

#9

Indiana State University  
Faculty Senate, 2021-2022

**Executive Committee**

November 9, 2021  
3:30 p.m. via Zoom

Members present: A. Arrington-Sirois, A. Arrington-Slocum, S. Arvin, A. Badar, L. Brown, J. Frost, J. Gustafson, K. Hinton, K. Yousif

Absent Members: n/a

*Ex-Officio* Present: Provost C. Olsen

Absent *Ex-Officio*: President D. Curtis,

Guests: K. Lawson, J. Trainer, C. Paterson

**1) Administrative Reports**

a) President D. Curtis: no report/unable to attend

b) Provost C. Olsen

We have started sending out messaging about the Spring testing and vaccination program. We have received feedback from students so we know it is reaching them. We need to send out a clarification that distance students do not have to follow this if they are not on campus. We have had slight uptick in COVID cases since Halloween.

Applications for Fall 2022 are up 40%. This is mostly through the common app. We have no historical data on how many students will come to ISU as this is the first year we have been involved the common app. Students applying through the app are historically higher qualified than our typical students. We had a lot of potential students show up for preview Saturday.

K. Yousif: Does the testing and vaccination program apply to distance faculty that only teach distance courses?

C. Olsen: They will follow the same guidelines as distance students.

**2) Chair Report: K. Yousif**

Anecdotally, went to the popup clinic for a booster and they ran out of vaccinations, and at the regular clinic later the line was very long. The message is getting out on vaccines.

Soon, will be reviewing another program suspension, this time in Nursing.

**3) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion**

*No questions*

**4) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes (November 2, 2021)**

Motion to approve L. Brown, A. Badar: 8-0-1

**5) Policy revision: Search Committee Membership Nominations, 146.2.2.2.1, approved by AAC with associated procedures**

Motion to approve: J. Gustafson, A. Arrington-Sirois: 9-0-0

Motion to approve amendments K. Yousif, K. Hinton: 9-0-0

*Presented by C. Paterson*

C. Paterson: AAC dealt with Executive Search Committee this year. Revising the system to optimize everyone's time. Among the changes we made were to take into consideration rank and service. We created a process that should be followed when choosing a search committee, factoring in rank and service, and creating at least six person slates representative of the colleges. In considering university service as part of process, need to also recognize that there are some faculty that do not have service requirements. In collecting data, we also feel that AAC should not store the private data that is provided by the surveys.

J. Gustafson: Are you talking about the self-disclosed gender and ethnicity data? AAC will need access to that somehow.

C. Paterson: AAC would only have access when needed then the information would be stored with faculty senate.

K. Yousif: This charge came from the President because she felt the process took too long. Could there be a way to streamline the process?

C. Paterson: We were looking at ways to make a meaningful slate.

K. Yousif: Normally we know when an executive position will be opening. Could the faculty senate executive committee do some of the leg work ahead of time?

C. Paterson: That was part of the reason we didn't give exact roles to some parts of the process. We believe that the two chairs can work together to get this done.

L. Brown: We are hopeful that this won't have to be done for another four or five years so having a process that should be followed will be helpful.

J. Gustafson: Was there a reason this was written in a passive voice?

C. Paterson: We wanted to leave it open to interpretation.

L. Brown: I don't like having it open but I understand it lets you be more flexible.

K. Yousif: We can keep this on the new Canvas site.

K. Hinton: I am worried that some ranks will discriminated against due to the fact that their rank and time would keep them from having service experience.

C. Paterson: That is why we added "University service experience of a nominee should be considered".

K. Hinton: That could be interrupted as service is required.

A. Arrington-Slocum: May we could add something about rank and a set amount of time.

K. Yousif: We can add "if appropriate". Would AAC want to see this and vote on the addition? *See motion on amended language.*

C. Paterson: No. We would consider this a friendly amendment.

## 6) Informational Item: Civitas

*Presented by Kristi Lawson*

K. Lawson: Part of the Lilly Grant involves using software to help track student success. We have tested a few different systems and Civitas appears to be the best software. We will be able to adjust the software to fit our needs and we will be able to use the platform in multiple areas without extra cost (as an enterprise system). We have a twelve-minute video that can be sent to each of you that explains a little bit about the software. This software has the ability to interact with the different systems we have on campus. We will be able to track if students are swiping their card or logging in to Canvas. Instructors will also be able to manually raise a red flag. Once this happens we can reach out to the students to find out what is happening and get them the help they need.

J. Gustafson: What data will you look at in Canvas? Will students know what other type of information will be collected and monitored?

K. Lawson: We are still doing testing with this and we haven't determined what information will be needed.

A. Arrington-Sirois: Who is the group that is determining what will be seen in Canvas and other areas? Does this group include faculty, as their input is important? Also how is a computer program going to determine things like "a sense of belonging"?

J. Trainer: We already have a data set that tells what the warning signs are for students that don't succeed. There are three major factors in this. First is that sense of not belonging, next is grades, and the final part is financial. We can look at card swipes and see that students aren't eating with everyone else so someone can reach out to them and invite them to an event. We can offer tutoring to help the student get back on track if their grades are not where they need to be. Together we can create a plan with the student and see if they are sticking to it. We have been talking with other schools that use this software and we are going to be looking at a lot less information they track.

A. Arrington-Slocum: I feel that there needs to be a faculty group before this rolls out. Who will be reaching out to the student? How is the faculty being informed what is happening and what information needs to be manually entered?

C. Olsen: We aren't at that point yet. We haven't even signed the contract for the software. Once we reach the testing stage we will have faculty involved. This will be easier to use than the last software we had.

J. Frost: Is it just the University College advisors that will get to use the software during the trial?

C. Olsen: At this time they are one of the groups looking at the different software. Once we are ready to start testing the software we will be bringing in other groups to help.

K. Lawson: The project success group is smaller at this time and we haven't completely decided who they will be.

J. Gustafson: I understand the need for data but there is already some discomfort about this and we haven't even started the testing phase. It seems like the information that is to be collected is a bit intrusive.

K. Yousif: I understand the panic that is creating. Please let us know what we can do to help dispel the panic. Could faculty be involved with the test pilot?

K. Lawson: We aren't at that point yet.

J. Trainer: Please watch the demo and allow us to answer any questions that you have. Nothing is clear cut yet and we are still very early in the process.

C. Olsen: Again, I want to reiterate that we are not ready to start any testing. We have not even signed the contract to purchase the software. We are still looking at evaluating the different software. This one seems to be the best fit so far. We are far from being ready to begin anything.

## 7) Standing Committee Reports

AAC: Arrington-Slocum: No report

AEC: Gustafson: No report

CAAC: A. Arrington-Sirois: R. Noll (Chair, CAAC) posed three questions related to reviewing the HIP "array" coming through: 1) What is the scope of our review? *Is it pro-forma?* Is it, as Linda Maule suggests, simply to ferret out "anomalous" HIP courses? Is it something else? 2) May we ask about whether departments offering HIP courses have the resources to offer the HIP course? 3) May we reject individual courses that are inappropriate or suggest changes? Overall, what is the scope of our review to be? Although it is more work, perhaps it would make most sense to arrange a meeting with Exec officers.

L. Brown: CAAC doesn't review courses. This something that is left over from when Foundational Studies did not have someone from faculty watching over them. Bob Guell stated last year this is something that needs to be looked at. Any work here will be *pro forma*. All CAAC will be doing is reviewing the array to make sure that it fits the alignment of the standards.

A. Arrington-Sirois: So if we see a course that doesn't fit, we vote down the whole array?

L. Brown: Yes.

K. Yousif: UCC has done all of the work already. They can always contact A. Rider in UCC.

FAC: L. Brown: No report

FEBC: K. Hinton: No report

GC: J. Frost: No report

SAC: A. Badar: Met last Friday. They are working on Pass/Fail policy. I have reminded them that Exec expects SAC to complete this policy ASAP. SAC has passed a motion with the policy language, which will be forwarded to CAAC.

URC: S. Arvin: Received five submissions. Working on scoring them individually by November 15<sup>th</sup>. They will schedule a meeting after that.

**Adjournment 4:49 pm**