



June 27, 2025

Meeting Minutes

www.usi.edu/faculty-senate

- I. CALL TO ORDER – Nicholas Rhew, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.
- II. ROLL CALL – Nicholas Rhew, Chair
 - a. *Faculty Senators Present: Amie McKibban (At-Large), Peter Whiting (At-Large), Nicholas Rhew (Romain College of Business), McManus Woodend (College of Liberal Arts), Brett Anderson (College of Liberal Arts), Jenna Thacker (College of Nursing and Health Professions), Guoyuan Huang (Pott College of Science, Engineering and Education), and Kyle Mara (Pott College of Science, Engineering and Education)*
 - b. *Alternates: Prasenjit Ghosh (for Jiaying Liu, Romain College of Business), Tom Noland (for Nancy Kovanic, Romain College of Business), and Kirsten Williams (for Kate Sherrill, Library)*
 - c. *Faculty Senators Absent without Alternate: Jessica Mason (College of Nursing and Health Professions), Zachary Ward (College of Nursing and Health Professions), Susan Ely (Pott College of Science, Engineering and Education), and Todd Schroer (College of Liberal Arts),*
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – The minutes from the April 25, 2025, meeting were approved through unanimous consent after one correction: adding “reduction” after “5%” in the sentence reading “He announced that there is an anticipated 5% across all line items...”
- IV. PRESIDENT, PROVOST, AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS
 - a. President Bridges reported on the successful conclusion of the search for the Vice President for Student Affairs, the relocation of offices from Wright Administration Building due to renovations, trustee vacancies, updating the university home, the progress of the searches for the Vice President for Finance and Administration and Vice President for Governmental Affairs, the mechanics of securing funds for the raise pool. Additionally, he announced dates for the next Board of Trustees meeting and the Presidential Inauguration and took questions from senators.
 - b. Provost Blunt reported on the relocation of the Provost’s Office, the successful completion of searches for the Honors Program Director and Dean of the Pott College, other vacancies, HEA 1001 compliance for under-threshold programs, renovation updates in Rice Library, NEEF grant funding to enhance outdoor learning spaces, and updates on implementation of new policies concerning academic standing. Additionally, she answered questions from senators.



- c. Assistant Provost Hardgrave reported on the bees, Watermark, and Core 39 assessment.

V. FACULTY SENATE CHAIR REPORT

- a. The Faculty Senate Chair deferred his report to the discussion of business items related to HEA 1001.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS – None

VII. OLD BUSINESS – None

VIII. NEW BUSINESS –

- a. Nicholas Rhew moved, and Brett Anderson seconded, to recommend the distributed policy proposals regarding post-tenure review to the USI Board of Trustees for compliance with HEA 1001.

- i. During discussion, Nicholas Rhew moved, and McManus Woodend seconded, to amend list of acceptable scholarly products in the proposal to read:

“For the purpose of post-tenure review, scholarly and professional products include: the publication of articles and books; papers published in the proceedings of conferences or professional meetings; presentations at symposia, conferences, or professional meetings; poster sessions or presentations at conferences or professional meetings; creative works of literature, art or invention resulting in publications, exhibits, and patents; documentation of applied research projects and their impact; grant applications; offices held in professional organizations; experience in organizing and assisting in symposia, conferences, workshops, and seminars; professional consultation; referee reports for peer-reviewed publications, conferences, or professional meetings; board service related to teaching discipline; supervising undergraduate or graduate research projects leading to presentations, reports, or publications; discipline-related audio-visual works; Institutional Review Board reviews; external and/or comprehensive internal program assessment or evaluation reports; documentation of reviews of books, databases, software, and other resources; bibliographies, guides, or webpages that significantly enhance access to and use of information resources; the receipt of professional honors, grants, and awards; and/or other scholarly and professional products as determined by the discipline and approved by the dean or library director.”

After debate, the motion to amend passed unanimously.



- ii. Returning to discussion on the amended motion, Nicholas Rhew moved, and Kyle Mara seconded, to amend the “Teaching (Professional Performance for Library Faculty)” section of the proposal to read:

“Post-tenure, teaching performance must remain viewed as satisfactory by students, colleagues, and administrators with respect to supporting learning in alignment with program, college or library, and university goals preparation, relevance to subject matter, and organization of material. Moreover, effective teaching assumes intellectual competence and integrity, innovative and effective pedagogical techniques that stimulate and direct student learning (including experiential and/or service learning opportunities), cooperation with students and colleagues, and scholarly inquiry which results in constant assessment and improvement of courses and curricula consistent with new knowledge. Additionally, for post-tenure review, evaluation of teaching will include consideration of the faculty member’s teaching workload, the total number of students taught at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and time spent on instructional assignments and, if applicable, overseeing graduate students.

“Post-tenure, professional performance for librarians must remain viewed as satisfactory by clientele, colleagues, and administrators with respect to professional and intellectual competence; creativity and initiative in the performance of responsibilities; collections; skill in pursuing user needs and in stimulating faculty and student utilization of services and resources through individual or formal instruction; and a willingness to consider, suggest, and apply new ideas and alternative approaches to services. Moreover, being an effective librarian assumes a positive professional image and integrity, creative techniques that stimulate and direct student learning, cooperation with students and colleagues, and scholarly inquiry which results in constant review of products and services consistent with new knowledge. Additionally, while IC 21-38-3.5 requires that information related to teaching workload, the total number of students taught at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and time spent on instructional assignments and, if applicable, overseeing graduate students be included in post-tenure review of all tenured faculty, evaluation of professional performance for librarians will focus on the library faculty member’s workload and administrative assignments.”

After debate, the motion to amend passed unanimously.

- iii. Returning to discussion on the doubly amended motion, Nicholas Rhew moved, and Peter Whiting seconded, to amend the proposed policy by adding the following sentences to the paragraph beginning with “Tenured faculty members must undergo post-tenure review in the spring of their fifth year...”:



“A faculty member may request an extension of their post-tenure review timeline due to extenuating circumstances. A request for extension must be approved by the department chair or academic unit head, the dean or library director, and provost.”

After debate, the motion to amend passed unanimously.

- iv. Returning to discussion on the triply amended motion, Nicholas Rhew moved, and Brett Anderson seconded, to amend the proposed policy by adding “library director” everywhere where “dean” is listed.

After debate, the motion to amend passed unanimously.

- v. Returning to discussion on the quadruply amended motion, Nicholas Rhew moved, and Kyle Mara seconded, to amend the “Scholarship and Professional Activity” section to insert the following sentence after the first sentence:

“Faculty members receiving six or more hours per semester of teaching release time for administrative appointments must produce at least two scholarly or professional products in each post-tenure review cycle.”

After debate, the motion to amend passed unanimously.

Returning to discussion on the five-times amended motion, debate continued. Following debate, the amended motion passed with 10 votes in favor, one vote opposed, and zero abstentions.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND GOOD OF THE ORDER

- X. ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, Nicholas Rhew adjourned the meeting at 3:18pm.



HEA 1001 Compliance – Policy Change Proposal – Adopted by Faculty Senate on June 27, 2025

Post-Tenure Review

C.13.A.8: Edit to read “A faculty member is required to submit a Faculty Annual Report. The faculty member’s department or academic unit is responsible for faculty annual evaluations and recommendations regarding salary, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. Counseling and disciplinary action are the responsibility of the department chair and academic unit head.”

Changes: reordered list, added “post-tenure review”

Create new C.13.G: Post-Tenure Review (re-letter following sections)

Pursuant to IC 21-38-3.5, tenured faculty members must undergo post-tenure reviews that measure and evaluate productivity. This process is separate from and in addition to any evaluations of a faculty member’s promotion of intellectual diversity.

Tenured faculty members must undergo post-tenure review in the spring of their fifth year of service in their current rank and every five years thereafter. If a faculty member applies for promotion in their fifth year in their current rank, the evaluation of their application for promotion will fulfill the post-tenure review requirement. Additionally, if a faculty member applies for and receives promotion within five years of their last promotion or post-tenure review, the faculty member’s timeline for post-tenure review resets to the start of the academic year when appointment at the promoted rank takes effect. A faculty member may request an extension of their post-tenure review timeline due to extenuating circumstances. A request for extension must be approved by the department chair or academic unit head, the dean or library director, and provost.

Post-tenure review will consider achievements in 1) teaching (professional performance for library faculty), 2) scholarship and professional activity, and 3) service.

Teaching (Professional Performance for Library Faculty)

Post-tenure, teaching performance must remain viewed as satisfactory by students, colleagues, and administrators with respect to supporting learning in alignment with program, college or library, and university goals preparation, relevance to subject matter, and organization of material. Moreover, effective teaching assumes intellectual competence and integrity, innovative and effective pedagogical techniques that stimulate and direct student learning (including experiential and/or service learning opportunities), cooperation with students and colleagues, and scholarly inquiry which results in constant assessment and improvement of courses and curricula consistent with new knowledge. Additionally, for post-tenure review, evaluation of teaching will include consideration of



the faculty member's teaching workload, the total number of students taught at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and time spent on instructional assignments and, if applicable, overseeing graduate students.

Post-tenure, professional performance for librarians must remain viewed as satisfactory by clientele, colleagues, and administrators with respect to professional and intellectual competence; creativity and initiative in the performance of responsibilities; collections; skill in pursuing user needs and in stimulating faculty and student utilization of services and resources through individual or formal instruction; and a willingness to consider, suggest, and apply new ideas and alternative approaches to services. Moreover, being an effective librarian assumes a positive professional image and integrity, creative techniques that stimulate and direct student learning, cooperation with students and colleagues, and scholarly inquiry which results in constant review of products and services consistent with new knowledge. Additionally, while IC 21-38-3.5 requires that information related to teaching workload, the total number of students taught at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and time spent on instructional assignments and, if applicable, overseeing graduate students be included in post-tenure review of all tenured faculty, evaluation of professional performance for librarians will focus on the library faculty member's workload and administrative assignments.

Scholarship and Professional Activity

Post-tenure, faculty members should maintain an active scholarship and professional activity agenda resulting in at least three scholarly or professional products in each post-tenure review cycle. Faculty members receiving six or more hours per semester of teaching release time for administrative appointments must produce at least two scholarly or professional products in each post-tenure review cycle. For the purpose of post-tenure review, scholarly and professional products include: the publication of articles and books; papers published in the proceedings of conferences or professional meetings; presentations at symposia, conferences, or professional meetings; poster sessions or presentations at conferences or professional meetings; creative works of literature, art or invention resulting in publications, exhibits, and patents; documentation of applied research projects and their impact; grant applications; offices held in professional organizations; experience in organizing and assisting in symposia, conferences, workshops, and seminars; professional consultation; referee reports for peer-reviewed publications, conferences, or professional meetings; board service related to teaching discipline; supervising undergraduate or graduate research projects leading to presentations, reports, or publications; discipline-related audio-visual works; Institutional Review Board reviews; external and/or comprehensive internal program assessment or evaluation reports; documentation of reviews of books, databases, software, and other resources; bibliographies, guides, or webpages that significantly enhance access to and use of information resources; the receipt of professional honors, grants, and awards; and/or other



scholarly and professional products as determined by the discipline and approved by the dean or library director.

Departments or colleges may require additional scholarly and professional products or may narrow the list of what is an acceptable product to align with specialized accreditation.

Service

Post-tenure, faculty members should maintain active service to the University in line with departmental or college guidelines. Tenured faculty members are expected to be available for service to University faculty, students, and administration. They must show willingness to serve and to demonstrate efficient impactful performance in capacities such as faculty governance, department/college and University-level committees, administrative assignments, sponsorship of student organizations, and other University-related activities, in addition to community service.

Process

Post-tenure review will run concurrently with the faculty annual evaluation process. Faculty members will submit their Faculty Annual Report for the year in which they are undergoing post-tenure review and for each year since their last promotion or post-tenure review.

The faculty member's department chair or academic unit head will evaluate the materials to determine whether the faculty member exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations for each area, teaching or professional performance, scholarship and professional activity, and service. The department chair's evaluation will then be forwarded to the dean or library director, who will evaluate the materials and either concur or disagree with the chair's evaluation. In cases where the faculty member exceeds or meets expectations for each area as evaluated by the department chair and concurred by the dean or library director, the dean or library director will notify the provost of the successful post-tenure review. In cases where a faculty member does not meet expectations in at least one area, as evaluated by the department chair or dean or library director, the faculty member will be evaluated by the college's promotion and tenure committee. Following the college promotion and tenure committee review, all three evaluations (department chair, dean or library director, and college committee) will be forwarded to the provost for final determination. If the provost determines that the faculty member exceeds or meets expectations for each area, then the provost will notify the faculty member of their successful post-tenure review.

If a faculty member does not meet expectations for one or more areas of post-tenure review, the faculty member will be placed on a performance improvement plan developed by the department chair in consultation with the dean or library director and provost. The performance improvement plan must allow adequate time to rectify the deficiency



highlighted through post-tenure review, up to the following post-tenure review for areas such as scholarship that require substantial ramp-up time. If the deficiency is not rectified by the date established in the performance improvement plan, the faculty member will be subject to disciplinary action. Disciplinary actions may include additional professional development, a new performance improvement plan, counseling, salary reduction, demotion, termination, or other disciplinary action as determined by the institution.

Implementation Period

The provost, in consultation with deans or academic unit heads, will develop a calendar specifying when each tenured faculty member must undergo post-tenure review. Approximately 20% of tenured faculty will undergo review per year beginning Spring 2027.