

USI Faculty Senate Minutes

24 February 2017

Senators present: Nick LaRowe, Brandon Field, Brett Long, Erin Reynolds, Charlotte Connerton, Mary Kay Arvin, Sang Woo Heo, Chuck Conaway, Wes Durham, Sheri Keenan, Jason Fertig, Chad Milewicz, Rex Strange, Peter Whiting

Visitors present: Riley Guertzini (The Shield), Amy Chan Hilton (CETL), Ben Luttrull (University Communications).

- Called to order: 2:30pm
- Minutes approved unanimously.
- Senate Chair's Report:
 - Peter, reporting from President's Council:
 - Budget hearing presentations will be March 15, 17, 24, and 31. Theme for the presentations is "growth"; no clear definition of what that means (what kind of growth, what is growing, etc) conveyed.
 - Andrew Lenhardt talked about having an outside firm to do a review of salary and benefits of support staff.
 - Richard Toeniskoetter: Hacking attempts directed at our campus have increased, and with increasing levels of sophistication. Some have been successful. Workshops about security training will be offered starting in April.
 - Access has been restricted to the set of outdoor doors of Wright Administration Building that enter into the President's and Provost's office suites (access from the interior through 103 or 104 remains unchanged). There is also a plan to look into locks that use embedded chips in the Eagle Access cards to grant access to different areas.
 - Working on HP third floor renovations; IU Med School classes are being rearranged so half of the floor can be worked on at a time, and Steve Bridges will be meeting with UE and IU to finalize our working relationships with the IU Med School downtown.
 - USI Fact Book is being updated.
 - Chair's Council:
 - Draft proposal for changing our requirements for English proficiency testing for incoming foreign students to make them more in line with other universities. This would increase the number of different exams that we allow, and include other acceptable means of demonstrating proficiency.
 - Adapting methods and techniques for documenting experiential learning.
- Revisiting the tuition waiver charge that we previously approved: the language as written in the recommendation only included faculty, not faculty and staff.
 - Question about whether the calculations from the Economic Benefits Committee were based on faculty and staff, or just on faculty. Examining the presentation they sent, the numbers seemed to be based on faculty and staff.

- Another question would be whether or not the benefit applies to retirees. It might have, once.
- Would like to ask Economic Benefits Committee to change the wording on their recommendation to replace "Faculty" to "Faculty and Staff".
- Would also like them to add a projection of the required cost if 10% more and 10% less people took advantage of the benefit.
- Would like Economic Benefits Committee to get us a response in time for Nick to add it to the budget hearing on March 24th.

New Business:

- Budget request presentation; Nick will present the Faculty Senate on March 24th.
 - Raises and tuition waiver charge will be the first two things that Nick will request.
 - Economic Benefits Committee usually compares our salaries to our peer institutions, could we use those data in the presentation?
 - Nick will also contact Staff Council because they are part of our budget cluster.
 - The theme for this year's budget presentations is "growth". We would like to hear how that word should be defined.
 - Nick would like us to talk to our respective colleges and we will discuss it at our next meeting.
- Our past practice for subcommittee reports has been that they were received at the last meeting of the semester, but that means that there is very little time to act on the results. If the reports were received earlier than that, there would be enough time to act on the reports. This could be customized by committee.
 - When we give a charge, we could ask for a due date from the subcommittee.
 - Motion to change the reception of subcommittee reports to the penultimate meeting of the year.
- The Tenure and Promotion charge from the University Promotions Committee charge from 5 February 2016. The request was that faculty going up for promotion be given information with regard to a failed application. A prior charge to this effect had been sent to the University Promotions Committee, and it was sent back for clarification.
 - The motion was made and seconded that we send a charge to the Faculty Affairs Committee that they examine the question of feedback from the University Promotions Committee to determine if: (1) we can charge the Promotions Committee to give a reason for their decision to the candidate, or (2) if that would require a change to the bylaws, or (3) if it is impossible to request such feedback, and if so to provide us with an explanation. We would like the report by April 7th. Motion was approved with one opposed.
- Adjourned, 4pm.