

#3

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2018-2019

October 18, 2018

3:30 p.m., DEDE III

Approved

Members Present: A. Anderson, S. Arvin, C. Ball, M. Blaszk, L. Brown, M. Chambers, M. Cohen, E. Gallatin, K. Games, B. Guell, C. Hanson, T. Hawkins, L. Henson, M. Hutchins, D. Israel, M. Jackson, B. Jose, B. Kilp, J. Kinne, S. Kopaczewski, X. Li, J. Liu, R. Owegi, S. Phillips, R. Peters, J. Potts, B. Roberts-Pittman, A. Soleskey, E. Southard, J. Weust, M. Williamson, E. Wittenmyer.

Members Absent: S. Stofferahn

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Curtis

Guests: Andrew Payne, Ann Rider, Ron Dunbar, Concetta De Paolo, Winnie Ko, and Virgil Sheets

1) Memorial Resolutions

a) A. Payne: Michael 'Mike' Williamson

Michael G. Williamson of Marshall, Illinois, passed away on May 30, 2018, at Union Hospital in Terre Haute, Indiana. Mike received his Associate's degree from Lincoln College and completed his Bachelor's degree at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. He later earned his Master's degree from Indiana State University. Through his extensive career as a Senior Human Resource Director, he continued his passion for teaching. He also was a University of Illinois certified master gardener.

Mr. Williamson came to ISU in 2008 as a Career Counselor and Lecturer. During his 10 years at ISU, Mike served on numerous committees at the College level, including the Student Affairs Committee and at the Department level, including the Personnel, Scholarship, Retention, & Recruitment Committees. As an instructor from 2011 to 2016, Mike split his time between the Department of Built Environment Safety Management program and the Department of Human Resource Development and Performance Technologies HRD program. In 2016 Mike joined the Department of Built Environment fulltime teaching undergraduate and graduate level Safety Management courses on campus and online. He was promoted to Senior Instructor in 2017 and was part of the inaugural class of the Master Teacher program. Mike enjoyed spending time in the classroom with students and serving as a career counselor and advisor to students from all across the university.

He also participated in numerous professional and civic organizations, including the local chapter of the Society for Human Resources Management, Wabash Valley Human Resources Association, Big Brother-Big Sisters of Vigo County, and Marshall Area Library Board of Trustees.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University expresses to his family their sincere sympathy and condolences, and that they further express their appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which he gave to his students, to the Department of Built Environment, and to 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.

b) A. Payne: William ‘Bill’ Baker

Dr. William “Bill” L. Baker of Terre Haute passed away on July 23, 2018. Bill served his country for many years in the United States Air Force 181st Intelligence Wing, retiring as Senior Master Sergeant in 2015. He was instrumental in the development of the Homeland Security Center at Indiana State University.

Bill received an associate degree from Spartan School Aeronautics in Tulsa, Oklahoma, a Bachelor of Science in Industrial Technology Education from Indiana State University, his MBA from Indiana Wesleyan University, and his Ph.D. through Capella University. Bill was an industry leader in manufacturing for several years prior to his military career.

Dr. Baker joined the Department of Built Environment Construction Management program in January 2013. During his 5 years at ISU, Bill served on a number of committees at the University level, including the University Scholarship Committee, at the College level, including the Faculty Affairs Committee, and at the Department level, including the Scholarship and Spring Retreat Committees. Dr. Baker served as the coordinator of the Construction Management Online program from 2015 to 2017. He was very involved in the Construction Club and the Sigma Lambda Chi Construction Management Honor Society.

Bill was very generous with his time, often volunteering with students to serve the local community. He was a very passionate and active member of the Noon Optimists annual Clothe-A-Child fundraiser and was very involved in the 14th & Chestnut Community Center in Terre Haute, Indiana.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University expresses to his family their sincere sympathy and condolences, and that they further express their appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which he gave to his students, to the Department of Built Environment, and to 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.

c) A. Rider/R. Dunbar: Peter Bruning

Dr. Peter Bruning, Emeritus Professor of German, passed away on June 1, 2018 at the age of 95, and is survived by his wife Margaret, their son and daughter, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. He retired in 1990 after 34 years of faithful service to the University. He was born in Amsterdam, Holland, where he received the Baccalaureate degree from the Montessori Lyceum, and then studied at the University of Bern in Switzerland and received the doctorate degree from the University of Amsterdam in 1949. Peter came to the U.S. later that year and initially taught at Indiana University, the University of California-Berkeley and Rice University. When he joined the faculty of Indiana State in 1956, German instruction was suffering the effects of WWII and there were only two courses left, but he was able to personally create 24 different courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels and thus develop the German major and German Teaching Certificate programs. An engaged teacher, he organized several summer Honors and study abroad programs in Germany, directed plays and especially contributed to the cultural enrichment of his students through his lively interest in the music and artistic traditions of Germany.

He was an active researcher in the fields of 19th Century German and Contemporary Netherlandic and Flemish Literatures, publishing numerous articles and serving as a consultant to *World Literature Today*. He also served the profession as President of the Indiana Chapter of the American Association of Teachers of German and on the Executive Board of the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association.

Peter was not only a dedicated teacher and scholar, but also an avid world traveler, an accomplished classical pianist and an especially gifted artist whose works have appeared in galleries in the U.S. and Europe.

His passion for music and art also allowed him to serve the community through his work on the boards of the Terre Haute Symphony, the Swope Art Gallery and the Terre Haute Community Theater, and for several years he co-hosted the program “Invitation to Music” on radio station WTHI.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Dr. Bruning’s family its sincere sympathy and condolence, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication that Peter 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.

- 2) Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes of September 20, 2018 (File #1)
 - a) Motion to approve (J. Kinne/A. Anderson); [Vote 32-0-0](#)

- 3) Support Staff Report: El-Houcin Chaqra
 - a) Last July, I appointed a committee to look at our bylaws to make sure they were in line with the new reorganization of Enrollment & Communications/Marketing. Our elections of staff members are based on divisions. That reorganization will have an impact on elections. The committee has completed its work and it will submit a proposal at the November meeting. It will go for a vote in December.

- 4) SGA Report: S. Lamb
 - a) The third draft of our Health & Wellness Report will be sent out tomorrow to staff and faculty who have worked with us on this. We surveyed students about three 3 weeks ago. There were 841 responses. Students supported the implementation of a Health & Wellness fee, with 62% support. We have not narrowed down how much or what we will propose it to be. In addition, we asked about tobacco free campus: 58% support, 29% do not support, and 13% are undecided. We also asked is they plan on voting: over 60% yes, and 40% no/undecided. We had a Town Hall Meeting here last night, and there was a good turnout. Conversations included student org funding, inclusiveness on campus, and how SGA can help student orgs promote events/programs. The inclusiveness on campus discussion was lively, and a good opportunity to get/give feedback.

- 5) TFA Report: S. Monday
 - a) [Via email]: I wanted to give you an update of what I have been working on. I have been asked to pick up the torch for the parking pass concern for temporary faculty. I have reached out to key people on campus to start a conversation as well as try to get the history of the issue. I am also attending the FAC meeting Tuesday to speak about the Temporary Faculty Advocate position.

- 6) Administrative Reports:
 - a) President D. Curtis
 - i) No report (absent).
 - b) Provost M. Licari
 - i) Last Friday, the BoT met and the agenda was short however, they did approve an honorary doctorate to Clyde Kersey. As a state representative, he was a member of the budget committee and a longtime advocate for the university. We were planning on him being our commencement speaker and he is an alum, therefore it seemed appropriate. He has been a champion for the university and has had a great public service career. The BoT also approved an update to the university naming policy. One set which will be of value to you is to name endowments supporting faculty hires or professional development. Hopefully, that spurs those conversations.
 - ii) The SEM Council has swung into full gear and is meeting regularly; Tim [Hawkins] is present and I have added Bob Guell as well to bring some analytical capabilities and questions. The extension to this is a lot of work. It also added a lot to the plate of SAC. I would like to publicly thank the members of that committee for their role in

SEM. It was as not on their plate when they volunteering, and they were ambushed. Again, I would like to publically apologize and thank them.

- iii) I am gearing up for annual visits to departments on campus. It is great to meet directly with faculty in their departments. I am glad it is still valuable and have received no rejections.
- iv) The state budget committee was on campus Tuesday for round two of our budget request to the state. The first stop was a tour through HHS, led by Dean Mallory as a thank you for their support. That building was constructed with state appropriated money. The next stop was Dreiser Hall which is the next ask. I pointed out the need for upgrades for instruction, faculty, students, and the accessibility issues. There are some serious challenges for entrances and elevator use. President Curtis gave a presentation to the committee, which was a modified version of the presentation she gave to the commission in September at round one. It was well received. The presentation was good and we had a successful day.
- v) There have been concerns from homecoming over the weekend, and I have had many conversations with VPs and directly with President Curtis. Although she is traveling, we found time to have a phone call about these issues. She has called a special cabinet meeting for Monday afternoon. We will start making some plans for improvements. In November, there will be a larger meeting for anyone involved in planning including members from the city to identify solutions to issues that pop up especially on Saturday. Of course we want everyone to have fun, but in a safe and responsible way. This will take a collaboration between ISU and the city.

7) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) Let me begin my report by reviewing the rest of our agenda. Following our open discussion, we will consider the proposal to approve a Business Analytics minor. This will be followed by multiple FAC items. I sent an email yesterday with a revised File #3, as approved by EC. Let me remind you that we will hold off the reading of File #2 today and bring it back next month with a rider about officer succession. File #4 will bring us FACs recommendation regarding merit pay. File #5 is for informational purposes only.
- b) I hope your Homecoming experience was positive. That, obviously, is the expectation, not only for alumni, students, faculty, and staff, but also the larger community. In my experience here, however, it has become traditional at the Senate meeting after Homecoming to express concern about one or another incident that did not reflect well on the Homecoming experience. I am not naïve; I understand that this is a time associated with celebration. I also understand that in many cases the university has little or no control over what happens over the course of the weekend, when those celebrations go too far. But at a certain level, everything that happens during Homecoming is associated, fairly or not, with ISU. We cannot draw a clear line or build a wall between the university-sponsored or affiliated events such as the parade and the football game that are designed to show us at our best and create or reinforce positive associations... and the other stuff. I did not personally witness the reported public intoxication and pop-up bars that were a feature of the Saturday experience, nor did I witness the party Saturday night in Farrington's Grove that left a shooting victim. I was, however, contacted on Monday by a faculty member whose house was in the line of fire—literally. The public intoxication is disturbingly routine, the out-of-control partying is frankly appalling, and

the comments from an assistant police chief that this Homecoming was the worst he had seen in the past 20 years is simply depressing. Such negative associations with ISU Homecoming should concern us all. While it appears that no ISU-affiliated group was directly implicated in the events of Saturday night, and neither the shooter nor the victim were ISU students, this should only be cause for marginal relief. It is not far-fetched to expect future Homecoming weekends (and the reputation of ISU) to be permanently stained by the alcohol abuse, public disturbances, and even violence that is regularly associated with this time of year. To the extent possible, I implore the administration and SGA to be proactive about next year, to work with the city, with fraternal organizations, etc. to ensure that Homecoming 2019 is one we can be proud of—from beginning to end.

- c) Katie Butwin has asked that I announce that we need faculty volunteers for the Discrimination Appeals Committee. You can make nominations or self-nominations to her.
- d) Shana raised a concern about the BR at the September meeting—identifying an inconsistency in the teaching section and connecting it to the FAD report. I wanted to mention that Liz and Susan will be working together on a fix for the BR and reporting data. Liz will update as needed.
- e) You will recall that much of our Senate meeting in September was devoted to a presentation from the provost regarding enrollment management. In the interim, I have been involved in the SEM council discussions that now occur weekly with representatives from various concerned constituencies. In one initiative, Steve Neiheisel convened a workshop with the deans that was designed to raise awareness of the challenges and opportunities facing the university in the short and long term. Afterwards, it appeared to me that many illusions that this would be an easy process were left behind at that table. No sense of doom and gloom, rather cautious concern. I am happy to report that long-term planning has begun. At the same time, the SEM council has also encouraged its members to embark on various efforts designed to have immediate or at least short-term impact. With respect to faculty participation, we (the Senate officers) immediately saw a role for SAC, and so I have asked Mike Chambers, the EC liaison to SAC, to provide a brief update on SACs activities to date. Before I cede the floor to him, let me say that we can all help. I was discouraged to learn that only 14 out of 120 interview slots at the December Scholarship Interview Day last year were filled by faculty. We must do better this year, and so I encourage this room of faculty leaders to sign up. All we need is 100% participation from the Senate to double last years' number...
- f) On a related note, you all received an email from Rich Toomey regarding important changes to the new student scholarship program. As a reminder, instead of the laptop scholarship being a merit award, it is now the Sycamore Technology Award, a NEED BASED award, based upon students EFC (estimated family contribution) determined by their Financial Aid.
- g) I wish to thank the FS faculty who submitted interim grades this fall. This data is critical for retention goals, as it allows us (the UC in particular) to target students who need intervention *early*, while there still may be time to change course. I appreciate Linda Maule's follow-up reporting on these students.
- h) Finally, remember the ISU Staff Council Harvest Party, next Thursday, 6-8 in the Dedes.

- i) SAC update: M. Chambers
 - i) SAC was a little bit ambushed this year. SAC held its first meeting with Steve Neiheisel, Rich Toomey, and Josh Powers there to give them input & information at SEM. It is overwhelming, but SAC understands some of its tasks moving forward. We are working to get additional meeting times more than once a month, which was the original schedule. Some committee members have been joining up with other committees on campus looking at SEM issues. For example, Chris McGrew asked for SAC representation on a committee that deals with non-English speaking international students. SAC is starting to get geared up for the SEM task. We thought it would be an easy committee. We are not moving as quickly as the SEM Council is, but will have more to report in the future.

8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) M. Williamson: The OSP can provide funds for reprint or publication, but the policy is over a decade old so the cost is not accurate. Could they look at it?
 - i) J. Kinne: It is current, is it not enough?
 - ii) M. Williamson: It offers \$400, but for my discipline, it is \$1,200. Not a lot of faculty apply because it only covers about 20%.
 - iii) T. Hawkins: We can talk to URC.
 - iv) C. Mallory: Is there a match from the faculty member or college/department?
 - v) M. Williamson: I am not sure, but the most you can get is \$400. That was created over a decade ago.
 - vi) C. Mallory: I am not sure how much they can give out, but can the cost be shared? Not all faculty members are aware of OSP funding this. Do departments or colleges share the burden?
 - vii) M. Williamson: Anything will help, but the cost has gone up a lot.
 - viii) C. Mallory: It is unlikely the university would be able to cover the entire cost.
 - ix) S. Arvin: As the library rep, I can say that whether it is reprint or open access, the price varies by discipline. Capping that at \$400 could be a problem.
- b) J. Kinne: How much would the student Health and wellness fee be?
 - i) S. Lamb: It is proposed at \$74 per semester, and the same student that pay the rec center fee would be billed for this fee. If all goes well and we pass it in March, then it would go to the BoT in late spring. I am not sure if it could be proposed in the budget for the state, but we have talked with Diann McKee. She and Greg Goode are willing to incorporate it into the proposal if the BoT approves and it is practical.
 - ii) J. Kinne: What exactly would it be used for?
 - iii) S. Lamb: Hire more full time staff for counseling and preventative care. Help fund the food pantry that will be in the in rec center, and provide mental health first aid training. This training can give those not in the counseling field the ability to recognize mental health conditions and respond in emergencies. It would be very useful for RA's. It would also go towards the Sycamores Care Initiative and the Michael Simmons Emergency Fund. We need to make sure we are meeting the growing demand for mental health services. Right now, there are 5-6 full time counselors and they have to turn people away. They have so much on their plates it is hard to get email back right now. They do not have a lot of help.

- 9) CAAC Item: W. Ko (see Curriculog <https://indstate.curriculog.com/>)
- a) Business Analytics minor
 - b) Motion to approve (A. Anderson/D. Israel); **Vote 32-0-0**
 - c) C. De Paolo: My background is in operation supply chain and in recent years, these disciplines are called Business Analytics. There has been huge increase in graduate and undergrad programs in Business Analytics, giving trends and recent graduate placements. This will give them a stronger background and the needed credentials. We will be using existing courses, and have developed this off other programs at institutions such as U Denver, Drexel, Villanova, and U of Virginia. There are three domains: stats, math modeling, and data management plus electives, which allow the student to focus on a certain domain. It would be viable with 17 current students indicating strong interest. IU, Purdue, Ball State all offer this and it would keep us current with other institutions in IN.
 - d) W. Ko: This is a hot area, and students will experience what they might be doing in future employment.
 - i) D. Israel: I understand you are seeing this in your recent graduates, but will this be taking away from any minors.
 - ii) C. De Paolo: There is not much overlap, but it is interdisciplinary in ISM and Marketing to give the skill sets. I do not see anyone leaving another minor. A lot of majors would actually pick up a minor in this according to the students we surveyed. I think it would add enrollment to courses and get certifications. It will not be taking away from other programs.

10) FAC Items: V. Sheets

- a) Faculty Ombuds Proposal (File #3)
 - i) Motion to approve (A. Anderson/S. Kopaczewski); **Vote 32-0-0**
 - ii) V. Sheets: FAC was charged with looking at such an idea, for the origination I have to give credit to Susan Powers who did exploration about how they operate at other universities. This is a place faculty can go when they do not know where else to go. When an issue seems to fall outside of place in the ISU system. For example, as chair of Senate you get faculty who have issues/concerns coming and asking for guidance, but you if serve a role in grievances, that is a difficult position to navigate. Those sorts of things could go through the ombuds, who would not take a side or could give guidance about where to go next. This person can do that. The changes that FAC made to the original proposal was to have the provost and Senate chair give suggestions of functioning. In addition, that the ombuds gives a generic report on issues so the Senate could make changes if necessary to relieve reoccurring issues.
- (1) T. Hawkins: This was made consciously vague to provide for negotiation between faculty and admin. Provost Licari can tell you that the admin is on board.
 - (a) M. Licari: Yes, very much on board. Every year it comes up. There is always a situation where we would try to find somebody to be an ear and it was very much ad hoc and felt sloppy. It seemed like we could do a better job to provide that place to get some advice. This is not blazing a trail, this concept is pretty common across higher education, but I am very much in support. The details need to be worked out in terms of how bureaucratic we want to make this. I prefer not so much at least at first to see how much this is used and how much infrastructure we need. It is hard to undo bureaucracy. I am worried

about setting up something so formal, but the philosophical underpinnings I am supportive.

- (2) D. Israel: We have very few faculty left and pulling them into something else, even if it is all great things, but I wish there was more specificity in here. Maybe more than one person right off the bat to have more than one for less time. What if the one person you chose is in my department or college and I cannot talk to that person.
 - (a) M. Licari: Those are exactly the kinds of things we have to navigate.
 - (b) V. Sheets: We were being vague since we need endorsement of the concept, but if we need more precise language, or create handbook language, we could do that. The details can be worked out later.
 - (c) T. Hawkins: This is not handbook language, but a recommendation to the administration.
 - (3) M. Blaszk: Is this a full time person?
 - (a) V. Sheets: FAC wants it to be a faculty member. We proposed PT, but the EC changed it to “appropriate compensation.”
 - (b) M. Licari: The person serving is a faculty member.
 - (c) D. Israel: It does not come through in this that it is not full time.
 - (d) T. Hawkins: These are discussions we have had and we are all on the same page: faculty member, not staff equivalent, we have that understanding. Proceeding towards implementation, it did not need to be in the language beyond that.
 - (4) S. Arvin: I see value to this. AAUP officers provide this as volunteers. If the university supports this that can be a good thing. I am curious from AAUP members officers would be interested to hear this or I they have issues with it.
 - (a) V. Sheets: Yes, AAUP have served those roles. Someone with that knowledge and expertise would be great in the university role.
 - (b) S. Arvin: I am grateful for former AAUP officers who are still on campus. Will the ISU chapter of AAUP still exist?
 - (c) V. Sheets: Yes.
 - (d) S. Arvin: AAUP would still exist and if there is a conflict they could talk to us, but it would be wonderful if there were other solutions to that as well.
 - (5) L. Henson: What would be the time demands?
 - (a) S. Arvin: I would have to consult with other AAUP officers, but some of them take a lot of time, especially when juggling your own work. There is an emphasis on doing it right and not rushing bad counseling.
 - (b) B. Guell: There is not a typical number. There are 1s and 2s that come about with P&T issues, but when there is a person who is new to the Senate chair position and thinks they have more power than it does a cauldron is created and more activities occur. Luckily, we have fewer of those than we have had in the past.
 - (c) V. Sheets: I understand admin concern that you cannot get rid of bureaucratic structures that are built, but usually if they are there people find uses for them. If we have them, we might find out there was demand built up and people did not know where to go.
- b) Merit Pay recommendation (File #4)

- i) Motion to approve (M. Jackson/J. Weust); [Vote 27-3-1](#)
- i) V. Sheets: Last spring at the end of the year the BR model was changed to separate merit pay from the process. As part of that, the administration and Senate agreed that departments would develop their own merit-pay guidelines. The BR had an artificial limit on how many could be recognized in each department. FAC tried to avoid putting limits or defining appropriate standards for everyone on campus. Each department needs to create what would *meet* or *exceed* and how they would appropriately recognize that in the pay system. Deans would provide oversight to make sure the plan is appropriate and makes a meaningful distinction.
 - (1) D. Israel: Does there need to be clarity on how frequent merit pay discussions will be? It was every other year with the BR.
 - (a) V. Sheets: That would be valuable. "Considering from prior merit review period" was there for that.
 - (2) C. Hanson: It is not tied to the BR period?
 - (a) V. Sheets: FAC assumed it was.
 - (b) M. Licari: Yes, it flows from the BR upward.
 - (c) B. Guell: Will there be a new merit pay report? Departments will decide that under stable admin leadership, enrollment, and finances there will be merit pay. Do BR and merit pay on odd number years. Do that and then in a future recession you cannot imagine a president would scratch the BR. However, the first thing to cut is merit pay. Not right now, imagine a situation in which you do not have the standard two-year window, but some much longer window that does not correspond to the BR.
 - (d) T. Hawkins: The University is now giving departments autonomy about how they want to deal with it. Departments could consider such a scenario and create a plan for it.
 - (3) S. Arvin: If I am elected to a personnel committee then I have to look at previous years to try to be fair. I can see that adding more work.
 - (a) T. Hawkins: Departments may have those discussions.
 - (4) M. Jackson: How would we know when there is money available? When it was appropriate to evaluate faculty on the basis of merit? Will it be announced by the administration? We need language about that. We are not going to do it if there is no money.
 - (a) S. Kopaczewski: Shouldn't there be some kind of timeline where the administration will announce available money for the next year?
 - (b) T. Hawkins: I don't think there can be sufficient advanced notice of that.
 - (c) M. Licari: I would be reluctant to do that.
 - (5) E. Southard: Will the Ombuds be seated by next fall? Providing opportunity for merit pay is good, but a chair having their own self-determined structure seems like a hornets nest.
 - (a) T. Hawkins: Yes.
 - (6) B. Kilp: Is it all faculty? Or regular, FT, PT? If it is, tenure-track people tend to have a lighter load so they can spend more time on publishing. Is it the department's determination who qualifies?
 - (a) L. Brown: It is regular faculty only, instructors and professors.
 - (b) B. Kilp: It does not say that.

- (c) J. Kinne: I suggest adding the language regular faculty.
 - (d) L. Brown: If you are required to do BR, you have to be *meeting expectations* in all categories.
 - (e) B. Kilp: What if what they get on P&T does not apply? If it is a legal document, you have to pay attention.
 - (f) B. Guell: This was drafted vaguely to let departments draft polices which made meaningful distinctions. If not, they will cede decisions to college P&T.
 - (g) L. Brown: Departments might have to consider how important service is, which is why it is sent to departments.
 - (h) T. Hawkins: That was the philosophy behind allowing departments to make these decisions.
 - (i) B. Jose: What if those expectations vary from year to year?
 - (j) T. Hawkins: Nothing ties departments to the first iteration of their process. They can redo it.
 - (k) V. Sheets: FAC was hoping they would not lay down too many expectations, but there are some standards to evaluate. It is up to the department.
- (7) X. Li: There are two documents to submit at the same time, the BR and the merit pay?
- (a) T. Hawkins: You will submit BR material, and you will be categorized as *meeting* or *not meeting*. Departments will then determine candidates for merit pay. Senate's hope was that departments would have made the adjustments to their BR documents by October of this fall to be in line with the Senate document passed last spring. Now we are asking departments to move ahead and establish a merit-pay process by early 2019.
 - (b) J. Kinne: Departments could take what you had already created for exceeds or could do something else. *Meets* is real and genuine, but not too easy.
 - (c) D. Israel: The timing issue is going to be challenging. If we happen to be in departments with pre-tenured faculty, they have different deadlines. A timeline is helpful when you have to have decisions. Are we going to have stuff in there other than materials used for the normal BR process? That would be difficult to do. It should be stated somewhere. We have had problems before with that. Departments did not want to include instructors. If departments do not have the leeway in the category to be eligible, it should state that in here.
 - (d) L. Brown: Deans in consultation with P&T committees will provide oversight; the department would not get away with it (not rewarding instructors). There are checks and balances.
 - (e) T. Hawkins: We can include "regular" in this document with unanimous consent. Keep in mind, this is essentially a letter from FAC asking departments to write procedures and be ready for February 2019. As far as a list of requirements, we should be talking about this in our own departments. The point of the change was to empower departments to make decisions. I am concerned that we seem to be questioning this concept here. Take it to the departments. We can pass this with the necessary revisions right now, and I can send a statement to the deans & to the chairs that there are specific concerns you need to be sure are raised in each department. Each department

- could have a different answer. We do not, I think, want to turn this into a FAC-prescribed list of rules. That is not what Senate wanted last spring.
- (8) B. Jose: I was asked to inquire if there are models for several different disciplines we can see.
- (a) T. Hawkins: As far as I know those do not exist.
- (b) L. Brown: You could ask colleagues from other institutions what they do.
- (9) C. Hanson: Is this a one-time bonus, or on top of the base salary?
- (a) L. Brown: Base.
- (10) T. Hawkins: I am asking for unanimous consent to include “regular” ahead of the first appearance of “faculty” in line 2. [unanimous consent granted] I can then have this discussion included in the email we are going to send tomorrow to the deans. We will ask deans and chairs to begin deliberations. These issues can be a part of those discussions.
- (11) E. Wittenmyer: What is the definition of “regular faculty?”
- (a) B. Guell: It is in 305.
- (b) M. Licari: Tenure-track professors and instructors.
- (c) E. Wittenmyer: OK, but in the past I have had people say you are just an instructor and not faculty.
- (d) B. Guell: That is not true now, but it was ten years ago.
- (12) S. Arvin: Will this potentially be given every year? Pre-tenured faculty turn in reports every year. Tenured faculty have the BR.
- (a) V. Sheets: Every other year.
- (b) M. Jackson: It does not say that. Are we to assume we set out timelines based on the old timeline?
- (c) M. Licari: I do not see a problem with that. It does not change anything for the university.
- (d) S. Kopaczewski: For our department it would be much easier to do merit pay in the spring. Are there problems if we make those decisions in the spring than in the fall?
- (e) T. Hawkins: Last year Senate rejected a spring BR.
- (f) D. Israel: Not merit pay. Some people do not have to do BR, are we making them do another report?
- (g) L. Brown: It depends on what process your department creates. That is the reason it goes to departments
- (h) S. Kopaczewski: Do we have the authority to do it in the spring?
- (i) M. Licari: That would be a big problem for payroll, budgeting and accounting. It has to be one timeline. Otherwise, payroll will not be happy.
- (j) M. Chambers: If we are not going to increase workload on 4/5 years their stuff is due in Dec/early Jan. If we are going to be doing merit pay decisions, are we going to use reports in December for the previous year?
- (k) L. Brown: It depends on what departments ask for in the merit pay plan. It may not be full evaluation materials. It depends on what they decide they want.
- (13) K. Games: Could we use FAD? If a department comes up with merit pay documents will departments be able to work with Susan Powers to create a separate report for departments? The BR is meeting expectations, but merit pay is

exceptional. That could result in different things ask for. On the back end, does that create a challenge?

- (a) T. Hawkins: I do not know if we can answer some of these questions now. Departments will have to wrestle with many of them. Senate wants departments to create the merit pay documents by February. That will give deans and P&T committees time to review them and suggest revisions. If there are problems then they can be addressed. We must emphasize that departments should not be trying to overburden their faculty by creating a complicated process to identify their best persons. You could go through FAD...but why? Build a process right off the BR. For example, if you *meet expectations* you can ask to be considered for merit pay. You would then submit specific materials for evaluation by your department committee. That is all it has to be.
- (b) L. Brown: Or a little check list. People could submit their CV. Departments can make it super simple or really complicated, or hopefully somewhere in between.
- (14) A. Anderson: Many of you many not remember, but with the old merit system we were often told do it, but then the money was not there in the end. Be conscience of that. A committee has met, worked on it, but there is no money. Exercise caution, please.

11) Adjournment at 5:12pm.