

Faculty Senate Meeting

30 September 2022

Senators present: Kim Delaney, Kyle Mara, Rob Dickes, Jason Hardgrave, Brandon Field, Xavia Burton, Paul Arthur, Erin Reynolds, Shane White, Shannon Pritchard, Cathy Carey, Gary Black, Jennifer Evans

Additional attendees: Mohammed Khayum, Shelly Blunt

Held in BEC Boardroom



- Called to order: 2:30pm
- Draft minutes from Sept 16 meeting approved unanimously with spelling corrections with abstention.
- Senate Chair report from Kim:
 - Reached out to the Registrar's Office about the Finals Schedule, and they are working on collecting the data.
 - Talked with Steve Bridges about the ID replacement and the *per diem* request charges and he is working on those
 - University is working on the Quality Initiative; we will need people who are interested in working on that and will have people
 - New Academic Review process will require an expansion of the Assessment Committee and we will talk next time about how we can temporarily expand that committee.
 - The Graduate Program has redefined a "certificate".
 - Public Safety is willing to offer training to any unit that is interested, reach out to Steve Bridges.
- Report from the Provost:
 - Indiana Commission will be on campus November 9-11th. We have about an hour to present on a topic that feel would showcase a best practice from our campus.
 - The Quality Initiative will be made up of a wide range of people. It will focus on a campus-wide topic of interest
 - Searches are undergoing.
 - Seventy-six programs are going to be reviewed this
 - The CRM from Slate was selected. There is a third party that we will be partnering with to support the implementation of the CRM.
 - We got the report from Gray and Associates about what ideas were developed for new programs in our August workshop. The next phase is to look at all of our programs with Gray, going college by college with the chairs involved, and that will start soon.
- New Business:

- Charge 2022_14: Employee and Dependent Athletic Fee Waiver.
 - Staff Council and Admin Senate are working on something similar. If we sent this to the Economic Benefits Committee, all three of them could work together.
 - There are other fees that are not waived, but this would be the largest fee that is would not be part of the fee waiver.
 - Motion was made and passed unanimously to send this to EBC to work with the other two groups. Kim will compile a list of questions that we would like asked, so send suggestions to her.
- Charge 2022_15: Amendment to Article V, Section 5 of By Laws: University Promotions Committee.
 - Charge included the text of a modification to the By Laws of the Promotions Committee.
 - The dissemination of the information from this charge is the responsibility of all the members of the Senate, so that everyone knows that the source of this charge was the Promotions Committee's report from last year, and the summary of the data is attached with these minutes.
 - Modifications to the By Laws was approved unanimously.
- Next meeting: October 14.
- Meeting adjourned: 3:07 pm

Name: _____ (Optional)

Date of Submission: 8/31/2022

Name of Faculty Senate Representative:

1. Kim Delaney
2. Kyle Mara
3. Xavia Burton

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:

A Request to include the Athletics fee as part of the Employee & Family Fee Waiver

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?

A major benefit for USI employees is tuition and fee waiver offered for employees and family. This benefit is highly utilized by our employees and staff and serves as a draw for potential employees to work at the university. The newly instituted Athletics Fee for Fall 2022 was not included in the fee waiver. Nor was it scaled for part-time students. As the fee increases over the next four years, it will come close to doubling the cost of attendance for an employee or family member taking a single course.

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 the administration to include the Athletics Fee to the waiver granted to employees and their family. If that's not an option, perhaps the administration could at least scale the fee for part time students.

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:

Action Taken by Senate: Vote to send to Economic Benefits Committee. EBC should work with counterparts in Admin Senate and Staff Council to collect relevant data, which will inform next steps.

Name: Kim Delaney (Optional)

Date of Submission: 09/19/2022

Name of Faculty Senate Representative:

1. Kim Delaney
2. _____
3. _____

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:**

Amendment to Article V Section 5 of the By-Laws of the Faculty Constitution

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?

Recent data presented to Faculty Senate indicate that the current role of University Promotion's Committee would benefit from review. There is concern over the large workload of this committee as well as its alarmingly high number of negative reviews of candidates with otherwise unanimous support from all other levels of review.

Faculty Senate and any of its standing committees should always serve as an advocate for faculty. It is important that the by-laws and standing charge for this committee reflect Senate's commitment to supporting faculty progress and development.

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.

Replace

The committee is composed of one elected faculty representative from each academic college and three elected at-large faculty members. Members of the committee must be of associate rank or higher.

Functions of the committee are:

- A. To receive applications for academic promotions from the deans of the various colleges.
- B. To acknowledge in writing to the individual under consideration the receipt of the promotion application.
- C. To review pertinent information concerning any applicant's qualifications.
- D. To inform each applicant in writing of the committee's recommendation.
- E. To forward the recommendations in D (above) to the provost.

With

“The committee is composed of one elected faculty representative from each academic college, one elected faculty representative from Rice Library and three elected at-large faculty members. Members of the committee must be of associate rank or higher.

The committee will review and recommend applications for academic promotion for any application in which:

- 1) recommendations from the department, college, library, chair, and/or dean lack agreement.

or

- 2) the applicant requests an additional review. In such case, applicants must request a review within 7 business days of written notification of their dean's or director's formal recommendation to the Provost.

During review, the functions of the committee are:

- A. To receive applications for academic promotions from the deans or directors of the various colleges or library.

- B. To acknowledge in writing to the individual under consideration the receipt of the promotion application.
- C. To review pertinent information concerning any applicant's qualifications and render a recommendation regarding its merit. The merit of an applicant's portfolio shall only be measured using the guidelines for promotion published by the University and the applicant's department, college or the library.
- D. To inform each applicant in writing of the committee's recommendation.
- E. To forward the recommendations in D (above) to the Provost.”

4. Potential Resources:

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

Article VI of the by-laws reads "These by-laws can be amended at any regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting by a two-thirds majority vote of the total Senate, provided that a written proposal for the amendment has been submitted to the members of the Senate at least one week in advance."

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:

Action Taken by Senate: Bylaws change unanimously approved. Senate chair will work with the Provost's office to make sure the change is reflected in the USI Faculty Handbook and relevant processes are modified. Change will take effect for Promotion and/or Tenure applications in Fall 2023.

Historical University Promotions Committee Data

2010-2022

Purpose

Following a request from Faculty Senate and members of University Promotions Committee. We undertook an analysis of Promotion and Promotion & Tenure (P/T) recommendations over the last 12 academic years.

We reviewed every application for Associate Professor or Full Professor during this time, considering every decision from each level of review. A “yes” indicates a recommendation for P/T, a “no” indicates a recommendation to deny P/T.

Data presented here are trends from the entire dataset. Data will not be presented by year or college to avoid identification of individual applicants.

UPC Workload

Academic Year	Packets Reviewed
21-22	22
20-21	19
19-20	16
18-19	15
17-18	11
16-17	17
15-16	19
14-15	22
13-14	17
12-13	15
11-12	10
10-11	14
	197

56 applications for Full Professor

131 applications for Associate Professor (with tenure)

This total includes 1 withdraw, and 4 files for which packet details were unavailable. Moving forward, these were omitted from the analysis. Therefore **192** applications were included in the analysis.

Overall Results

192 packets included in the analysis:

9 did not receive P/T
(“No” from Provost)

183 received P/T
(“Yes” from Provost”)

*P/T represents Promotion or Promotion & Tenure as appropriate

How often do Candidates Receive “No” Recommendations?

Department/ College Committee	Chair	Dean	UPC	Provost
6	1	8	24*	9

*includes split vote

Of 192 packets analyzed, these are the total number of “No” recommendations from each level of review.

How Many Candidates have Conflicting (Non-Unanimous) Recommendations?

29 candidates received a no or split vote at any level

UPC was the ONLY no/split vote in

15

Of these cases

All of these 15 individuals earned P/T

Trends are Consistent Across College & Level

This trend is consistent across all colleges

This trend is consistent for
Full Professor and Associate Professor:

Of the 24 No/split decisions from UPC:

-14 Associate (UPC was only 'no' 9 times)

-10 Full (UPC was only 'no' 6 times)

Candidates with Conflicting (Non- Unanimous) Recommendations at Levels Prior to UPC (College, Dept, Chair, Dean)

12 candidates had at least one “No”
recommendation at a level prior to UPC:

UPC recommended “No/split vote”: **8** candidates

Provost “No” Recommendation: **7** candidates

*(6 overlaps)

3 candidates received “yes” from both

Updated UPC Workload

Academic Year	Packets Reviewed	Non-Unanimous Reviews Pre-UPC*
21-22	22	1
20-21	19	0
19-20	16	1
18-19	15	0
17-18	11	1
16-17	17	1
15-16	19	1
14-15	22	1
13-14	17	2
12-13	15	0
11-12	10	2
10-11	14	2
	197	12
	56 Professor	3 Professor
	131 Associate	9 Associate

*Minimum number of packets that would have been reviewed annually under the newly adopted policy.

Applicants may also request review, which means numbers will likely be slightly higher.