

#2

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

September 6, 2016

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Final Minutes

Members Present: L. Brown, J. Conant, R. Guell, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins, B. Kilp, S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, L. Phillips

Members Absent: None

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

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: J. Jasco, R. Lotspeich, D. McKee

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley:

- i) You've seen the five-day enrollment report. We are at the same overall head count enrollment as at this point last year. Unfortunately, we have a decline in full-time students with the make up in part-time students, who do not pay the full rate. We did make budget in terms of what we had set. We have about 350 fewer freshmen than we had last year. We will move heaven and earth to make sure that does not happen two years in a row.
- ii) I'm going to Bloomington on Thursday with to meet with the Higher Ed Learning Commission. We will be asking for a capital project to renovate the Fine Arts and Commerce building for \$15 million.
- iii) The Hulman Center CIP Board has been formed by the County Commission. We will be having our third meeting on Friday. The hope is the Board will approve a design for the building and a manager for the building. We are looking for a national manager most likely.
- iv) I will be announcing results of the strategic planning from last year at my fall address. To move forward, we need more buy-in from academic departments. We made a lot of progress but to continue, we need to get down further in the organization.
- v) T. Hawkins: Does the budget reflect salary increases for the year?

- vi) D. Bradley: I haven't had the conversation with Diane, but I think that if there was a need to discuss it she would have brought it up. I will have a definitive answer next week.
- vii) The Department of Labor has radically changed some of the standards. You can no longer be made exempt if you are making under \$48,000 a year. We now have 200-250 employees that we will move them from monthly to bi-weekly pay and be required to account for their time. There is also a creation of two new types of employees: 1) non-exempt professional staff; most people moved to hourly will be still viewed professional and be paid overtime and 2) there is an exemption in the law for people who spend most of their time with students in an instructional or guidance manner. Academic advisors will be in that category. Their salary will be moved to the minimum we have for instructors. We are doing this in as humane a way as possible. Every employer in the country will have to conform to this by December 1. Some people may struggle in the move from once a month to bi-weekly payroll.
 - (1) R. Guell: How is this going to happen for staff?
 - (2) D. Bradley: They will get a full check then 3 weeks then 2 weeks.
 - (3) R. Guell: There may be issues during that transition as they have a smaller paycheck in which to pay all of their health insurance, for example. Staff should be held harmless.
 - (4) D. Bradley: We're looking at the potential impact in different scenarios. We are also trying to tie this in with the November 1 salary increase. We're looking at various examples to see what exactly this impact is so we will have a better idea.
 - (5) R. Guell: My hope is you hold the staff harmless. You understand my example?
 - (6) D. McKee: I understand your example.
 - (7) D. Bradley: The question is the month or two of transition. Most people do find two week payroll a god-send but initially it can be a struggle.
- b) Provost M. Licari:
 - i) We had the ground breaking of the CHHS building.
 - ii) The Career Readiness task force is continuing to meet. We have one additional meeting next week. We have made good progress on creating learning objectives and putting them into the curriculum. Instead of building it entirely brand new, it will be a mixture of Foundational Studies and the major.
 - iii) The University College this past academic year undertook an advising experiment. It ended up that those students with an advisor with a lighter load had a retention rate 3.5% higher than the control group and that's encouraging. We are going to run the experiment again this year to see if we get comparable results.
 - iv) I've got a number of leadership posts I need to search for. I'm starting with the College of Education Dean since Kandi's last day is December 31. It will be up and running with a search committee soon.
 - v) I also have the Associate VP position on inclusive excellence open with most of the work being currently done by J. Powers. As I remarked to the group before that was on my list of goals for the year, to hire good people

- vi) D. Bradley: The goal is to have all of those positions filled soon.
- (1) M. Licari: My hope is to have them all filled by July 2017.
- vii) T. Hawkins: What about faculty searches? Will we know soon?
- (1) M. Licari: That is still the hope. The search approval last year didn't come until well into the semester. We do have some work to do still in terms of understanding how many and what kinds of faculty we have on board for the fall. It's difficult to go forward without uncertainty until you know what you have. There is some talk about the middle of September for an initial round of faculty searches.
- viii) R. Guell: In previous years when we had growing enrollments and we had underestimated revenues, there was a considerable amount of money used to pay for regularly occurring expenses that never found a way into the budget. We had a need for a residual. In the planning for the budget this year and next year, have we transitioned the known and knowable expenses into the budget?
- (1) D. Bradley: It is not as problematic as it was. We have a significant issue with faculty budget. That can be resolved in short order by getting us to the distribution of faculty to benchmark. I think that will be the pressure I will be putting on M. Licari this year to move us along that line.
- (2) S. Lamb: 70% tenure track, 15% instructors, 15% lecturers is the goal. Where are we at now?
- (3) D. Bradley: High on instructors, low on adjuncts. We are low on tenure track in a sense that there are some tenure track lines that have temporary faculty in them, but there is a high degree of confidence that that position will be filled with a tenure track faculty. What it really means is that we should have 65% or so of tenure track positions filled at any one time, 5% are agreed that these are temporary positions and they will be filled with full-time positions. I have asked M. Licari to get some level of agreement on tenure line expectations to get us where we need to be. It sounds like it's easy until you have about 50 people minimum in that communication line. We're better off than we used to be but we're not where we need to be.
- (4) S. Lamb: It's also difficult when tenured track faculty teach less than instructors.
- (5) D. Bradley: We have to be careful about that argument because it will be difficult to maintain that ratio if we think that way. The goals that I've agreed with you all on are pretty aggressive. If you look at national average, we have aggressive goals. Everyone will have to have an "other duties as assigned" work ethic. Especially when enrollment goes down.
- (6) D. Hantzis: Please help departments understand how this will work. How do we unwind some of this? This has happened over several years and we can't just flip a switch. What kind of faculty work needs to be done and by what kinds of faculty?

- (7) M. Licari: There are challenges in unwinding this. We have not gotten ourselves into this in 12-24 months, it's been years. We have 3 year contracts, tenured faculty, and personnel movement.
- (8) D. Hantzis: There are new leadership vacancies at the chairperson level. Do you have a sense of how many chairs are interim or vacated?
- (9) M. Licari: There were interim chairs when I got here last July, and there are now additional concerns, which is what spurred me to cover the material we did at the Academic Affairs retreat: leadership development. I think we've got a challenge generally speaking and we are not unique in this challenge. We need to have faculty willing to step up as department chairs. We have seen this numerous times in finding chairs in current departments. There should always be one person waiting to become department chair. The short term aspect is that we do have interim chairs, sometimes outside of the department. We will work very hard on resolving these kinds of issues this year. You should expect dean attention to this.
- (10) R. Guell: Susan Powers created trainings for new chairs. This is helpful as there are things that became necessary to learn in my new position.
- (11) M. Licari: The more that my office can put this information out and provide information and provide these types of opportunities the better.
- (12) S. Lamb: I think there is so much more than just MySam and Blue Reports. In the two departments I am in, I see two that have the ability to deal effectively with their colleagues and listen carefully and have the charisma necessary to be effective. It is amazing the extent of MySam and Blue Reports and other reports that have become important aspects of our jobs. You have to have colleagues that are happy to sacrifice and give. You need a chair who is in the ilk of a servant leader.
- (13) T. Hawkins: You cannot overestimate the importance of the department chair.

2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) We do not have a lot of action items on the agenda today, but there are important issues for discussion. I would like to thank our guests for taking the time to participate today.
- b) This will come up later in the agenda, but I would like to thank everyone for seeking out candidates for PTOC. It has been a challenge this past week. I think we will be able to populate this committee and get Senate approval, with the expectation of a well-functioning group.
- c) D. Hantzis was up late last night and requested interpretive clarification of Handbook & Biennial Review language. The four issues were as follows:
 1. Are Instructors allowed to serve on Senior Instructor reviews? It would seem that they can. However, it is not specified clearly. How do you read this language?

305.11.2.2.2 Peer Review Committees Each department shall elect a peer review committee of regular faculty members, including at least one tenured member and one Senior Instructor (where appropriate), to evaluate the performance of Instructors seeking promotion to Senior Instructor. Chairpersons and deans shall not serve on these committees. It is the Instructor's responsibility to present to reviewing bodies evidence of satisfactory performance in the specified areas of responsibility in accordance with the established criteria and standards.

The officers and provost agreed that instructors should not serve on a Senior Instructor review. However, we agreed that the language is unclear and should be changed to remove all doubt. We can do this at the next Exec if someone wishes to recommend alternate language. Or, I can give it to FAC.

2. According to the language in

305.12.1.3 Peer Review Committees. Each department shall elect a peer review committee of faculty members, including at least one tenured faculty member, and one Instructor, where appropriate, to evaluate the performance of Lecturers. Chairpersons and deans shall not serve on these committees. It is the Lecturer's responsibility to present to reviewing bodies evidence of satisfactory performance in the specified areas of responsibility.

Should we assume that the one Instructor could be a Senior Instructor?

The officers and provost agreed that an Instructor could be a Senior Instructor.

3. Regarding the Biennial Review: the process document says the faculty member may request a second review in the interim year and it will be conducted according to the same procedure; does that mean that we use the process as it was before we amended it in April 2016?

The officers and provost agreed it should be conducted according to the latest approved BR language.

4. Also, I want to be certain that Instructors eligible for promotion under the grandfather clause do not have to undergo both promotion and annual review. I was asked by two of our instructors if they should submit both promotion and their actual year, in case the promotion decision is negative. I believe they should submit only for promotion and that the decision can be promote and reappoint, do not promote and reappoint, or do not promote and do not reappoint for them as it can be for those seeking promotion in the ordinary year.. I believe the HB supports this (305.11.1.4, "The renewal of an instructor and the promotion of an instructor are separate decisions" and "An instructor denied promotion to senior instructor will remain eligible for a continued appointment as an instructor." (305.11.2.2.1).

The officers and the provost agree that instructors should not have to submit for both. The provost clarifies that the review is not “to reappoint” but rather to determine if the instructor is eligible to be reappointed.

- d) Last week, R. Guell inquired whether “faculty in the midst of phased retirement” are eligible to vote in their department. The consensus, confirmed by S. Powers and M. Green, is that these faculty are officially retired from the University, are working under a post-retirement arrangement, and therefore are not eligible to vote in their former department. If this is a significant point of confusion, we can add Handbook language. R. Guell suggested two alternatives: a hard 245 revision or an easier 305 revision. We can leave it alone, I can send it to FAC, or we can accept a proposal here.
 - e) Looking ahead to Exec next week, we will take photos on Tuesday. Also, L. Spence has been invited to introduce us to Canvas, a possible replacement for Blackboard.
 - i) D. Bradley: L. Spence is only presenting it. She has no desire to push it. The faculty will decide what to use.
 - f) Looking ahead to Senate, you received my first email requesting nominations for Temporary Faculty Advocate. Since then, I have sent out a second notice. Despite my initial bobble, I hope we can have someone in place by the end of next week. To date, we have one self-nomination: Abram Book. As it stands, the process has raised one concern in my mind: in order to do this we need to have a reliable list of full-time and part-time lecturers in place ASAP. This does not yet appear to be the case.
 - g) Finally, our discussion about required syllabus/pedagogical language on the Academic Affairs website has evolved. I have invited Molly Hare to give us a presentation regarding the FCTE website next week.
 - i) M. Licari: The syllabus material is available on the website but we can put it into BlackBoard so you would have it so that every course could have that built in. If that’s a better way to move this forward, you don’t have to pull the stuff on the website.
 - ii) T. Hawkins: If you can make that an option that would be great.
 - iii) M. Licari: You can edit it out if you don’t like it.
 - h) FAC will be sent a charge to modify the handbook so that only tenured faculty or senior instructors will serve on the evaluation committees for promotion to senior instructor. Also, only tenured faculty should serve on the annual review of assistant professors and their promotion to associate professor.
- 3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of August 23, 2016
- a) Motion to approve the minutes (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips) Vote: 9-0-0.
- 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
- a) R. Lotspeich: I have come here today to request that you approve a revised version of *Retention, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* for the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS).

The revised version was approved in April 2015 by the Faculty Council of the CAS, but it has not come into force because it was sent to the University Promotion and Tenure Oversight Committee (PTOC) for approval and the PTOC has failed to address it. The PTOC has not responded regarding this revision, even though they received the document more than a year ago.

The CAS is in great need of having this revision to guide the critical work of evaluating our faculty for retention, promotion and tenure. The evaluation practices and processes in the CAS would be much improved, and we should not have to wait for PTOC to respond in order to bring these new *Guidelines* into force. I ask that this Committee, the highest faculty authority at the University, approve our revised *Guidelines* so that we can begin using them.

- i) C. MacDonald: Historically, once your college approves it, it's in place. PTOC can critique it, but it's in place unless it is rejected later.
- ii) R. Lotspeich: If I can get this clarification then I can go back and give them clarification.
- iii) D. Bradley: We should implement a cooling off period; i.e., PTOC has a limited number of days to approve.
- iv) R. Guell: It's already been said but this frustration with PTOC goes back many chair persons ago; me included. That is why we essentially de-personed PTOC and repopulated it by the Senate committee and we do that today hopefully. I believe that the President's comment within 246 where PTOC is formed, we need to make a clarified statement on whether C. MacDonald's or PTOC's understanding of guidelines for approval is accurate.
- v) R. Lotspeich: I can't imagine PTOC will find this document problematic. It would be very useful to have in my college.
- vi) R. Guell: Would the CAS use this document for its October deliberations if we passed it out of here within the next 14 days or if it's simply to ensure we use it for next year?
- vii) B. Kilp: We shouldn't be voting on it.
- viii) T. Hawkins: We can put together PTOC today, get Senate approval next Thursday and have PTOC do this task first.
- ix) D. Bradley: You will have to accommodate people who are following the current document. To say we officially approved it today, it would be cleaner to accommodate.
- x) R. Lotspeich: I don't believe anything in this would put people at a disadvantage under the currently approved document.
- xi) D. Bradley: If we are wrong in that understanding then faculty could opt to be reviewed under the old guidelines. If you read the other and it advantages you, then use it.
- xii) D. Hantzis: Do you want it explicit? Shall I carry that to FAC?
- xiii) T. Hawkins: Yes.

- xiv) D. Bradley: In case something crazy happens, I think PTOC should have 90 days to review.
- xv) R. Lotspeich: I will return to my College and let them know we can use the document.
- xvi) T. Hawkins: I think that's what we are working towards.
- b) D. Hantzis: I had my first experience of having a student who is homeless in my class. She was told to call A. Perone. I've gone to the ISU website and all that comes up is financial aid. I checked our peer institutions and found no information for homeless students. I went to our Student Affairs site and there is no "homeless". I couldn't find any resources to suggest.
 - i) J. Conant: I had a student last semester who was sleeping under the bridge.
 - ii) D. Bradley: I'm not sure how to differentiate between a student who can't pay their fees and a student who is homeless. It seems like the state may have something for transitioning foster kids.
 - iii) C. MacDonald: There is very little help.
 - iv) D. Bradley: They do get tuition though.
 - v) D. Hantzis: It varies by state. I know we care but it seems like a lot of universities are just starting to talk about it and we need to have resources available.

5) Travel Policy Updates

- a) T. Hawkins: We will be covering two issues today: one, the transition from Orbitz to Altour; two, the new policy regarding travel to sensitive locations. We can invite our first guests to the table. Please tell us about the transition that was made at the end of the summer from Orbitz to Altour.
 - i) D. McKee: On August 1 we were notified that Orbitz had been merged with Agencia. We had been using Orbitz for our online direct bill provider. The new Agencia that they merged with would not allow that. We had Altour also but Orbitz was much more popular. For the interim, Altour will do the online direct bill. We are doing a search to replace Orbitz but will take us a few weeks to get done. This was a change made for us by our provider not by the university.
 - ii) T. Hawkins: How effective is Altour for the challenges faculty members have?
 - iii) J. Jacso: They are certainly allowed to do any online providers but they will be reimbursed after the trip whereas with Orbitz it was a direct bill to the university. You can use anything you want, but not as direct bill. We're just saying this is the only thing we have that allows it be direct billed to the university.
 - iv) T. Hawkins: Do faculty need prior approval to use other providers?
 - v) J. Jacso: You do not need prior approval. We will go through our website and update it. We're not going to allow you to travel first class, but...giving you the option to do what you need to do is what we want to provide.
 - vi) D. McKee: We will be doing an RFP to replace Orbitz.

- vii) R. Guell: I've had to cancel some travel in my department and have been able to get almost none of it back in regards to flights and hotels cancelled. Is it possible to have something to come back to the university?
 - viii) J. Jacso: The cheapest rates are always non-refundable. It will cost more money.
 - ix) R. Guell: If you die or don't work for the institution, anymore, it would be nice to get reimbursed.
 - x) D. McKee: We can put anything in an RFP to solicit. We haven't created it.
 - xi) J. Jacso: There are a number of online services we provide. We have Enterprise and parking at the airport that you can use it for faculty and university business but also personal business. We do have some direct bills with the Indianapolis airport. We can have meetings with the university.
 - xii) T. Hawkins: No matter how clear a website can be, hopefully one of the goals is to communicate effectively what we can and cannot do. If you can come to Senate that would be appreciated.
 - xiii) D. McKee: J. Jacso talks with new faculty at New Faculty Orientation.
 - xiv) C. MacDonald: That new information doesn't go to older faculty.
 - xv) D. McKee: We need to do better job communicating globally as you suggested. Last year we thought we found a new interactive package and then it was no longer going to be supported by Ellucian (Banner). But the new one we found, Chrome River will interface with Banner.
 - xvi) J. Jacso: It's an image-based software. You can send a picture of your receipts instead of sending your paperwork in. After we had some departments to set it up and use it, we were told they were no longer going to support it. We are looking at this new application. If we can get it at the right price, Chrome River will be what we use.
- b) T. Hawkins: Next we will move to faculty traveling to sensitive locations.
- i) J. Gustafson: Last week, I received an email containing an alert on a new travel policy statement that was circulated among several units on campus. I wish to make a brief statement about the potential harm the proposed policy, as it is currently written, would pose to academic freedom and student success at Indiana State University.

The "alert" read as follows:

The Vice President of your area or Provost must review and approve faculty/staff/student travel to countries/areas for which the U.S. State department has issued a Travel Warning or Alert. The State Department's Travel Warning/Alert page is located at <https://travel.state.gov/content/passports/en/alertswarnings.html>.

Approval will also be needed if the U.S. State Department has issued a Travel Alert or Warning after the initial authorization was granted, but prior to the date of the actual trip. It is the responsibility of the traveler to get approval prior to departure.

I understand this policy is now under review and I hope will be reconsidered after receiving input from Faculty Senate, since it directly concerns faculty research and teaching, which are under the senate's primary authority.

This travel policy is being revised in response to several situations surrounding international faculty travel last year, one of which was my proposed research trip to Iran. I will speak to that experience in particular as it is my own. I received funding from the former Dean John Murray in the College of Arts and Sciences to travel to Iran in July 2016, where I would be working with the deputy director of the National Archives to prepare materials for my environmental history seminar and conduct research towards a book project. I received funding in November of the previous year, and had an approved travel authorization in hand. However, just a few days before I was scheduled to leave, our departmental administrator informed me that my case was being reviewed by the Risk Management Officer, Mark Green. I reached out to Dr. Green in order to explain the situation and have some input into the review process. Instead, I received a brief email several days later from him explaining that my funding and travel authorization were abruptly revoked, and that ISU would no longer in any way support travel or research activities in Iran. I requested the opportunity to meet with Risk Management and the Provost during this process, and followed up later to seek clarification, but I still have yet to receive a response from either office.

I appreciate that the new policy is designed to prevent situations like this from happening in the future, which is a positive step. However, I and other faculty members hold deep concerns about the form of this new draft policy. It gives administration wide latitude over faculty research and teaching, by creating barriers to studying politically sensitive areas and topics. The new policy triggers a review process for travel to any area on a State Department warning and alert list, which covers nearly every corner of the globe, including large sections of the Middle East, Africa, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, and most of the time all or part of the European Union. If risk aversion is taken to an extreme, it would mean cutting off ISU faculty from conducting research or otherwise engaging with most of the world. In practice, I doubt this is intended to halt faculty activities in Mexico, faculty-led trips to Africa and China, or conferences in Belgium or France, or even Israel. Since so many other trips have been green-lighted to the Middle East and other international destinations which may be considered safety concerns, I can only conclude that the difference with my trip to Iran was not one of relative safety, but political sensitivity, which I can certainly understand. Iran does not always invite the most positive image in the minds of Americans. However, it is worth pointing out that under the current administration in Iran, there has been a major opening up. Iran has become a popular destination for tourism and academic exchange. The ASPS is even holding a major international conference in Shiraz next year. Unless you hold dual citizenship and haven't done your military service, overstay your VISA, or engage in overt political activities, there is little evidence of actual danger. There has been a steady flow of American researchers and travelers in the past few years, and I cannot find a single incident of a scholar or tourist, in Iran as an American citizen, who encountered any difficulties. The difference between Iran and much more dangerous destinations like Mexico, Nigeria, or Israel, is not safety, but poor political relations. I personally have a travel authorization that allows me to conduct research regularly in Chicago at the Oriental Institute and the Regenstein Library in Hyde Park, one of the most dangerous neighborhoods in a city with a violent crime rate of 884 incidents per 100,000 people. I am about 10 times more likely to be the victim of a violent crime in Chicago than Iran.

When crafting this new travel policy, I would urge you to include the faculty senate in the process and ultimately seek faculty input into determining acceptable risk. It is our job as scholars to engage with the rest of the world and conduct research on politically sensitive regions and topics. The draft policy grants administration wide authority to define what constitutes undue risk without any burden of evidence beyond the broad strokes of US travel advisories, and thus offers wide latitude for other concerns to take over. Furthermore, there remains no process even for appealing such decisions.

A restrictive and politicized travel policy furthermore places student success at risk by placing our graduates at a disadvantage compared to their peers at metropolitan schools where they are able to engage with and confront global diversity more directly. Success in this area requires a diverse and engaged faculty. We hired a new Africanist last year, and employ scholars in the Middle East, Latin America, China, Russia and Eastern Europe. If we place unnecessary restrictions on their activities, it would limit their ability to act as active and engaged scholars, and would damage our institutional reputation and ability to recruit quality faculty in the future. As experts in our fields, and people with lives outside of our work, we are well equipped to make decisions about placing ourselves in harm's way. It should be assumed at least that we are well-motivated not to go seek death. I personally have a wife, and two small children. In fact, I'm leaving this meeting early in order to attend my five-year-old's first baseball game. If I tried to conduct research in a war zone, I assure you my wife would kill me before I even left.

Risk aversion is a matter of academic freedom. We will always have to balance the interests of averting financial risk with having globally engaged scholars. There is a line somewhere in between the two extremes, where faculty can do productive research without placing an extraordinary strain on university resources. This is a matter of who has the burden of demonstrating reasonable or unreasonable risk and who has a voice in the process. We have international faculty and experts in global affairs whose voices are not often heard when it comes to the university's international outreach and diversity initiatives. This travel policy has the potential to marginalize faculty input even further. It creates obstacles across campus to studying and teaching on politically sensitive topics. In turn, this will negatively impact our ability to prepare students for the increasingly globalized world they will confront after graduation.

- ii) D. Bradley: Political considerations were not a part of this discussion. We need to consider if the risks to the institution are reasonable and the safety of the employee is preserved. There is a significant difference between street crime and the government turning you into a pawn. There have been instances where the government of Iran did turn travelers into pawns.
- iii) M. Licari: The intention here is to get this step in the approval process of travel authorization up front. One of the challenges is there was no mechanism that alerted me until very late into the planning stage. We need to get that authorization up front before pulling the rug on someone. The motivation is purely a risk litigation and safety. Politics doesn't factor in to it. Watch lists are designed to show safety concerns.

- iv) T. Hawkins: Do we have to presume there are countries that will always be disapproved?
- v) M. Licari: Yes, North Korea for example. With relative frequency, this isn't a proposed policy that will smash away international travel. It isn't as stern as that. What I'm interested in is getting this decision up front and getting a good look at places people are traveling to. It is something where the university is funding your trip and is responsible for your safety. From my experience, to extract faculty and students is nerve wracking. There are mechanisms that we can put in to place to head that off and we would be irresponsible to not review this type of travel.
- vi) S. Lamb: I think you have a strong statement and am pleased to hear the concept of review that each trip be evaluated for its potential benefits versus risks. I think an academic responsibility is to be in the forefront of some of the political dynamics that are occurring in stressed nations. If not us, then who? I hear about your capacity to assess the risk. If that be the case, is there not a middle ground where the faculty member can assume the risk or does it put the institution in such a poor light that the institution be foolish to take that route?
- vii) D. Bradley: If we cover the entire expense, we would assume moral and ethical responsibility to help.
- viii) R. Guell: If his statement is to be believed, you also said not to use his title.
- ix) M. Licari: I didn't say that.
- x) J. Gustafson: I have an email from M. Green.
- xi) M. Licari: If the university is sponsoring the trip, you can't sign away your workman's comp, etc. The decision I made was to prohibit the trips to Pakistan and Iran. I was frustrated about that because it put both faculty members in awkward positions. The timing of the decision was unfortunate.
- xii) D. Hantzis: I appreciate your statement and your scholarly obligation. In the 90s when I went to Sri Lanka, I would never have been able to do what I did there if I couldn't say I was a Professor. I want that to be clarified. If we are going to do this morally and ethically, I need to be able to represent myself for the reason I'm there. I appreciate the timeline creation.
- xiii) L. Phillips: In J. Gustafson's statement is the State Department's list the one we should always have to go by? This list could be possibly politically driven.
- xiv) M. Licari: Except North Korea.
- xv) T. Hawkins: I do want to suggest that we continue to talk about it and also to see what other universities are doing. For example, are blanket bans common?
- xvi) D. Bradley: The State Department's list is at our discretion.
- xvii) D. McKee: We have added a place on the travel authorization if it requires international travel so that we can get up front knowledge.
- xviii) J. Gustafson: The main thing I think we should have is faculty input. I think that would be the major change of the policy draft as it stands.
- xix) R. Guell: I know it sucks to why policies change, but we do owe Professor Gustafson some form of trip in the future once we figure this out.
- xx) J. Conant: It's unfortunate that the policy did not exist. We need it to exist. Particularly when sending students out, the university has to have a say in that. It's

not for places just that are war-torn and are dangerous. When there are diseases, etc., we have the responsibilities to warn people of that.

xxi) M. Licari: I agree and that's partially why we modified some of the forms so we can have conversation points. I think the absence of the policy is what led to the bad timing.

xxii) D. Bradley: The more discretion we want in the policy, the more qualitative the decision.

6) PTOC Nominations

a) Motion to approve the final draft list of PTOC members (C. MacDonald, D. Hantzis)

Vote: 7-1-1.

b) Motion to stagger terms by lots (R. Guell, D. Hantzis) Vote: 9-0-0.

i) Results: R. Haynes (3 year term), E. Glendenning (1 year term), R. Lotspeich (2 year term), J. Harper (1 year term), R. Hinshaw (3 year term), E. Strigas (2 year term), S. Ely (3 year term), K. Evans (1 year term), C. Crowder (2 year term)

7) Assessment Council Nominations

a) T. Hawkins: Send me e-mails with recommendations if you have them.

8) Adjournment: 5:32 p.m.