

Faculty Senate Meeting

17 March 2023

Senators present: Kim Delaney, Gary Black, Kyle Mara, Erin Reynolds, Nicholas Rhew, Jessica Mason, Stephanie Young, Shane White, Matt Hanka, Curt Gilstrap, Jason Hardgrave, Rob Dickes, Jessica Mason, Ashley Carter



Additional attendees: Mohammed Khayum, Chuck Conaway, Sally Vogel-Bauer, Amy Chan Hilton, Guoyuan Huang, Jenn Horn, Julie McCullough, Austin Siders, Constance Swenty

Held in BEC Boardroom

- Called to order: 2:30 pm
- Minutes from 24 February: 8 approved with factual correction. 2 abstentions.
- Senate Chair report from Kim:
 - Ad hoc committee with Amy Chan Hilton. Asking for a Faculty Senate representative to serve on the roles and reviews of clinical faculty (March 27th first meeting, 1:00-2:00 pm). Kim will forward Robert Dickes to Amy.
- Report from the Provost:
 - Chief data officer search is ongoing.
 - Last Tuesday, budget process is now completed.
- Old Business: Charge 2022_07: Merit Process Modification and Economic Benefits. The *ad hoc* committee's report has nine recommendations for action. We discussed and voted on items 1 through 6 (see the Minutes from 24 February).
 - Recommendation 7:
 - Curt questioned language and how related back to the University Handbook. Kim clarified that all should be in writing. Sally noted that the omission was not intentional. Also, discussion on redundancy about point 7d.
 - Language modifications
 - “When making their recommendation to the college dean or director,”
 - “This response should go to the faculty member supervisor, dean or director, and provost.”
 - “Further actions should follow the grievance procedures outlined in the University Handbook”
 - 11 votes for amended recommendation. None opposed.
 - Recommendation 8:
 - Hanka noted nothing in University Handbook did not have any specific language about leave of absences. Shane asked questions about increase of pay. Kim reiterated that everything we are voting upon here today is to be taken to upper administration for changes.

- Language modifications: “At the beginning of the fiscal year, faculty will receive salary increase letters indicating their new salary and the percentage increase that was awarded to the previous year’s salary.”
 - 13 votes for amended recommendation. None opposed.
- New Business:
 - Charge 2023_02—Duties and Responsibilities of Department Chairs
 - CNHP have 12 faculty on clinical track. Currently, clinical track faculty do not have the option of tenure. Faculty do not have the right to serve as chair of departments. Policy prevents a clinical track faculty to be appointed a chair.
 - Discussion ensued. Note that clinical track faculty do not have the option to be tenured. Endorse the charge and include amended language “clinical assistant professor.” Encourage administration to look into having assistant professors to potentially serve as department chairs. “
 - 12 vote for amended charge. 1 opposed.
 - Charge 2023_03—Implementing a 10-week administrative withdrawal date.
 - Hardgrave: Noted that administrative withdrawal is not permanent.
 - Kim: Students can participate in CPS (Course Perception Surveys) even if they have been withdrawn from the class. Noted the complexity of students withdrawing from classes (and a retention issue).
 - Gary: Noted that differences between attendance for face-to-face and online courses. What is the purpose of administratively withdrawing students?
 - Curt: Noted that he emails students as a way for them to drop class.
 - Jenn: Freshman students do not know how to navigate the process. They also are afraid of requesting to drop the course from the instructor.
 - Kim: How does a W differ from an F when it comes to financial aid?
 - Jason: Impacts their GPA
 - Kim: Subcommittee(s) would work with institutional analytics (CPS) or evaluating Add/Drop processes. No indication in the any of the handbooks about the actual Add/Drop processes.
 - Nick: Motion to create a subgroup of Faculty Senate to disentangle the process comprised of three members.
 - 13 votes. None opposed.
 - Nick: Motion to table any of these issues and original charge.
 - 13 votes. None opposed.
- Next meeting: 31 March 2023.
- Meeting adjourned: 3:49 pm.

Date(s) addressed by Senate:

04/21/2022

03/17/2023

CHARGE TO THE USI FACULTY SENATE

Formal Request for USI Faculty Senate Action

Appendix 1

Charge: 2022_07

Name: Sally Vogl-Bauer (Optional)

Date of Submission: March 21, 2022

Name of Faculty Senate Representative:

1. Charles Conaway
2. Michael Strezewski
3. Stephanie Young

Complete the following items and submit this form to either your Faculty Senate Representative or to the Faculty Senate Chair for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

1. Charge Title:

USI Merit Process Modification

2. Background:

Provide an explanation of the background and context for the proposed charge. What problem, issue, or experience prompts the proposal of the charge?

Last year was the first time I participated in the merit process at USI as a faculty member. This experience showed me that the current merit process used for reviewing faculty performance has many issues that need to be reviewed/revise in order to provide consistency and transparency for these decisions. This issue impacts employee relations as well as morale because most faculty don't know how merit increases are determined (if merit rubrics are used, they are often not shared with faculty; when they are shared, there may be inconsistencies between how merit is determined versus how faculty performance is reviewed using faculty annual report (FAR) data). This also impacts those individuals charged with completing faculty merit reviews, as they would also benefit from clear, standardized, guidelines. I break down the specific concerns in item #3.

3. Action Requested and Desired Result:

Specifically state what action you would like the Senate to take and the desired outcome that you would like to see.

There are many action steps I would like to see addressed. They include the following: (1) I recommend the creation of an ad hoc committee to review/revise merit procedures, working in conjunction with Faculty Senate and the Provost's Office, having representation across colleges,

faculty, staff, and administration. The merit process impacts faculty across campus, so having representation across units is recommended; (2) Review the level of consistency of procedures across academic units. For example, College websites do not clearly indicate what the FAR guidelines are. This does not mean annual reports are not done, but there are inconsistencies with what is required when completing a faculty annual report. There is even less known when it comes to merit; (3) Determine what evidence/documents are to be used for making merit decisions. Faculty often assume that it will be faculty annual reports, but this may not be the case. Colleges may be using different types of evidence and all of this complicates what evidence is being gathered and used to make these decisions; (4) Review the level of standardization across departments within Colleges. For example, every department in the College of Liberal Arts has its own merit guidelines; (5) Determine what criteria should be used when making merit decisions. It should not be assumed that the criteria used for merit align with FARs. In some instances, there are merit criteria that may contain departmental-centric biases (that are often unknown by faculty). It is also unclear how balanced merit criteria are. Presently, there are not percentages or weights for how faculty are to be spending their time/being evaluated per each main criteria area (e.g., teaching, research, service); (6) Determine the time periods that are to be used for merit decisions. Is it the calendar year (January - December), the academic year (July - June)? Furthermore, how do these time periods coincide with evidence provided by faculty? For example, FARs often use calendar years. But if an academic calendar year is being used for merit, faculty may not have had opportunities to provide evidence for the entire time period. Whatever decision is made about the time period under consideration, it should be standardized for all individuals to aid in consistency and whether goals have been achieved within the designated period and to ensure that faculty have been able to provide evidence for the time period under review; (7) Address the lack of consistency in how information pertaining to merit is communicated and shared with faculty. At the present time, University contract letters are vague. They do not indicate a faculty member's previous year's salary, just the new salary. They also do not indicate the percentage of pay increase for the particular contract period. Faculty in some colleges receive formal verification of the size of their merit increase, but this does not happen for all academic units. In other instances, faculty receive no verification in advance of receiving their university contract letters; (8) Ensure that merit increases are assessed separately from salary compression increases. These two items are not the same thing and merit funds should not be used to correct for larger salary compression issues on campus. Salary compression is a real thing, but it should be addressed separately from decisions about merit; and (9) Determine a formal appeal or grievance process for merit decision

appeals. There is no formal process currently in place for appealing a merit decision.

4. Potential Resources:

Provide any information that can help Faculty Senate fully address the charge. Attach additional documents if necessary.

In order to fully address the items in this charge, this will require an extensive review of current practices across academic units. Therefore, based on the items listed, it is recommended that these items (e.g., FAR reports, current merit practices) be gathered at the committee level.

Items 5-7 are to be completed by Senate Chair or Secretary:

5. Senate Comments:

6. Action Taken by the Faculty Senate:

7. Action Taken by the Administration:

Executive Summary

Merit Review Committee

Broad Summary Statement

At its April 1, 2022, meeting, Faculty Senate approved Charge #2022 07 titled “USI Merit Process Modification”. (see Appendix A). This charge recommended that Faculty Senate, with the support of the Provost’s Office, form a campus-wide committee to review the merit (salary/pay increase) decision-making process currently in place at the University of Southern Indiana. A committee representing all academic units on campus was formed in Spring 2022 to address the items noted in the charge (specific charge items are noted below).

Composition of the Committee:

- Sally Vogl-Bauer, Chairperson, College of Liberal Arts
- Chuck Conaway, College of Liberal Arts
- Alisa (AL) Holen, College of Liberal Arts
- Rick Hudson, Pott College of Science, Engineering, and Education
- Kenny Purcell, Pott College of Science, Engineering, and Education
- Jennifer Evans, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Marilyn Ostendorf, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Cindi Clayton, Romain College of Business
- Brian McGuire, Romain College of Business
- Becca Neel, Rice Library
- Sarah Will, Human Resources

The committee worked from June 2022 – February 2023 and (a) researched how merit pay increase process was performed by all academic units on campus, (b) reviewed how comparable peer institutions addressed merit, and (c) surveyed department chairs and directors across campus to learn how merit decisions were made.

Based on the work done, the Committee is making a series of recommendations that align with the intent of the charge put forward. The following sections of this Executive Summary (a) provide the specific charge, (b) summarize the data collection and analysis done, and (c) make recommendations/action items in alignment with the findings and charge.

Specific Charge Items

There were nine specific items to Faculty Senate Charge #2022 07 “USI Merit Process Modification”:

1. Recommend the creation of an ad hoc committee to review/revise merit procedures, working in conjunction with Faculty Senate and the Provost’s Office, having representation across colleges, faculty, staff, and administration.

2. Review the level of consistency of procedures across academic units.
3. Determine what evidence/documents are to be used when making merit decisions.
4. Review the level of standardization across departments within Colleges.
5. Determine what criteria should be used when making decisions.
6. Determine the time periods that are to be used for merit decisions.
7. Address the lack of consistency in how information pertaining to merit is communicated and shared with faculty.
8. Ensure that merit increases are assessed separately from salary compression increases.
9. Determine a formal appeal or grievance process for merit decision appeals.

Summary of the Data Collection and Analysis

The Merit Review Committee gathered data from several areas: (a) reviewing faculty annual report (FAR) documents currently used by academic units, (b) examining how comparable peer institutions address issues of merit, and (c) surveying department chairs and directors to learn more about how merit decisions are made. Below is a summary of each of these efforts.

a. FAR Comparisons

At the onset, the Committee realized that faculty annual reports (FARs) played an important role in the merit process, as they are often the primary evidence provided by faculty members. Thus, while the Committee's charge was centered on merit-based salary decisions, the Committee felt it would be helpful to investigate the level of consistency of the templates used for faculty annual reports across academic units.

Although the Provost's Office provides a template to use for Faculty Annual Reports, most colleges modify this template for their own use. All faculty annual reports templates included documenting faculty activity regarding teaching/advising (or professional performance for Rice Library), scholarship/professional activity, and service. Each college describes what qualifies under each title slightly differently. At least one college and the Rice Library required faculty to identify professional goals for the next year.

b. Comparable Institutions

The committee reviewed the handbooks of Ball State University, Murray State University, Western Kentucky University, and Northern Kentucky University. Procedures and schedules for merit pay increases were found in each university's Salary/Compensation handbook section

(similar to our Section E.1). While procedures and schedules varied by institution, all had a defined process and required communication between the department or program chairs and the faculty members when merit pay increase recommendations were made.

c. Chair/Director Survey

During the Fall 2022 semester, Council of Chairs and Program Directors members were asked to complete a Qualtrics survey on the merit process used in their respective departments. Thirty-five individuals participated in the study; however, some data was missing. The results indicated there was little level of consistency across academic units, as evidenced by the following results:

1. Although 29 participants stated that they reviewed faculty annual reports (FARs), only 14 participants claimed they completed the spreadsheets generated by Human Resources for merit-based salary recommendations. Eighteen participants stated they provide written or oral feedback to the dean about merit-based salary decisions.
2. Participants reported different levels of providing feedback to faculty about their annual review.
 - a. 13 participants always provided feedback,
 - b. 7 participants only provided feedback sometimes or for some faculty,
 - c. 8 participants provided feedback only if necessary, and
 - d. 1 participant never provides feedback.
3. In written responses, some participants identified that their departments used rubrics for merit-based salary decisions, but this practice does not appear to be common.
4. As indicated above, practices regarding merit decisions vary by academic unit. In addition to the differences listed above, the survey of chairs and program directors found the following:
 - a. When merit-based salary pools were available, 12 participants reported that faculty in their department always get the same percent increase;
 - b. Whereas 11 participants reported faculty sometimes get the same percent increase; and
 - c. 1 participant reported that faculty never get the same percent increase.
5. Regarding training,
 - a. 6 participants indicated they had received training or guidance about reviewing annual reports and making salary recommendations,
 - b. 19 indicated they had not received training.

Recommendations/Action Items

The Merit Review Committee is making nine (9) recommendations to address the merit review process at the University of Southern Indiana:

1. In the event that the pay pool for raises does not exceed 2% of the current salary base,
 - a. All faculty should receive an equal percentage increase in their salaries.
 - b. No evidence or documentation other than continued employment is required to calculate the increase.
2. In the event that the pay pool for raises exceeds 2% of the current salary base,
 - a. The first 2% of the pay pool will be distributed as described above.
 - b. The portion of the pay pool that exceeds 2% of the current salary base will be distributed applying the process defined in the University Handbook that is based on the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) submitted by the Faculty member.
3. Given the radically different natures of disciplines both within and across the colleges, no universal set of criteria can be developed for merit pay calculations.
 - a. Rather, the faculty members of each department should determine appropriate criteria for merit pay calculations to be made by the department chair.
 - b. These criteria should align with faculty activity reported on the Faculty Annual Report (FAR), but each department shall determine how to prioritize faculty achievements in these categories to calculate merit pay increases. When setting criteria for their department, faculty should be mindful of the different expectations associated with different faculty ranks and types of contracts. All full-time faculty, regardless of rank or type of contract, are eligible for merit pay increases.
4. The time period to be used for making merit pay decisions will be the most recently completed calendar year (January-December) as documented in the Faculty Annual Report (FAR).
5. In the event that no pay pool is available for merit raises in any given year, faculty accomplishments shall be carried forward to the next year in which such raises are calculated.
 - a. The carryover time window is two years.
 - b. Individual faculty members and their departments may deem a long-term project appropriate for carryover.
6. Process:
 - a. Department chairs will forward merit pay recommendations to the college dean.
 - b. The college dean makes an independent evaluation and forwards their recommendation and the department chair's to the Provost.
 - c. Merit amounts may be adjusted at any level during this process.

7. When making their recommendation to the college dean,
 - a. Department chairs shall notify faculty of their recommendation in writing.
 - b. Provide each faculty member with a justification for their recommendation.
 - c. After this or any subsequent adjustments to the amount awarded, faculty will have five business days to respond in writing to the recommendation. This response should go to the faculty member's immediate supervisor (e.g., department chairperson or dean).
 - d. Further actions should follow the conflict resolution steps outlined in the University Handbook.
 8. Faculty will receive fiscal year salary increase letters indicating their new salary and the percentage increase that was awarded to the previous year's salary.
 9. To address items 1-3 and 6-8, the committee recommends Section E.1 of the University Handbook be edited to include the language outlined in Appendix B of this report.
-
-

Appendix A
CHARGE TO THE USI FACULTY SENATE
Formal Request for USI Faculty Senate Action

Name: Sally Vogl-Bauer (Optional)

Date of Submission: March 21, 2022

Name of Faculty Senate Representative:

1. Charles Conaway
2. Michael Strezewski
3. Stephanie Young

Complete the following items and submit this form to either your Faculty Senate Representative or to the Faculty Senate Chair for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

1. Charge Title:

USI Merit Process Modification

2. Background:

Provide an explanation of the background and context for the proposed charge. What problem, issue, or experience prompts the proposal of the charge?

Last year was the first time I participated in the merit process at USI as a faculty member. This experience showed me that the current merit process used for reviewing faculty performance has many issues that need to be reviewed/ revised in order to provide consistency and transparency for these decisions. This issue impacts employee relations as well as morale because most faculty don't know how merit increases are determined (if merit rubrics are used, they are often not shared with faculty; when they are shared, there may be inconsistencies between how merit is determined versus how faculty performance is reviewed using faculty annual report (FAR) data). This also impacts those individuals charged with completing faculty merit reviews, as they would also benefit from clear, standardized, guidelines. I break down the specific concerns in item #3.

3. Action Requested and Desired Result:

Specifically state what action you would like the Senate to take and the desired outcome that you would like to see.

There are many action steps I would like to see addressed. They include the following: (1) I recommend the creation of an ad hoc committee to review/revise merit procedures, working in conjunction with Faculty Senate and the Provost's Office, having representation across colleges,

faculty, staff, and administration. The merit process impacts faculty across campus, so having representation across units is recommended; (2) Review the level of consistency of procedures across academic units. For example, College websites do not clearly indicate what the FAR guidelines are. This does not mean annual reports are not done, but there are inconsistencies with what is required when completing a faculty annual report. There is even less known when it comes to merit; (3) Determine what evidence/documents are to be used for making merit decisions. Faculty often assume that it will be faculty annual reports, but this may not be the case. Colleges may be using different types of evidence and all of this complicates what evidence is being gathered and used to make these decisions; (4) Review the level of standardization across departments within Colleges. For example, every department in the College of Liberal Arts has its own merit guidelines; (5) Determine what criteria should be used when making merit decisions. It should not be assumed that the criteria used for merit align with FARs. In some instances, there are merit criteria that may contain departmental-centric biases (that are often unknown by faculty). It is also unclear how balanced merit criteria are. Presently, there are not percentages or weights for how faculty are to be spending their time/being evaluated per each main criteria area (e.g., teaching, research, service); (6) Determine the time periods that are to be used for merit decisions. Is it the calendar year (January - December), the academic year (July - June)? Furthermore, how do these time periods coincide with evidence provided by faculty? For example, FARs often use calendar years. But if an academic calendar year is being used for merit, faculty may not have had opportunities to provide evidence for the entire time period. Whatever decision is made about the time period under consideration, it should be standardized for all individuals to aid in consistency and whether goals have been achieved within the designated period and to ensure that faculty have been able to provide evidence for the time period under review; (7) Address the lack of consistency in how information pertaining to merit is communicated and shared with faculty. At the present time, University contract letters are vague. They do not indicate a faculty member's previous year's salary, just the new salary. They also do not indicate the percentage of pay increase for the particular contract period. Faculty in some colleges receive formal verification of the size of their merit increase, but this does not happen for all academic units. In other instances, faculty receive no verification in advance of receiving their university contract letters; (8) Ensure that merit increases are assessed separately from salary compression increases. These two items are not the same thing and merit funds should not be used to correct for larger salary compression issues on campus. Salary compression is a real thing, but it should be addressed separately from decisions about merit; and (9) Determine a formal appeal or grievance process for merit decision

appeals. There is no formal process currently in place for appealing a merit decision.

4. Potential Resources:

Provide any information that can help Faculty Senate fully address the charge. Attach additional documents if necessary.

In order to fully address the items in this charge, this will require an extensive review of current practices across academic units. Therefore, based on the items listed, it is recommended that these items (e.g., FAR reports, current merit practices) be gathered at the committee level.

Items 5-7 are to be completed by Senate Chair or Secretary:

5. Senate Comments:

6. Action Taken by the Faculty Senate:

7. Action Taken by the Administration:

Appendix B

Proposed University Handbook Language

The following language is recommended to be inserted in the University of Southern Indiana's University Handbook to reflect the recommendations made in this Executive Summary.

- In the event that the pay pool for raises does not exceed 2% of the current salary base,
 - All faculty should receive an equal percentage increase in their salaries.
 - No evidence or documentation other than continued employment is required to calculate the increase.

- In the event that the pay pool for raises exceeds 2% of the current salary base,
 - The first 2% of the pay pool will be distributed as described above.
 - The portion of the pay pool that exceeds 2% of the current salary base will be distributed applying the process defined in the University Handbook that is based on the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) submitted by the Faculty member.

- Given the radically different natures of disciplines both within and across the colleges, no universal set of criteria can be developed for merit pay calculations.
 - Rather, the faculty members of each department should determine appropriate criteria for merit pay calculations to be made by the department chair.
 - These criteria should align with faculty activity reported on the Faculty Annual Report (FAR), but each department shall determine how to prioritize faculty achievements in these categories to calculate merit pay increases. When setting criteria for their department, faculty should be mindful of the different expectations associated with different faculty ranks and types of contracts. All full-time faculty, regardless of rank or type of contract, are eligible for merit pay increases.

- The time period to be used for making merit pay decisions will be the most recently completed calendar year (January-December) as documented in the Faculty Annual Report (FAR).

- In the event that no pay pool is available for merit raises in any given year, faculty accomplishments shall be carried forward to the next year in which such raises are calculated.
 - The carryover time window is two years.
 - Individual faculty members and their departments may deem a long-term project appropriate for carryover.

- Department chairs will
 - Forward merit pay recommendations to the college dean.
 - The College dean makes an independent evaluation and forwards their recommendation and the department chair's to the Provost.
 - Merit amounts may be adjusted at any level during this process.

- When making their recommendation to the college dean,
 - Department chairs shall notify faculty of their recommendation in writing.
 - Provide each faculty member with a justification for their recommendation.
 - After this or any subsequent adjustments to the amount awarded, faculty will have five working days to respond in writing to the recommendation. This response should go to the faculty member's immediate supervisor (e.g., department chairperson or dean).
 - Further actions should follow the conflict resolutions steps outlined in the University Handbook.

 - Faculty will receive fiscal year salary increase letters indicating their new salary and the percentage increase that was awarded to the previous year's salary.
-
-

Name: Connie Swenty (Optional)

Date of Submission: 2.23.23

Name of Faculty Senate Representative:

1. Erin Reynolds
2. Amy Wilson
3. Jessica Mason

Complete the following items and submit this form to either your Faculty Senate Representative or to the Faculty Senate Chair for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

1. **Charge Title:**

Duties and Responsibilities of Department Chairs

2. **Background:**

Provide an explanation of the background and context for the proposed charge. What problem, issue, or experience prompts the proposal of the charge?

The CNHP has 12 faculty who have chosen clinical track. Clinical track faculty do not have the option of tenure. Several of the faculty are clinical associate or clinical professors. The faculty feel they should be given the right to serve as a chair of their departments. The policy currently prevents a clinical track faculty to be appointed a chair.

The following statement is found in the Faculty Handbook, Duties and Responsibilities of Department Chairs, Section II, Appointment, Tenure and Evaluation of Department Chairs.

To be appointed chair, a candidate must be a tenured member of the faculty or eligible to receive tenure in the department.

<https://handbook.usi.edu/duties-and-responsibilities-of-department-chairs>

The CNHP chairs and faculty are requesting that the statement be changed to:

To be appointed chair, a candidate must be a tenured member of the faculty or eligible to receive tenure in the department or hold the rank of clinical associate professor or clinical professor.

3. Action Requested and Desired Result:

Specifically state what action you would like the Senate to take and the desired outcome that you would like to see.

We would like Senate endorsement for a change.

4. Potential Resources:

Provide any information that can help Faculty Senate fully address the charge. Attach additional documents if necessary.

Items 5-7 are to be completed by Senate Chair or Secretary:

5. Senate Comments:

6. Action Taken by the Faculty Senate:

7. Action Taken by the Administration:

Name: anonymous (Optional)

Date of Submission: March 2, 2023

Name of Faculty Senate Representative:

1. Dr. Stephanie Young
2. Dr. Jason Hardgrave
3. Mr. Rob Dickes

Complete the following items and submit this form to either your Faculty Senate Representative or to the Faculty Senate Chair for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

1. **Charge Title:**

Implementing a 10-week Administrative Withdrawal date

2. **Background:**

Provide an explanation of the background and context for the proposed charge. What problem, issue, or experience prompts the proposal of the charge?

In recent years, we have seen more students attend classes through the 6-week administrative withdrawal period but stop attending classes, for a variety of reasons, after that period. This creates challenges for both student and faculty. For faculty, if the student is still enrolled after the administrative withdrawal date, that student is given the opportunity to complete a course perception survey (CPS). While a student who is not attending classes may not complete the CPS, the opportunity still exists. If a faculty member has denied a non-attending student the opportunity to complete all missing coursework in the last few weeks of class, the non-attending student can complete the CPS with negative comments on how the faculty member was "unhelpful," "mean," etc. Such negative comments can have an unfairly negative effect on annual faculty reviews and applications for promotion and tenure

If a student is unable to attend the course after the withdrawal date and does not reach out to their faculty member for a drop form signature, faculty are left with no choice but to report an F for the student at the end of the course. For students, an F can be especially challenging for several reasons: 1) an F means the student must take that class again to which can be difficult depending on when/how often the class is offered; 2) the F has a substantially negative impact their overall GPA,

which not only can make admission into their desired program difficult, but, for an already struggling student, a F can be discouraging enough that a student will not continue their education at USI.

I argue that adding a second date where faculty can administratively withdraw non-attending students can be a retention effort for not just our qualified faculty who no longer need to fear a negative evaluation from a student who hasn't been in class, but it can be especially beneficial our struggling students. A student is likely to find it easier to "recover" from a W than an F which means they are likely to continue their education at USI and their challenging semester will not discourage/stop them from pursuing their degree.

3. Action Requested and Desired Result:

Specifically state what action you would like the Senate to take and the desired outcome that you would like to see.

I would like Faculty Senate to work with the necessary offices (Registrar? Provost?) to implement this second administrative withdrawal date. I propose the following:

1- The second administrative withdrawal date must take place prior to when data is collected for the course perception surveys so that students who are administratively withdrawn at the second date are not included in the CPS emails.

2 - To mirror the pre-midterm administrative withdrawal warning (NA at week 3), I propose that an "F-NA" be added as a mid-term grade option for students who have stopped showing up just prior to midterm. Or, if that isn't possible, a similar warning should be made available so faculty can warn students that they will be administratively withdrawn before the end of the semester.

3- ONLY faculty who need to administratively withdraw a student at week 10 (or whatever date is used) will need to complete this report - it should not be required of all faculty or all faculty teaching 100-200 level courses.

4 - It's important to note that this should only be used for students who are not attending class. A student who is attending class but not completing the coursework or is submitting failing coursework should still be required to complete a drop form from the Registrar's Office.

4. Potential Resources:

Provide any information that can help Faculty Senate fully address the charge. Attach additional documents if necessary.

Items 5-7 are to be completed by Senate Chair or Secretary:

5. Senate Comments:

6. Action Taken by the Faculty Senate:

7. Action Taken by the Administration: