by the College of Education. There is a huge need for middle school math teachers. Currently there are two pathways for students: they can complete a secondary math teaching major which is about 80 credit hours or they can complete the elementary education program with middle school math minor, which is about 86 hours. This major carries fewer credit hours and students graduate with a license to teach middle school math. The major will use existing courses that are already in the middle school math minor and education courses. It requires only one new course, an advanced middle school math methods course. The program can be completed in three years if they come in calculus ready. Most of them do, and in four if they are not calculus ready.
			1. J. Kinne: Does this have to go to the state?
			2. L. Brown: No, it has the same CIP code as the secondary mathematics teaching major; it does not have to go to the Commission [ICHE].
	1. History Writing Minor (elimination)

**Motion to approve (T. Hawkins/A. Kummerow); Vote: 28-0-0.**

* + 1. S. Stofferahn: This was a curricular clean up. We did have one student sign up a few years ago, it was a mistake, they meant to sign up for a general history minor. We have a major and minor, there is no reason to hold on to the history writing minor.
1. Exec Items
	1. 932 Revision

**Motion to return it to the floor and approve (L. Phillips/K. Games); Vote: 27-0-1.**

* + 1. L. Brown: If you remember, last time Kent [Games] brought up the intellectual property concern.
			1. K. Butwin: Yes and the changes speak for themselves. I made two changes in red to specifically ensure that the data security policy will not affect the intellectual property policy. We did not originally intend for the one to affect the other, we have made it clearer.
1. FEBC Item
	1. Compensation for 699-799-899 courses (forwarded without Exec recommendation)
		1. L. Brown: Provost Licari has already addressed this. Exec forwarded this without endorsement. Do you want to discuss or endorse?
			1. J. Kinne: Does anybody else have anything else to say about it? I would like to discuss it. It was suggested that faculty be paid $200 per head because some departments do not distribute their graduate students appropriately.
			2. L. Henson: I agree with Provost Licari’s sentiment about not paying by the piece. However, I do wonder what will hold departments accountable for creating a more equitable distribution of workload.
			3. M. Licari: That will have to be negotiated between faculty and department chairs and deans need to make sure chairs are living up to those arrangements. I am content to leave those up to the individual departments and deans.
			4. B. Bunnett: So this came up last year, but we never voted on it?
			5. J. Kinne: Exec reviewed it last year but it never came here.
			6. M. Licari: Yes, and if you look at the minutes from last year you can see I pushed back on it then as well.
			7. J. Kinne: I think it was suggested it would cost around $100,000.
			8. X. Li: Is this not part of P&T?
			9. J. Kinne: The majority of 699-799-899s are not part of the regular faculty load.
			10. M. Licari: It varies as to what is recognized as regular. Each department has its own needs. What works for one department does not for another. Some build it into P&T expectations, others do not. There are lots of ways to manage this other than with per piece-type payments.
2. FAC Items
	1. Biennial Review Revision (BR) (for discussion only)
		1. L. Brown: Every year during which a BR takes place, the Faculty Senate is charged with reviewing the process, clarifying, streamlining, and making any necessary changes. What you have in front of you has been approved by FAC, with a minor change made by Exec. Exec removed ‘first 6 years’ because it was redundant. FAC and Exec endorsed the elimination of merit pay from the BR process. A task force has been created with two from FAC, two from Exec, and the provost to revise the BR. Its first meeting is Monday morning. Exec has not voted on this. We would like to talk about proposed changes here today and get an idea of where people are. The taskforce can then take your suggestions into consideration for a quicker approval process in April. Lindsey [Eberman], chair of FAC, is here to explain the rationale.
		2. L. Eberman: We collected data through a survey, open comment emails to me, and feedback from the Provost’s Advisory Council through Susan Powers. This process started in November/December 2017. As a committee, we struggled with agree on how to change it. There was quite a spectrum from no changes to the removal of merit pay to the drastic rewording of qualifications. We consulted with Exec and Provost Licari about what is doable. FAC discussed moving to the process to the spring, but that was rejected. It eliminated the 4th domain [administrative work], created a more robust means of remediation; eliminated merit pay and discussed alternatives. None of us think any of these are perfect. We discussed including a school review, clarifying the reconciliation process and the documentation associated, better incorporating university data, and creating clearer metrics about performance.
			1. K. Yousif: On page 1, ‘pre-tenure are subject to annual review and will not be included in this process.’ So they will not be reviewed until their third year?
				1. L. Brown: Only senior instructors and associate and full professors will be subject to biennial review, every two years.
			2. K. Yousif: Can you explain this move from 3 to 9 pages?
				1. L. Eberman: That was partially logistical and related to FAD [Faculty Activity Database]. It eliminated the links. Whatever would have been linked is now in the total number of pages.
			3. K. Yousif: Having served on the college-level [review] committee, when BR was linked to merit pay, it became a tenure review. I would like to see the whole process moved to the spring. The work in the fall is excessive. I understand the reasoning behind removing the links, but now it is longer.
				1. L. Eberman: Many faculty were ‘meeting’ or ‘exceeding’ without showing any evidence. It is difficult to appraise without any material. The other part of this is a cultural issue, faculty are unwilling to identify people who might need remediation, who are not meeting expectations.
			4. J. Gustafson: This version removes the overall evaluation, now only domain-specific evaluations are included?
				1. L. Eberman: Now that the BR is not tied to merit pay, there is no need for an overall performance evaluation. We discussed whether the deans might do it but thought there was no need for an additional review when faculty are meeting expectations.
			5. A. Kummerow: What was the reluctance to move the BR to spring?
				1. L. Eberman: Typically, we have searches going on in the spring, and with P&T happening in the fall we would be evaluating all year long.
				2. L. Brown: I would love it to be in the spring as well.
				3. K. Yousif: But if it were in the spring, we could focus more fully on P&T in the fall and on reviewing senior instructors and adjuncts. Could we still shift it?
				4. L. Eberman: I get the idea that nothing is off the table.
				5. L. Brown: Senate could take this up.
			6. J. Gustafson: This makes me question if we need the BR at all. It seems to target a small amount of people needing remediation and angered some of those at the top. Is there any way to do this without costing thousands of faculty hours?
				1. K. Yousif: There is value in doing it every 3 years. It made me proud of my colleagues and was a good experience. It forced me after tenure to take a moment to see where things are going well. Without merit pay, which you are accurately describing as a high-tension thing, maybe it will fall away.
				2. J. Gustafson: I have chaired the BR committee, it was positive, but what is the overall purpose? Putting this much energy into a BR that yields so little. There are ways a dean can intervene or bring about remediation that would not take this amount of time, the faculty members’ time preparing their own BR, reviewing them while serving on the committees, the difficulties with the FAD. It is a nightmare. One more thing on top of thousands.
				3. T. Hawkins: I am very sympathetic to that point of view, but there is no way we can get rid of it even if we all agreed. I also sympathize with Keri, if the periodic review of performance can be a positive thing, and every 3 years, that would be good. Those five or six in need of remediation were the target. We accepted the BR in return for identifying the top performers and giving them a monetary reward. If we lower the stakes for compensation, we can lower the pressure and focus on remediation. The point would be to see where someone needs help and provide it, this would reduce a lot of the pressure and anxiety. If we cannot remove merit pay, it might work to redirect it away from ‘exceeds,’ the category that is causing most of the frustration.
				4. M. Licari: The concept of peer review among professionals is important. The Department of History is a good example. There you have a set of colleagues with a set of expectations they all understand. We need that kind of environment on campus. Peer to peer accountability. On the more positive side, Keri’s comments are spot on about the benefits of BR. Yes the current process may be broken, but that is not a reason to completely scrap it all or the top end. We need to lift up those who are excellent by finding a way that is less political. With regard to ‘not meeting,’ yes there were very few. We all have periods in our career where we might slip. We need formative and constructive BR so faculty can get help and can re-engage in one or more domains.
				5. L. Brown: Yes, in an individual category, people may need a little help or boost. Very few of us are excelling everywhere all the time.
			7. K. Games: With removal of merit pay there is still the language here that if someone is ‘not meeting’ in one or more domains, compensation adjustments will be affected. We are separating the stick from the carrot.
				1. M. Licari: That is why we need the carrot.
				2. K. Games: Previously [not getting a salary adjustment] was based on ‘not meeting’ overall. With this switch, we could potentially be pretty unfair to people who are making honest mistakes.
				3. L. Eberman: Should stay the way it is written here. If someone is not meeting expectations, money is set aside to help with professional development.
				4. J. Kinne: I have seen that stick work. Someone says to himself or herself I know I am not going to be paid if I do not do this, so I will do it.
			8. J. Kinne: We could get rid of the college level review.
				1. L. Brown: We will have to wait and see after the task force meets.
				2. M. Licari: Yes, I cannot comment now.
				3. J. Kinne: You could just have a CV-type page on each domain.
				4. L. Brown/M. Licari: We will talk about this on Monday.
			9. J. Gustafson: Usually with pay increases related to salary, the increase is a percentage, merit pay was dollar amount. If there were a continuation of merit pay, I would strongly endorse the dollar amount. A percentage-based award would allocate more money to those already making the largest amount. I know several in my college that would receive a smaller amount. We do not want to increase the pay gap between the colleges.
			10. J. Kinne: Will we see this again before voting?
				1. L. Eberman: Yes, Exec has not voted yet either.
				2. J. Kinne: Voting is when?
				3. L. Brown: April, we can use one of our special agenda meetings in April. Probably the 26th.
				4. K. Games: If approved by the end of the year does that mean summer implementation?
				5. T. Hawkins: It has to be approved this year.
				6. K. Games: So departments and colleges will have to work over the summer to make the changes? It has to be in place a year in advance, yes?
				7. L. Eberman: Yes.
				8. L. Brown: It would have to be in place by September 20, 2018, some departments do not have any criteria in place right now.
			11. L. Eberman: Speaking of that, I have not received all the P&T documents. Approve them now and send them to me. FAC has started review. The goal is to have them done at the end of the year.
			12. A. Kummerow: Can you clarify the language regarding an executive director?
				1. L. Eberman: If one exists. If not then it is n/a. If you have suggestions on how to make that clearer let us know.
				2. A. Kummerow: If applicable, but that does not mean there is always one here.
				3. L. Brown: Andre, I am going to let you figure out what that language should be to ensure it does happen, bring it to Exec. It does not have to go back to FAC for that.

Adjournment at 4:59pm.