

**File 1**

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

March 4, 2014

3:30pm, HMSU 227

**Agenda**

- I. Administrative Reports: President D. Bradley, Provost R. Williams
- II. Chair Report: S. Lamb
- III. Approval of the Executive Committee Minutes of February 25, 2014 **(File 2)**
- IV. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
- V. Continued Discussion Regarding SF Ratios and FTE Goals
- V. SAC Report on Investigating the Desirability of Sending Midterm Grades to All Students: J. Buffington, L. Valentine **(File 3)**

**File 2**

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

March 4, 2014 3:30pm, HMSU 227

**Minutes**

Members Present: S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, R. Guell, A. Anderson, T. Hawkins, B. Kilp, C. Olsen, V. Sheets

Member Absent: K. Yousif

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Bradley, Provost R. Williams

Guests: J. Buffington, C. Enyeart, L. Maule, J. Neumann, J. Powers, B. Stucker, C. Tillery, L. Valentine, B. Whitaker

1. Administrative Reports: President D. Bradley, Provost R. Williams:
  - a. D. Bradley:
    - i. The Strategic Plan Conference went well; it was the biggest crowd we've had so far. There were approximately 140 reservations and Dede III was packed. D. McKee, J. Powers, and S. Powers did a great job. Abdul-Hakim Shabazz came and did a nice job of talking to us. His niece is a freshman here and she is happy.
    - ii. The bids for the science labs are in and we now have a project approved to redo 18 science labs over the next nine months.
  - b. R. Williams: The Library Dean search information is all in and I should extend an offer this week. All three Dean searches are now complete.
2. Chair Report: S. Lamb:
  - a. We have had a great deal of discussion about student-faculty ratios; twenty-one to one appears to be the goal the institution has set for itself. Associated with that goal, if we continue with our regular growth, is an FTE of 555. I would make an argument that if we achieve greater than two percent growth, and it means an increase in faculty, we should do that. It's only rational. I do think we may be placing too much emphasis at the speed at which we achieve this goal and what sacrifices we're making.
  - b. Also before us today is the desirability of sending midterm grades to all students. My reading is that students are primarily concerned about getting feedback

quickly so they can make informed decisions as to what state their grade is in at a particular point in time. Those requests seem quite reasonable. I don't know if we'll go the route they've suggested, but I think we can keep the primary goal in mind, and that primary goal is that the students want to be able to achieve timely feedback. That is important to them, and it is impossible to argue with the rationality of that position. My personal belief is that it is surrounded by too much "other." I hope we can boil it down to its essence.

**3. Approval of the Executive Committee Minutes of February 25, 2014: C. MacDonald, B. Kilp 8-0-0**

4. SAC Report on Investigating the Desirability of Sending Midterm Grades to all Students: J. Buffington, L. Valentine
- a. S. Lamb: Jim, I would like to take these motions one at a time. Before we move to number one, is it the case that with number one you are moving that which was done in the ninth week to the sixth week? (**Motion: A. Anderson, B. Kilp**)
  - b. J. Buffington: First, we had a number of people who have studied these issues more than I have so I invited a select few of them to this meeting. L. Valentine, the President of SGA, was unusual among past Presidents in that he approached me with the SAC issue before the semester ever began. Also, we have two more SGA representatives, J. Newman and B. Stucker. Also, J. Powers put in extensive work, especially on number two. C. Enyeart is here as well as L. Maule and B. Whitaker. All these folks attended the last SAC meeting and made good recommendations. We very much appreciate being here and appreciate dealing with these singly. The first is far and away the most specific. The original charge was to investigate the desirability of sending midterm grades to all students. At the September meeting it evolved over time to a discussion of related concerns. From these we made four recommendations. The first is to move from the ninth week to the sixth week and, and we suggested the word "Interim" rather than "Midterm" report. Our research indicated that early feedback is better for the students; plus, by the time the ninth weeks rolls around, it might be too late for some students to make arrangements in their classes.
    - i. L. Valentine: It all started with midterm grades. That was what we ran our platform off of. This isn't for all students, just for those who get C-minus or worse. The hole is dug so deep already, and if midterm grades are turned in the ninth week of the semester you may not get those grades until the tenth week. There's less than six weeks until dead week, and you pray on your finals. As an average student, I've done that before. It's harder to pull my GPA up now due to issues from when I was a freshman and sophomore.
    - ii. J. Neumann: Just being able to have those grades sooner would be beneficial. You may have a bad first couple of tests. Knowing where you

stand and knowing what you have and knowing what you can do to pick it up helps.

- iii. B. Stucker: I completely agree. What the document is stating is in a sense the interim report is a lot better than a midterm report. It gives me a better idea of progression, of how many weeks I have to improve. The student has to take it upon themselves to improve that grade whether it means meeting with instructors and getting help.
- iv. S. Lamb: I'm rather interested in why we could not move this to all students. Is this an administrative nightmare? We could open it up. We have our grades completed in the sense that we could give interim grades. Is it such a hardship? Is there some administrative reason why we could not change it to all undergraduates?
- v. B. Whitaker: There is no administrative reason.
- vi. J. Buffington: There are some professors who have such large classes...
- vii. R. Guell: It is much more a pain in the neck to have two alphabetical lists than one.
- viii. V. Sheets: I think we should have a motion to change it to no later than the end of sixth week, and all undergrads should receive interim grades.  
**Motion to Amend to Include All Grades for All Undergraduates V. Sheets, C. MacDonald; Vote: 8-0-0**
- ix. D. Bradley: It seems this would imply that all instructors are needing to give something substantive in their classes. I don't know what has to be determined. We may need to put that specifically in the Handbook policy so we don't have any misunderstanding.
- x. L. Maule: This is such a great stride, and I think I would be wary of an actual percentage specified in the Handbook. I would suggest that it's better to have low-stake grades earlier on in the semester to signal that a student needs to turn things around.
- xi. S. Lamb: Those instructors who have students in trouble have given a grade. They have had an instrument out there for evaluation but they have not informed them about it. They come to the chairs en masse because they're upset. I think this is the most critical part of the document, to give them feedback. Feedback is what L. Valentine and the students want. I think there's too much pablum in this, but the feedback is not the pablum part.
- xii. L. Valentine: You could put some sort of grade in there based on participation or something. That's the students' responsibility. They can't hold a bad grade against you. The teacher can use this as well. If you see a student having trouble you can know sooner. Athletics is excited because they can really use it. R. Toomey is enthusiastic as well.

- xiii. S. Lamb: This may be a significant way to reach out to students and change retention.
- xiv. L. Maule: Logan made an astute point; it also helps faculty. Midterm was their first chance to see how the students were doing. It's guidance to both sides of the house.
- xv. A. Anderson: Some areas don't have a cognate approach to grading. We have long-term projects and they received a good grade at midpoint, only to receive a D at the end of the semester. Usually if they're doing above a C I give them a C. We're in the minority, and I guess we'll just have to deal with that.
- xvi. S. Lamb: The midterm grade might not be as representative?
- xvii. A. Anderson: For example, the Saudi students get hauled in by their ministry because they receive a C and I have to write letters to their sponsors.
- xviii. R. Guell: If grades are to be in their hands the sixth week, does that push reporting to fourth week? I'm concerned that even faculty who give three tests won't have that first test graded in time for the sixth week. If we're saying the end of the evaluation period is the end of the sixth week, and the impetus to respond is the end of the seventh...we need to understand specifically what "sixth" means. The plain language says they will receive it in the sixth.
- xix. L. Valentine: I don't know how reporting works, but my knowledge of this was get reports in the seventh.
- xx. R. Guell: Then that language needs to be amended.
- xxi. B. Kilp: Will we still be doing a midterm report as well? It's helpful in the beginning, but also to know if you've made progress. I don't understand why we're all using BlackBoard with its weighted totals instead of sitting there waiting for the report to pop up.
- xxii. R. Guell: Some of us have complicated weighting systems that BlackBoard is incapable of dealing with. I will download the grade to an Excel file and reupload it. Students get confused by it. We say something and BlackBoard says something else.
- xxiii. B. Kilp: The main concern is the first four semesters. That's the kind of thing that you're concerned about—not that the others don't matter, but we could have a different way of handling those first four semesters.
- xxiv. L. Valentine: My job is to advocate for all students, and all students want their grades. My stand was "go through BlackBoard and get your grades." You can ask any student—they want their grades.

- xxv. B. Kilp: I didn't mean other students now have their grades. You did mention freshmen several times. I don't personally have this problem so I'm surprised about it, actually.
- xxvi. **Motion to Amend R. Guell, C. MacDonald; Vote: 7-0-1** "No later than the Wednesday of the seventh week of classes, all undergraduates will receive progress reports in the form of letter grades based on assessments offered through the sixth week."
- xxvii. L. Maule: If we're going to have eight-week classes, a student who has already sunk their ship...
- xxviii. R. Guell: That gives them ten days.
- xxix. R. Williams: I thought that's why we brought it up. They don't start at the midpoint. I thought it was the seventh week.
- xxx. C. Olsen: We have classes that start on the fifth week.
- xxxi. R. Guell: That's against the backdrop of the majority of the faculty doing a four-test plan. If you do a three-test plan you haven't given it any time to be evaluated.
- xxxii. V. Sheets: I'm wondering how much time is needed administratively. I was trying to write, with Bob, "no later than the end of the sixth week of classes...based on a substantive assignment." Can the administration turn them around by Tuesday of the seventh?
- xxxiii. R. Guell: Lately it's just "pull it and publish it."
- xxxiv. D. Bradley: So if they're all in by 5:00 on Friday, for example, they come out at 5:05?
- xxxv. R. Guell: Faculty need the weekend to do a big grading event. Students would get it at midnight (first thing Wednesday); they would receive it due to cross-checking at the registrar. I think all grades are published to the Portal Wednesday at 12:01am.
- xxxvi. S. Lamb: in my mind much has been accomplished. The primary goal that Logan has had for some time is accomplished.
- c. J. Buffington: The second recommendation is our most sweeping. The issues that led to the formation of this recommendation consumed most of our discussion time. It was generated by our midterm charge. Anecdotes from students indicated that from time to time a student would experience something unpalatable. One student didn't know what any of his or her grades were going into the final. There were similar anecdotes that were unprofessional. We didn't do a formal survey or study. We generated a specialized assortment of properties to address specifically. At our January meeting we decided a statement of good teaching practices would address these issues that come up. The appendix was largely the product of work by J. Powers and L. Valentine who worked together to bring this to SAC, and it passed unanimously after discussion.

- i. L. Valentine: Dr. Powers did most of this...they asked us in the January meeting to take a different angle, and he and I talked about this all year. I reached out in the summer, and we meet at least monthly. This statement builds a culture that makes students want to learn. My most engaging classes are when the teacher asks me questions when I'm not paying attention. If they're just lecturing you can just zone off. Visual learners have specific issues as well. Getting us involved is a lot more interesting. It would be really cool to build that kind of culture.
- ii. J. Powers: SAC asked me specifically to work with Logan on this product. This is designed to be a principle document, intentionally. It outlines not just what we know about good teaching, but good learning. It includes guidelines for students. They are guided by the scholarship on teaching and learning and is designed to be informative. It is also practical for instructors to use in a syllabus or conversation starter at the beginning of the year. There is outlined the importance of feedback. That was the context for the document. The other thought was where would it go in the Handbook and we thought one sentence in the preamble would do it.
- iii. S. Lamb: It says "expects faculty to adhere to and foster the ideals as manifest in..." It's more than just a feel-good document, Josh.
- iv. J. Powers: In that sense it is, but it doesn't say much to that.
- v. V. Sheets: It says this will be the basis of faculty evaluation?
- vi. R. Guell: I am absolutely convinced that the Handbook is the wrong place for this document to be placed. I'm also not sure the sentiment works. I'm in favor of best practice kinds of instruction, but few things are more important to faculty than to uphold academic freedom. I would never challenge C. Hoffman in his pedagogical technique, nor N. Hopkins', though I would never use them myself. Both were tenured, free to engage in their own pedagogical experiments. Even if they're not judged against the document but saying that they're not free to engage in their own pedagogy. I am totally opposed to anything that would sound like a preferred pedagogy—I would much rather hear what Logan has to say about specific things he wants. I'm much more comfortable with rules for timely feedback and with reporting mechanisms than with pedagogical edicts, as well-intentioned as they may be.
- vii. S. Lamb: I echo that. I would go so far as to include this concern of timeliness which I think is very critical to student success, critical in their interest in class. Incorporate that in the minimum expectations associated with teaching. I think you said it rather well. Each of these is admirable, but not every one of them fits in my class. I do conceive of myself as an effective, engaging, teacher, and I don't want any more checklists. I echo

R. Guell's concerns. I'm willing to go far in that direction, to include FAC in that direction. Placing very specific guidelines adapted from department to department. Art is not going to use the same feedback as Accounting. Attention to feedback for students is critical for their well-being.

- viii. T. Hawkins: I fully agree with Bob and Steve. I don't think the Handbook is the place for this language. I don't disagree with a lot of the ideas here. The idea that we are copying seven principles of good practice from the 1980s suggests that there is thirty years of research that I haven't been exposed to. I think they should have been vetted by FAC.
- ix. S. Lamb: I'm in favor. After much discussion I would like to see something sent to FAC. We are trying to pay more attention to the teaching domain. Failure in that domain by itself means one does not meet standard expectations. Logan, for a faculty member to be classified as "below standard" they have to fail in two categories. We are trying to change that so that teaching failure stands alone.
- x. R. Williams: We have a department success task force. We have collected over 300 student surveys as well as from department chairs and faculty. Some of this will come up just looking at preliminary data. We will also be making recommendations that will have to be vetted through FAC and SAC.
- xi. R. Guell: It seems that this is not ready for a vote, unless there is anything vital?
- xii. J. Powers: Thank you all for your thoughtfulness. We thought about whether it would be appropriate for the Handbook. We wanted to highlight ways to underline the principles of good teaching. It may now. We hope something might emerge about educating about the teaching and learning mission.

**xiii. Motion to Table the Document and Refer it to FAC as well as Refer to Task Force Before Going Forward: R. Guell, C. MacDonald 8-0-0**

- d. J. Buffington: I would like to suggest that three is now moot now that two has been tabled.
- e. J. Buffington: The fourth and final one went through the discussion of how specific we wanted to be. For every specification that came up there seemed to be a counterargument that it would be unreasonable. Student work can be evaluated and returned by the institution, but there are other kinds of work that may require more than just a few days in order to give thoughtful feedback to the student. I assign research papers that require their own research, and in order to evaluate those, I have to read the articles they find first, which requires an enormous amount of time. The feedback needs to occur within a specific number of days.



- i. S. Lamb: But the timely feedback requirement is actually in line with the first vote.
- ii. D. Bradley: If this is as specific as you could be, I wouldn't do anything. You could probably do something in terms of being specific for regular work; but for major reports, do you have a specific time, or is it the beginning of the semester?
- iii. J. Buffington: Almost never at the end of the semester.
- iv. D. Bradley: I think that maybe Logan would suggest that three weeks would be a good number. I'd suggest that you could break up assignments into pieces.
- v. L. Valentine: This is what I went to Bob about in the fall semester. So long for quizzes, so long for tests. The first thing at SAC got shot down pretty quickly. I'm up for suggestions. The concept is what everyone understands.
- vi. R. Guell: It's my view that in order to be effective it needs to be specific and binding and tied to performance evaluation, but in a way that is meaningful at the department level. Rather than pass this in language that is vague we should charge departments to come up with reasonable expectations for feedback that those evaluating against those standards be used in biennial review.
- vii. D. Bradley: I don't have a real problem with that other than making sure students understand. That would have to be included in the class syllabus—outlined specifically.
- viii. R. Guell: It's far more important that we respect the difference between departments. Discuss specific things.
- ix. D. Bradley: I would refer this to the task force to form some language that would match what you said.
- x. R. Guell: But the task force is building a one-size-fits-all for the University.
- xi. L. Maule: That's what my concern is. However it works, of course I will defer to and be pleased with, but I initiated it under frustration. We cannot overestimate the number of students who complain about not getting timely feedback. When we have our student government come to us to say "would you please give us timely feedback..."
- xii. R. Guell: I'm perfectly fine with specificity because I teach regimented schedules.
- xiii. L. Maule: However, whatever version it gets to, can there be a time frame? There will be a debate in every department. We cannot risk our students anymore. They need feedback so they can learn, not just pass the class.
- xiv. R. Guell: That's my argument for getting it into the departments.

- xv. S. Lamb: I'm torn between having a universal document and having a department-specific document. There's so much commonality in our courses. It does seem to me that it would be possible to have a global and then a specific design by the department, then have those specifics incorporated into a syllabus. That could truly be helpful for our students.
- xvi. T. Hawkins: Personally I think university-wide requirements are frightening. It's a slippery slope. Department recommendations I have no problem with. With department requirements I also think you're going to be dealing with a lot of cases that will cause more conflict than togetherness. I think the fourth is redundant after passing the first. Requiring faculty to provide an interim report is the university standard we all agree on.
- xvii. L. Maule: Not a single faculty member will be comfortable with having centralized specific times for review. When I'm asking for students is to have the same consideration when the stakes are high.
- xviii. J. Neumann: In one class I turned in two papers after midterm and I had no idea if I had an A, B, or C. That's not the time to get mad at your professor.
- xix. B. Kilp: I'm currently taking on online-class class and I've been waiting to bring this up. They have this thing called Quality Matters. Courses and ultimately programs will be certified. I'm getting feedback and doing the same thing students are doing. This is very well laid out, but it doesn't tell you exactly how to do it. But it says requirements for feedback are clearly stated on a course/syllabus level. Not only that, there are suggestions on how to do it. It just says "here's what I'm going to do" and the student knows that on this day this is what I'm going to do. Then they can go to a chair and say "this is what he said he was going to do and it didn't happen." Why aren't we doing that?
- xx. C. MacDonald: A, it's expensive, and B, it's for online courses. I've been through the training. I'm not arguing that there's nothing we could adapt. My suggestion was rather than this requirement, faculty can put a statement in their syllabus that this is when they can expect feedback.
- xxi. S. Lamb: I don't see why we can't insist that timeliness of feedback can't be inserted into the syllabus. If the History professor has stated that the essay will be graded within three weeks, that is something for the student to hang their hat on. That is up to the professor working on their course. That would be an effective tool.
- xxii. L. Valentine: I would have to disagree with that because if I don't get the first two graded before I turned in the third, I've messed up the third and my grade is shot.

- xxiii. R. Guell: We don't have a motion and there could be no motion because we need to add something vague to the Handbook. We would need specific language to be recommended. After thoroughly vetting this here, task someone with writing specific language and come back with it, because we don't have anything actionable.
- xxiv. T. Hawkins: I'm not against feedback. My argument is we should not mandate university-wide requirements because there are times when you expect weekly feedback. Those kind of assignments may not apply in my class and I should not be expected to follow. If you don't have the feedback to go to B from A, you need to go to the professor.
- xxv. L. Valentine: If you do it by department then you have that input.
- xxvi. J. Neumann: I know professors are busy and students are busy, but if a student is expected to get something in on time, why is the teacher not expected to give feedback about it on time?
- xxvii. J. Powers: All four of these are different things that support our students. Should things be mandated or should faculty be accountable? You, Steve, have respect for others to teach how they want but how do you guide those expectations?
- xxviii. S. Lamb: Again, I'm thinking of my own department and faculty. If there were a minimum requirement that their feedback was specifically in their syllabus, and they are a public document in the first place, the document is going to be reasonable. We have reasonable peer pressure upon us as well. That is a wonderful place to begin. You can have conversations about how you are achieving feedback. You can even make it a Handbook requirement that syllabi specify times for feedback specific to the course.
- xxix. V. Sheets: I don't know if the task force picks this up where we'll go with it, but if as a chair a student can bring me a syllabus that says a faculty member promised feedback and hasn't done it, I can press them.
- xxx. S. Lamb: This would be a beautiful mechanism. It would get conversations going about the importance of feedback.
- xxxi. L. Maule: How would the Handbook language read?
- xxxii. R. Guell: There is a possibility of a university-wide policy that can be trumped by syllabi.
- xxxiii. S. Lamb: I'm not interested in going further than the syllabus. There is plenty of room in Section 3 of the Handbook for it. It's reasonable to think that feedback would be mentioned there. Instructors will include their specific associations with their feedback designed specifically for their course. We will consider it next meeting. Logan, I congratulate you on this battle. It has been your battle, and it is very important. I can tell you that in my experience when we ran across a professor that was giving good

feedback the path is so much easier. When they weren't the path was impossible. You have accomplished something immense.

5. Continued Discussion Regarding SF Ratios and FTE Goals

- a. S. Lamb: There has been a great deal of discussion about FTE and SF ratio and we're still very adamant about the need for C. Olsen to be able to work with accurate faculty counts for his department, etc., and we understand that goals will change per college because the spreadsheet doesn't work. We accept that. But you talked the other week about eight concerns: sabbaticals, people released for grants, partial administrative assignments, etc. In general it's our feeling that if the Dean and certainly if the Provost has blessed it then it should be taken into account. The denominator would assuredly raise our goals. Also some thoughts have been expressed that going to two to two-and-one-half percent makes one wonder what it's worth if it changes the character of the institution.
  - i. D. Bradley: Over time we have to keep our raises in line with what others are doing. Thank goodness that inflation has been nominal. I know what's going to happen if inflation is a problem because the state will still pinch us on tuition. You can talk about what you're going to do in any given year in regard to raises but long-term is yet to be seen.
  - ii. R. Williams: They basically have autonomy to deploy as they like. We have varied from saying you have a 4:4 to whatever they need...
  - iii. D. Bradley: I don't have any issues with it but I think there's nothing wrong with it. I would say it's somewhat incomplete. Some departments have a substantial amount of flexibility. Bob's department has something like .2 adjuncts in the fall out of eight but other departments have 25 percent adjuncts. If a department that has a lot of flexibility is overstaffed it doesn't take long to get that department where it needs to be. We can't do this faster in departments that are very highly tenured. In departments where you have flexibility you need to take advantage of it in a timely manner.
  - iv. R. Guell: For those who did not see, it is my view that 555/.21 is really difficult and can change the character of what we do if we do it too quickly. 2019 instead of 2017 is more realistic. Class size could become 47 in two years, 49 in year four; 25 becomes 27 in a five-year period. A five to ten percent change is more realistic. We try where possible to move from the spring to the fall. Rather than it be understood, we need to tap people on the shoulders and say "we need you to do 4:2 in History," for example. If it's involuntary, "it's now your turn." You still have time to do your work. Unless there was money tied to a sabbatical or specific time to a sabbatical, change it so all one-semester sabbaticals be spring ones. What we have as Dan has pointed out to us is a ten percent in fall-to-

- spring and a drop in fall-to-spring FTE. There's being flexible to achieve our goal and there's pushing so hard that we jeopardize what we're doing.
- v. D. Bradley: I don't believe that going to 21 won't lead to dramatic choices. If we say we have forty departments and we're going to keep it equal, there shouldn't have to be dramatic changes. But deans and chairs need to look at their departments and they need to say, we're going to have to cut a couple to give to other departments.
  - vi. R. Guell: I think part of the blowback is sort of the "MSNBC" position that was presented to the chairs, and they took a "Fox News" position. It's my view that 555 by 2017 you figure out is an end run to 4:4 loads.
  - vii. D. Bradley: That's absolutely wrong. In fact, I don't think R. Williams should tell deans and chairs to go to a 4:2 load. I think departments should allocate their resources and solve their own problems. If they can't the Dean and Provost need to solve them together. We don't know how big the problems are in the departments that have problems. R. Williams has said his goal is two fewer FTE than last year. That's .1 percent, I think. Fewer than two a year would be longer than 2017. I just want progress. If we get lucky and get retirements in the appropriate spots, then great. We just need to keep moving.
  - viii. S. Lamb: If we take advantage of flexibility where it does occur, that's reasonable. I'm sure that the deans and Provost and the President are all wise enough to know where those pockets are and do that which is politically necessary to change without disruption. We heard a lot of fear last week and we have allayed those fears.
  - ix. R. Guell: I think there needs to be some assurance that is someone is willing to go 4:2 that the hand is not bitten off. Putting that in a memo that is quotable down the line would be significant.
  - x. D. Bradley: The thing we should be doing now, maybe it's too late for fall, is if we had a schedule for every section. With a name for every section, we'd know what the needs are.
  - xi. T. Hawkins: My understanding is that it's impossible. If we can't see now how many students are coming in how can you plan for sections that are suddenly required?
  - xii. D. Bradley: If we assume exactly the same enrollment, maybe a few more sophomore sections—plan on the same number as you had last year. If we have to add a couple of sections, R. Williams will add a couple.
  - xiii. T. Hawkins: That is the way it is always done.
  - xiv. R. Williams: No, we added hundreds of sections in August. We want to make sure we have the schedule in place, ask the deans to look at FTE and

see if that's in place; if they have it, put that person on a class and deal with that fluctuation. I think we are at 75 percent scheduled.

- xv. T. Hawkins: I don't do schedules, fortunately. I just want to make sure I understand C. Olsen won't feel handcuffed because in July he will have to add classes.
- xvi. S. Lamb: And the Provost wants to be asked now.
- xvii. L. Maule: We need professors in Arts and Sciences, for example, to talk with one another. We should have their availability. They were this fall but they appear not to be. Does there need to be some adjustment from one department to another? If we only knew we could have added not 10 or 15, but 2.
- xviii. R. Williams: I have been told, "Can't we tell you what we need?" Classes have to be moved, faculty complains about having to move buildings. Let's make those changes now rather than at the beginning of the semester.
- xix. T. Hawkins: As I understand C. Olsen, he would like to be able to plan in advance. My sense is that as he sees the way things stand now he finds himself in July or August, no matter what, being asked to open sections. That is going to continue to happen. There will be a requirement and he will feel squeezed to ask for this. When he is asked to plan early he feels he won't have flexibility in August.
- xx. R. Williams: For those minimal changes there will be support. We want him to have 95 percent figured out now. I'm meeting with chairs to clarify that. I understand his concern, and it's valid, but we're going to try to change the past and be more proactive.
- xxi. R. Guell: There's a complication that hasn't even been discussed, even last week; that is, the graduation guarantee really throws another constraint into the problem. That you can't just say, "Well, now all the PSY 101 sections are all full."
- xxii. D. Bradley: When you have a student with a specific problem you have to deal with it. Find that spot for one person.
- xxiii. R. Guell: What I'm saying is that V. Sheets can find a spot for one, but not ten.
- xxiv. D. Bradley: Unless by some miracle we end up with the same number of students from here to eternity, there's got to be elasticity.
- xxv. S. Lamb: R. Williams, if you were to receive from V. Sheets and C. Olsen. their anticipated needs for this summer based on last summer, you would be able to move forward with your planning?
- xxvi. R. Williams: You need more than that because they need to stay within FTE. Dean Murray needs to get with his chairs. If I were then dean then I

need to see their needs and look at what they have as an FTE allocation. In September, August, October, and November they should have been having discussions. Dean Murray will expect a give-and-take.

- xxvii. R. Guell: Will that resolve in the 27 days before registration starts?
- xxviii. R. Williams: That's why I'm meeting with them tomorrow.

6. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion

- a. V. Sheets: Regarding the memo about using the Faculty Activity Database for Biennial Review, that the information in there will be the basis for the Biennial Review makes sense but that's not what the document says. There needs to be an alignment. Is FAC going to be charged with making that alignment work?
  - i. C. MacDonald: I would assume they would be doing that as part of their review process.
  - ii. S. Lamb: Is that an S. Powers issue?
  - iii. R. Guell: Probably a FAC issue and for S. Powers to align the FAD reports with the FAC recommendations. That is probably a next year's FAC problem.
- b. S. Lamb: I heard from a spokesperson for an international student—when we had holidays and the bus service was shut down, they were walking through horrible weather to get to class and it was a real strain on them. Can we look into this?
  - i. D. Bradley: My guess is from the city point of view they get holiday pay to work those days. There are probably several days throughout the year like that. Did they come from the apartments?
  - ii. S. Lamb: Yes.
  - iii. D. Bradley: We'll get D. McKee to investigate that with the city.

**Motion to adjourn 5:15pm**

**Report to Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
on Investigating the Desirability of Sending Midterm Grades to all Students  
University Student Affairs Committee  
Jim Buffington, Chair  
March 4, 2014**

**The Charge:** Investigate the desirability of sending midterm grades to all students.

**Background:** This charge originated with SGA. The primary impetus was a concern of students that, in some classes, students had no idea of their class standing going into final exam week. In some cases, students reported receiving no feedback as to their grades until final grades were released. SGA solicited comment from various students, faculty, and administrators about this concern. Over the course of the academic year, it became apparent that there were a number of additional concerns related to grading procedures and classroom practices. As these concerns were discussed in SAC, the Committee ultimately separated these concerns into four separate recommendations, all of which are discussed below. At its February 21, 2014 Meeting, SAC moved to approve the following recommendations:

**SAC Recommendation #1**

No later than the end of the sixth week of classes, all freshmen and students on academic probation receive progress reports in the form of letter grades. All other students doing C-, D+, D, D-, and F work at interim grading period are also given letter grade reports. Such a deficiency report does not indicate certain failure, but it should be regarded as a warning. Also the lack of an interim grade report of deficient work is not a guarantee that courses attempted will be passed. Vote: 5-0-0, L. Maule, L. Valentine.

**Rationale.**

Based on experience of the Student Success Council and solid academic research showing the importance of early feedback, there was a strong consensus among SAC members that the current midterm reports, which students receive during the ninth week of the semester, arrive in many cases too late for students to effectively address their shortcomings. The rationale behind a six-week report, which we have named an "interim report" to replace the "midterm report," was that this period of time would alert students to the need to address their grades by giving them a small window of opportunity to take immediate steps to address any deficiencies.

**SAC Recommendation #2**

To adopt the "Proposal on an Addition to University Handbook Language Related to Teaching and Learning" which includes the "Principles of Good Practice in Teaching" and "Principles for Effective Learning." Vote: 5-0-0, A. Brown, L. Maule.

**Background and Rationale:** Discussion over the course of this academic year raised many issues, originating from SGA, but supported by faculty and administration, relating to teaching and learning in classrooms. This discussion resulted in several motions such as "To assist student success, all faculty shall post for the benefit of each student in a class on "blackboard" or such other online venue specified by Academic Affairs the result of every graded assignment or effort no later than two (2) weeks after such an assignment or effort is due. Any attendance or participation points available in a class may be posted at the end of a term." Such proposals were not accepted by SAC, primarily because of their specificity and the many contingencies that could arise making the policy ineffective and unenforceable. At the January 17 SAC Meeting, J. Powers and L. Valentine were asked to draft a general policy on Teaching and Learning. This proposal (See Appendix A) adds a sentence to the preamble of the existing University Handbook (underlined below). It also includes two statements of principles, "Principles of Good Practice in Teaching," and "Principles for Effective Learning," for a new closing Section 310.3. Undergirding this



proposal is the articulation of research informed guidance to faculty and students that support student academic success. The drafting of this proposal was assisted by Sister A. Anderson and B. Whitaker.

### **SAC Recommendation #3**

The "Principles of Good Practice in Teaching" be used as a basis for faculty evaluation. Vote: 5-0-0, S. Powers, C. Enyeart.

**Rationale:** Another of SAC's charges this year is to assist in the development of an instrument to replace SIRs, and to develop an instrument which would be adopted campus-wide and consistently applied. There was a consensus among SAC members that the "Principles of Good Practice in Teaching" would serve as a helpful basis for developing this instrument.

### **SAC Recommendation #4**

Language be added to University Handbook Section 310.1.3 that faculty be required to provide timely feedback to students to afford them the opportunity to use that feedback to impact their scholastic performance for the remainder of the term. Vote: 5-0-0, L. Maule, L. Valentine.

**Rationale:** One of SGA's specific concerns was so ardently expressed, perhaps rising above all other concerns, that the consensus of SAC was to address the issue, albeit in less restrictive terms than earlier proposals. Again, academic research strongly supports the importance of providing students with prompt feedback.

## Appendix A

### Proposal on an Addition to University Handbook Language Related to Teaching and Learning

February 2014

The following is proposed for inclusion to the preamble to Section 310 of the University Handbook (text in red). The *Principles of Good Practice in Teaching* and the *Principles for Effective Learning* documents that follow are proposed for a new closing Section 310.3. Undergirding this proposal is the articulation of research informed guidance to faculty and students that support student academic success.

#### 310 FACULTY DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

*Policy 310 was included in the 2001 University Handbook revision and was amended by the ISU Board of Trustees as follows: Section 310.1.1.1 amended on July 16, 2004 and Section 310.1.5.1 amended November 1, 2006; amended 310.1.1.4 on December 17, 2011; amended Section 310.1.13, 310.1.12.1, 310.1.12.2, 310.1.12.3, and 310.1.12.4.*

#### *Preamble*

Newly appointed faculty members are expected to attend new faculty professional development sessions. Eligible faculty members are required to participate in any mandatory benefits as described in the University Handbook, Section 500 (Employment).

Members of the faculty of Indiana State University are expected to abide by established policies for the operation of the University and the conduct of its instructional programs, to participate in and contribute to the development and improvement of educational services within the scope of the mission of the University, to perform assigned duties to the best of their ability, and to be concerned about the educational welfare and achievement of students. Each faculty member should continuously endeavor to improve scholarly attainments, to participate in appropriate organized professional activities and, through research and teaching, to contribute to the expansion of knowledge and the advancement of learning. Personal conduct and relationships with students and colleagues should conform to accepted ethics.

The benchmarks of any great university are directly related to high standards of academic endeavor by both teachers and students. Truth and honesty are recognized as fundamental to a university community. The University expects both students and faculty to adhere to and foster the ideals for which the University was founded, including as manifest in the *Principles of Good Practice in Teaching* and the *Principles for Effective Learning* found at the end of this subsection of the University Handbook.

Indiana State University subscribes to AAUP guidelines for academic freedom and faculty duties and responsibilities. Faculty members are expected to conduct themselves in accordance with these guidelines.

## Principles of Good Practice in Teaching

Indiana State University

February 2014 DRAFT

As a faculty member at Indiana State University, I take pride in my instructional responsibilities and the opportunity to facilitate student learning that also requires student ownership as described in the *Principles for Effective Learning* document. In addition to abiding by *University Handbook* policy on teaching, you can expect the following from me, informed by extensive research on effective teaching practice<sup>1</sup>:

**Student-Faculty Contact** – I will communicate with students through the mechanism(s) identified in my course syllabus. I have posted office hours and welcome students to drop by with a question/need. Scheduling an appointment is also fine. I also invite conversations about other topics such as career goals and how this course may help a student to reach his or her goals, opportunities for graduate study, or just how things are going for him or her at ISU.

**Opportunities for Group Learning** – Success in any field/career requires the ability to work in or interact effectively with groups. The art of planning, negotiation, comfort in being reliant on others, accountability to others, and related skills come from such experiences. Students in my courses may at times work in pairs or small groups as appropriate to particular content or learning objectives.

**Embedded Active Engagement Mechanisms** – Relaying content through lecture is only one way a student may experience my courses. Students will also experience opportunities to learn from each other, to link learning to past experience, and/or to apply learning to their lives/future careers as may be appropriate to particular content or learning objectives.

**Prompt Feedback/Grading** – For simple assignments, I typically provide feedback/grading within 7 days. For more complex evaluations, it may take longer, but rarely more than 14 days. Furthermore, I aim to provide early term feedback on lower stakes assignments so that students can better understand my expectations and what they need to produce by way of quality submissions. I also provide both positive comments (i.e., what the student did well) as well as constructive criticism where such feedback is salient. I post grades to Blackboard unless I have a specific alternative mechanism as described in the syllabus.

**Time-on-Task Expectation Guidance** – I will help students to understand good time-management practices as applied to this course that is drawn from my observation of other students and my own experience as a college student.

**High Expectations** – I reinforce to my students that they were admitted to ISU because we believe they have the tools to be able to perform to a high level. I also expect a lot from myself having been entrusted to teach this course based on my training and previous performance. One way high expectations are

---

<sup>1</sup> Chickering, A. W., and Gamson, Z. F. (1987). *Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education*: <http://www.elmhurst.edu/~richs/EC/SPS/UsefulDocuments/7%20Principles%20of%20Good%20Practice%20in%20Undergrad%20Ed-ChickeringGamson.pdf>

manifest is by providing students' opportunities to offer formal and anonymous feedback on my courses, typically at the end, but I may also do so at the midpoint or other points in the term.

**Different Learning Approaches** – I recognize that students bring different learning preferences to a course. Hence, I embed different elements that enable a diversity of learning styles, some that will help to strengthen their ability to learn in a different context.

## Principles for Effective Learning

Indiana State University

February 2014 DRAFT

As a partner in the teaching-learning experience, students also have responsibilities in order to maximize what can be gained from one's courses. Informed by extensive research on effective learners<sup>2</sup>, we have the following principled expectations for students:

**Find passion in the content.** Faculty member seek to provide ways for students to engage a course's content. Students should aim to find where they can make a personal connection to it. Since a faculty member will generally not have the luxury of knowing his or her students well, students should assert themselves in those places where they can either relate or see a way to contribute.

**Get comfortable with failure.** Students should not expect that a course's content will come easy since he or she will likely be confronting it for the first time. However, since faculty seek to help students via early and prompt feedback, students should resist the urge to believe they cannot be successful in a course when confronted with constructive criticism. Students should also reach out to the faculty member if/as needed for feedback clarification or stronger understanding. Students are also encouraged to seek support when needed through other campus services; this is a marker of strength, NOT a sign of weakness.

**Read and think actively.** Grasping course content requires that a student not only do the out-of-class reading, but to do it in a way that anchors the material more solidly through techniques of mental mapping and non-linear reading where appropriate<sup>3</sup>. The faculty member can assist and/or refer a student to others that can assist in teaching these techniques.

**Ask questions in class.** The ability to grasp course content requires a student to be willing to ask questions when he or she does not understand and to contribute where he or she does. Student learning benefits from this approach as does the learning of one's classmates.

**Cultivate empathy for others.** One's classmates are also seeking to learn the content, and hence, a student needs to respect their rights as learners. A student has a responsibility to help others learn and an opportunity to learn from them as well, perhaps not even related to course content but in regards to how they carry themselves, interact with others, and/or their different life experiences.

**Set goals and make them real.** College is an enormous investment of time and resources. To be successful, a student need to set goals for him or herself, including within a course. The faculty member is there to assist and/or to refer a student to others that may be able to assist.

**Find a way to contribute.** Although a student may not always feel a strong connection to the content of a particular class, pushing oneself to engage is important. Most especially, though, knowing that course attendance is one of the strongest predictors of course performance, a student needs to commit to come to class or converse with the faculty member if he or she cannot on a particular day, subject to course policy in this regard found on the syllabus.

---

<sup>2</sup> Bain, K. (2012). *What the best college students do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

<sup>3</sup> A helpful source can be found here: <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~acskills/success/reading.html>.