

File 1

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 18, 2014

3:30pm, HMSU 227

AGENDA

- I. Administrative Reports: President D. Bradley, Provost R. Williams
- II. Chair Report: S. Lamb
- III. Approval of the Minutes of March 4, 2014 **(File 2)**
- IV. Fifteen-Minute Discussion
- V. Suggested Revision to Handbook Language Regarding Syllabi and Feedback : J. Buffington, D. Hantzis, R. Guell **(File 3)**

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE 2013-2014

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 18, 2014

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Minutes

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

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

Guests: J. Buffington, D. Hantzis, B. Whitaker

1. Administrative Reports:

- a. D. Bradley: I have no formal report, but I have news from the last legislative session.
 - i. We previously had a \$750,000 construction limit. Above that and there was a long approval process. That sometimes prompted creative scheduling of projects, but our limit is now \$2 million. This will result in a significant savings in terms of energy and worry.
 - ii. The legislature is also setting up study committees. One will look at teacher education. They want some way to assess new teachers and have their colleges/universities respond to that assessment. In principle it isn't bad but there have been a lot of anecdotes related to it. Assessment of elementary education is probably possible, but science education, small liberal arts schools, and the like will have trouble making statistical sense.
 - iii. There is a huge need for repair, maintenance, and rehab at Hulman Center. There have been discussions with the city about a partnership. The city wrote legislation for a "sports authority" that would generate revenue, but the bill it's tied to includes professional sports teams. The legislature is willing to think about tying into city projects and a Division I programs and it will be further discussed this summer. If it can't be worked out, it's going to be difficult to restore and maintain, as they need \$2 million just for basic maintenance.

- b. R. Williams: The Library Dean search is complete. We welcomed Robin Crumrin to the position, a great asset to the University. There was a lot of interest at the presentations, with 50-plus people attending. All three candidates were impressed with us.
- 2. Chair Report: S. Lamb: No Formal Report.
- 3. Approval of the Minutes of March 4, 2014: A. Anderson, B. Kilp 9-0-0
- 4. Fifteen-Minute Discussion:
 - a. R. Guell: This is for the President: could you describe your thinking regarding academic coaching, and whether it will be renewed?
 - i. D. Bradley: My gut is that it will be renewed. Whether it will go beyond two years is unknown. We have to do things slowly and make sure we are assessing properly. The sophomore return numbers are going to be our proof. Contract wants a decision on this in July. I think they will meet the requirement for contract renewal because that is about pre-registrations for fall and that should be able to get that done. We will discuss this vigorously and see if it is worth the money.
 - ii. R. Guell: Let's suppose they generate the preregistrations to generate the renewal. From where does that expense come? Will that affect Academic Affairs?
 - iii. D. Bradley: No.
 - b. B. Kilp: The new advising program for the freshmen is an increase in time for the advisor. MySAM doesn't do anything automatically. As I understand it we haven't been given full training on it at this time. In the fall it will start hitting the rest of the advisors. I have gotten professional and personal opinions about it, and it seems like a lot of extra time for advisors. How will this be accomplished? Are there funds for the release time for the advisor? Will we have to have more professional advisors down the road?
 - i. D. Bradley: Neither sounds promising because they are expensive options. I have not had a conversation with S. Powers that leads me to be concerned that is true. I think we have to fix the software if there is a significant amount of manual processing.
 - ii. B. Kilp: Others have been asking, because if a student does anything to their schedule, everything has to be changed manually.
 - iii. D. Bradley: That's got to be automated.
 - iv. B. Kilp: In what way? There are an infinite amount of combinations, depending on the individual student.
 - v. D. Bradley: The ability of that software in creating these degree maps is mandated by the legislature. We are far ahead of anyone else in terms of getting it to work properly.
 - vi. B. Kilp: Are we writing that software?

- vii. D. Bradley: We are writing the scripts, I imagine. We have to explain to the software how the degree program works, to load the prerequisites in advance and let the software take it from there.
- viii. B. Kilp: Some say it's not doing what you're suggesting right now. If we have to take on all those sophomores—even if the student doesn't go to their advisor before making a change—I hear that you have to go in and change it anyway.
- ix. D. Bradley: We have to make it easy or it won't get done.
- x. R. Williams: I will talk to L. Spence about your concerns.
- xi. S. Lamb: Has anyone had experience with this?
- xii. C. Olsen: Yes, and it's labor intensive. The best we can hope for is that some things can be automated. I can't imagine varying the Foundational Studies possibilities.
- xiii. S. Lamb: So when a student begins this program, you need to enter all the Foundational Studies courses?
- xiv. C. Olsen: If someone starts as an Economics major, all the classes for the program are right there. When someone takes something not in the program, it all has to be redone. Because of how it appears on the screen, advisors are constantly printing them out and working from the hardcopy because it's easier that way.
- xv. D. Bradley: It will probably be an iterative process.
- xvi. B. Kilp: And it's not just for the graduation guarantee.
- xvii. D. Bradley: The requirements that we need to monitor the graduation guarantee are now mandated by the legislature. Whatever our capacities are to implement this and make it fully functional this fall, we will be far ahead of anyone else. We will report back to the legislature and study how well we can do it. I don't really see a reason why the software can't be made to work fully automatically in adjusting schedule and adjust semesters. That should be possible for most degree programs, depending on options. The thing to do is get S. Powers to come and make a presentation.
- c. T. Hawkins: I haven't asked since January; but have we had an update on textbooks and the bookstore?
 - i. R. Williams: D. McKee and S. Powers have been working with the Bookstore. An individual went on maternity leave and is now back. S. Powers sent me an update on what they're doing. They're trying to address the issues you've brought up, with regards to knowing if the books are going to be available or not. I think we're on par to have a smooth start. There may be issues, but not as many.

- ii. S. Lamb: This question is for the chairs and concerns book orders: did you find inaccuracies in the reports that you received? When I went through mine a number of those had been ordered.
 - iii. C. Olsen: When our last list came out they didn't show up on the report as having been ordered. I'm not sure exactly if it was all of them or if there was too long a time lag.
 - d. C. Olsen: Related to that, with Faculty Enlight, you don't have to log in anywhere to order books.
 - i. K. Yousif: You have to log in to access the history...
 - ii. C. Olsen: You can log in as a guest and add things to different sections. My secretary and I both did this. Has anyone else been able to do this?
 - iii. R. Guell: So you could go in and delete my order?
 - iv. C. Olsen: Yes. We discovered it halfway through the process. Ellen was entering things and she discovered she could enter for everyone without logging in. There's a login prompt, but she just kept hitting "continue" and gave ten different book orders. I hope I'm wrong. We also found out the schedule they have preloaded is the old schedule from last year. My class didn't show up but my name was on several section numbers that didn't match what was being taught. The old schedule is about 80 percent wrong. It works well, but they need to get an updated schedule from us.
 - v. R. Williams: I'll follow up with that.
 - vi. C. Olsen: It was very easy to use, though.
 - vii. K. Yousif: If it keeps your history there is only one real time consuming entry at the beginning.
 - viii. D. Bradley: How are you getting into this? Through My ISU?
 - ix. C. Olsen: No, but it's also on ISU A-Z.
 - e. R. Guell: CAAC is dutifully looking at programs that exceed the standards for credit hours, and they are not liking the choices they are having to make. I have heard that Purdue and IU are pretty much ignoring the statewide 120 rule. Forty-seven percent of the programs exceed 120 hours, according to S. Powers, and they are just ignoring the legislative mandate. Whether it's the 120 rule or our own internal handcuffs, if the others are not following the rules...
 - i. R. Williams: I have not heard about that but I will look into it. Just from the level of complaining I hear from them, I would think they were compliant.
 - f. C. Olsen: Recently the Foundation kept rejecting an emeritus who kept trying to donate 200 shares of stock. In the past they always sold it for him, but this time they kept rejecting him.
 - i. D. Bradley: Sounds like people aren't communicating.
 - ii. C. Olsen: I wondered if something has changed.

- iii. D. Bradley: There are times the Foundation has been told they can't sell it.
 - g. C. Olsen: Someone else asked about rates of graduate and married student housing. A three-bedroom family apartment is \$8200 but three single students are being charged \$7000 each.
 - i. D. Bradley: There are changes in how they are being managed. Those numbers sound outlandish.
 - ii. C. Olsen: I promised to ask about it.
 - iii. D. Bradley: Some international students are clearly unhappy. They have difficulty sometimes getting into reasonable apartments due to the inability to get credit checks, etc. I sent an email to C. McGrew and J. Powers this week and they have already mitigated that. I think for people who are there and want to return the next year, it's significantly better than what you have described.
5. Suggested Revision to Handbook Language Regarding Syllabi and Feedback: J. Buffington, D. Hantzis, R. Guell
- a. S. Lamb: I hope we can have a thorough discussion of this and send these to FAC and SAC for their review.
 - b. R. Guell: D. Hantzis has already met with FAC and gotten a response. We received it at 1:30 today.
 - i. D. Hantzis: The emails I received said "please act quickly" and we were able to vote on it. I drafted it Monday night and it was voted on unanimously. Basically we read the proposal we received and it had been through SAC. We read it and I think you'll see we agreed with the intent and support, and offered a few more revisions. We added Colleges and Departments in the name of the clause. We changed that so students will know how grades will be determined. We also wanted to add a line that said faculty are encouraged to update syllabi when schedule changes happen through the semester. For example, we recommended a change in language that read "syllabi should be available *from* the beginning of the term." They need to be able to access it throughout the semester. We also tried to protect academic freedom. We also agreed that listing the kinds of assignments for "reasonable feedback" was a fool's game; any work that was being submitted for assessment needed a feedback guideline.
 - ii. S. Lamb: You have shared your thoughts with SAC?
 - iii. D. Hantzis: No, just the Executive Committee.
 - iv. K. Yousif: Where is the updating line?
 - v. D. Hantzis: Beginning with "Faculty are encouraged..." Section 310.1.2. We wanted that language because there is the expectation that colleges and departments should make those guidelines.

- vi. S. Lamb: I would like to ask both V. Sheets and R. Williams in the Department of Student Success—are these issues being discussed there as well? Is there a need to merge the thoughts of that group with this work?
- vii. R. Williams: I think it's a little premature but I think, yes, we should address that, as well as other things that will come to FAC and SAC and this body. I don't know if it's mature to go ahead and move ahead with it.
- viii. S. Lamb: Is there a possibility that this area could be expedited? It would be wonderful if we could achieve closure of this domain this year.
- ix. C. MacDonald: We could probably pass this and share it with the Task Force.
- x. R. Guell: In order to honor the work of L. Valentine and SGA we ought to pass this as quickly as reasonable and if further modifications come out of the Task Force, we make changes then.
- xi. S. Lamb: Our last meeting of the year is April 17. If we were to approve the content of this document and send it to the Departmental Success Task Force for their incorporation and personal modification, how would you react? It is my hope that we can bring this by itself to the April 17 meeting. I want to give them the opportunity to add what they need. I would like to ask for a motion to approve the content of D. Hantzis' material and send it forward to the Departmental Success Task Force for their study and possible modifications with the understanding that we will present this to the April 17 Senate.
 - 1. Motion to Approve the FAC Proposal, as amended (noted below), and refer that document to the Taskforce on Department Success with the understanding that they will return it to us so that the Senate can vote on the motion by April 17. T. Hawkins, K. Yousif; Vote 9-0-0**
- xii. J. Buffington: I have not had a chance to see what FAC has done. I want to thank this committee for solving our problem. I would also like to thank FAC for their quick work. However, Section 310.1.2.1 I still do not see a crystal clear reference to a timeline. "Reasonable expectations students may have..." What do they mean by reasonable? Detailed? Thorough? High quality? Or timeliness? It's open to interpretation.
- xiii. S. Lamb: The motion is on the table.
- xiv. R. Guell: D. Hantzis, if you would look at your version and I will look at mine; in neither does it really specify that it's about quality or specificity or timeliness—implied timeliness.
- xv. D. Hantzis: We assume that "reasonable" was not referring to the nature of the feedback, but students should be told, "I'm the kind of professor that will return papers in two weeks." They shouldn't have to wonder. We

thought “reasonable” was making sure students would know when to be worried about receiving grades. If we add specific language about the nature of the feedback we run into a problem.

- xvi. R. Guell: The point from the last meeting was that defining “specificity” and “timeliness” was a fool’s errand. If we said “tests this many weeks” and “quizzes that many days” it would be terribly problematic. You had to put some form of specificity in your syllabus as an individual faculty member that was acceptable to departmental norms.
- xvii. J. Buffington: I’m not making my point clearly. We cannot prescribe a specific time. I agree with that. The language here does not mention timeliness.
- xviii. R. Guell: In 310.1.2.1 it states, “reasonable expectations for timeliness...”
- xix. D. Hantzis: The language could be changed to match the language of the schedule. You can give a schedule by which assignments would be returned.
- xx. T. Hawkins: “Timely” should be in front of “feedback.” (“Timely” was inserted.)
- xxi. D. Hantzis: If SAC is concerned about the nature of the feedback, FAC and SAC would be interested in language about that.
- xxii. J. Buffington: That was not my point either, to specify quality measures.

- xxiii. D. Hantzis: In the Section where exceptions were given for new and late faculty, FAC did not understand the justification for that so we used the Handbook language of four weeks. Faculty should be hired no later than four weeks before the start of term if possible. The exception exists for those hired less than four weeks before start of term.
- xxiv. D. Bradley: If they’ve been teaching the class for years...
- xxv. D. Hantzis: They don’t have to take that exception.
- xxvi. B. Kilp: What about those that have a generic syllabus?
- xxvii. S. Lamb: What about unusual circumstances surrounding hiring?
- xxviii. R. Guell: I was not imagining a timeline of four weeks. Four days, maybe. You eliminate the concerns of a regular faculty member who had a course tossed upon them at the very last moment.
- xxix. D. Hantzis: Change “hired” to “assigned?”
- xxx. C. MacDonald: We’re amenable to that.
- xxxi. B. Kilp: I thought the syllabus was a contract between the faculty and the student. It’s like not knowing what you’re getting paid at a new job.
- xxxii. D. Hantzis: I think you’re right as a matter of practice. The department could write a default syllabus but you still have to allow a professor that has one day to at least reshape it a little. I don’t feel obligated to make sure

my students have to understand what's happening in week sixteen when we're still in week one.

- xxxiii. D. Bradley: This is too much detail in the Handbook. It should be moved to departmental procedures. Clearly we are reasonable people.
- xxxiv. R. Guell: We should strike the whole language and focus on reasonableness? (That recommendation was accepted.)
- xxxv. B. Kilp: What about syllabus requirements that contradict each other? I have to have two sets of learning objectives.
- xxxvi. D. Hantzis: I like this clause for college and departmental elements. We are defining what a syllabus is.
- xxxvii. D. Bradley: Ultimately we need to discuss the need for this in BlackBoard.
- xxxviii. R. Guell: The last of 310.1.2...I'm okay with that but I have an eight-page syllabus to 200 students in the fall. If I have to change a syllabus I do not want to repeat all eight pages; it says "in the manner in which it was provided."
- xxxix. C. MacDonald: Just update the pages that need changed.
 - xl. D. Hantzis: Our point was that we didn't want updates to be casual. We want them to be documented, published, and accessible. Changes have to be consistent.
 - xli. R. Guell: So I can publish my update to BlackBoard? I would like to have some conversation about the point that D. Bradley raised. I don't think it is a violation of any right to require BlackBoard or at least put the syllabus on BlackBoard...as well as grades.
 - xl.ii. K. Yousif: I agree, but my problem has been technology. I have one machine. It has been breaking down repeatedly. This is my second loaner and I can't store anything on it because it's not encrypted.
 - xl.iii. D. Bradley: There has to be reasonableness in everything. You're not going to be held responsible for that. We don't want to make the policy so convoluted by covering every possibility and by doing so protecting the guilty.
 - xl.iv. S. Lamb: I would like to eliminate "in the manner provided."
 - xl.v. K. Yousif: It doesn't adjust the BlackBoard issue.
 - xl.vi. S. Lamb: Is anyone uncomfortable with eliminating the phrase, "in the manner provided?" (This suggestion was taken.)
 - xl.vii. A. Anderson: Are we voting with the inclusion of the word "timely?"
 - xl.viii. R. Guell: Yes.
 - xl.ix. S. Lamb: I appreciate the attempt to make it less legalistic in general. We have to provide some flexibility for the chairs' input.

I. Vote: 9-0-0

Motion to Adjourn 4:32

Amendments to Handbook Sections 310.1.2 and 310.1.3

Current Language

310.1.2 Course Outlines and Syllabi. Faculty members are required to prepare course outlines or syllabi for their courses. If there is uncertainty about the content of outlines and syllabi, the department chairperson should be consulted. Two (2) or more faculty teaching the same course may use the same outline or syllabus. An outline of each course should be available at the beginning of the term so students may know what is to be covered during the term. New faculty are given reasonable time to develop and submit course outlines.

310.1.3 Methods of Instruction. Specific or uniform methods of instruction are not prescribed. Faculty are expected to adapt their methods to the nature and content of each course. Selection and organization of content of particular courses and the development of departmental curricula are faculty responsibilities. Teaching method is the responsibility of the individual faculty member. The quality of his/her teaching will be given high priority in the faculty evaluation process. Faculty are encouraged to avail themselves of the services of the Center for Instructional Research and Teaching, which provides an array of opportunities for faculty to continue their professional development as teachers.

Proposed Language

310.1.2 Course Outlines and Syllabi. Faculty members are required to prepare course outlines or syllabi for their courses. Two (2) or more faculty teaching the same course may use the same outline or syllabus. An outline of each course shall be available to students from the beginning of each term. Course outlines and syllabi should be published and accessible to students throughout the term. Faculty are expected to inform students of revisions to the information provided in course outlines and syllabi when they are made.

310.1.2.1 Required Elements. Each outline and syllabus shall provide information that facilitates communication and promotes student success, including contact information for the faculty member and the department in which the course is offered, faculty office hours, a list of required course texts and materials, explanation of how course grades will be determined, and reasonable expectations that students may have for receiving timely feedback on work submitted for assessment. Faculty are encouraged to review department and College guidelines for preparation of course outlines and syllabi.

310.1.2.2 College and Departmental Required Elements. Colleges and/or departments may establish additional required elements on course outlines and syllabi through appropriate governance processes.

310.1.3 Methods of Instruction. Specific or uniform methods of instruction are not prescribed. Faculty are expected to adapt their methods to the nature and content of each course. Selection and organization of content of particular courses and the development of departmental curricula are faculty responsibilities. Teaching method is the responsibility of the individual faculty member. The quality of his/her teaching will be given high priority in the faculty evaluation process. Faculty are encouraged to avail themselves of the services of the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence, which provides an array of opportunities for faculty to continue their professional development as teachers.

File 3

From: Robert Guell

Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 3:26 PM

To: Steven Lamb; Chris MacDonald; James Buffington; Linda Maule; Logan Valentine; Darlene Hantzis; Timothy Hawkins; Joshua Powers; Beth Whitaker; Christopher Olsen; Keri Yousif; Alma Anderson; Virgil Sheets; Brian Kilp

Cc: Biff Williams; Dan Bradley

Subject: Guell-suggested HB language for dealing with Feedback

All, (Feel free to forward this to anyone you think could offer insight into this topic)

As many of you surely know, SAC recommended fuzzy language regarding feedback after rejecting Logan's specific list. We agreed (at least I think we did) that the feedback expectations would be in the syllabus and that departments would be in the best position to offer guidance. The thing is, the HB language on the syllabus is CRAPPY. I was hoping for a list to which "feedback expectations" could be added. Unfortunately it wasn't that easy. You will see from that which is below there is no such list. A syllabus could be handed out that was a blank sheet of paper with the word "Syllabus" on it. So I have taken liberties to create a minimalist list (contact info, office hours, required texts and materials, grading, and feedback expectations), as well as formal statement allowing for departmental and college practices already in place (e.g. No course can be a Foundational Studies course without specific syllabus elements.)

I have also corrected the Center for Teaching and Learning vs Center for Teaching Excellence reference in 310.1.3.

Here is my contradictory thinking:

- 1) To honor SAC and SGA's work we should deal with this at Exec and send it to Senate for the March meeting.
- 2) These are revisions that go directly to FACs primary authority and ought to be fully vetted by FAC.

I lean toward #2 and an April Senate and May BoT vote for Fall14 implementation.

Bob

Bold Italic is new

Existing Handbook Language

310.1.2 Course Outlines and Syllabi. Faculty members are required to prepare course outlines or syllabi for their courses. If there is uncertainty about the content of outlines and syllabi, the department chairperson should be consulted. Two (2) or more faculty teaching the same course may use the same outline or syllabus. An outline of each course should be available at the beginning of the term so students may know what is to be covered during the term. New faculty are given reasonable time to develop and submit course outlines.

310.1.3 Methods of Instruction. Specific or uniform methods of instruction are not prescribed. Faculty are expected to adapt their methods to the nature and content of each course. Selection and organization of content of particular courses and the development of departmental curricula are faculty responsibilities. Teaching method is the responsibility of the individual faculty member. The quality of his/her teaching will be given high priority in the faculty evaluation process. Faculty are encouraged to avail themselves of the services of the Center for Instructional Research and Teaching, which provides an array of opportunities for faculty to continue their professional development as teachers.

Proposed Revision

310.1.2 Course Outlines and Syllabi. Faculty members are required to prepare course outlines or syllabi for their courses. If there is uncertainty about the content of outlines and syllabi, the department chairperson should be consulted. Two (2) or more faculty teaching the same course may use the same outline or syllabus. An outline of each course ~~should~~ **shall** be available at the beginning of the term so students may know what is to be covered during the term. ***The single exception shall be for new faculty and those teaching a course for which advance notice was not provided who are to be*** given reasonable time to develop and submit course outlines.

310.1.2.1 Required Elements. Each outline and syllabus shall include contact information for the faculty member, office hours, a list of texts and materials required, information relating to how grades will be assigned, and reasonable expectations that students may have for feedback on the assignments, projects, and/or assessments given. Faculty are encouraged to refer to departmental guidance but may reasonably deviate from it.

310.1.2.2 College and Departmental Required Elements. Colleges (including the College of Graduate and Professional Studies, and the University College) may add required elements for their course syllabi.

310.1.3 Methods of Instruction. Specific or uniform methods of instruction are not prescribed. Faculty are expected to adapt their methods to the nature and content of each course. Selection and organization of content of particular courses and the development of departmental curricula are faculty responsibilities. Teaching method is the responsibility of the individual faculty member. The quality of his/her teaching will be given high priority in the faculty evaluation process. Faculty are encouraged to avail themselves of the services of the Center for ~~Instructional Research and Teaching~~ **Teaching Excellence**, which provides an array of opportunities for faculty to continue their professional development as teachers.

From: James Buffington <James.Buffington@indstate.edu>
Date: March 12, 2014 10:57:21 PM EDT
To: Robert Guell <Robert.Guell@indstate.edu>
Subject: RE: Guell-suggested HB language for dealing with Feedback

Bob,

I lean toward #2 as well, but because these issues originated with SGA and SAC, I believe SAC input on your proposal is also desirable.

Please allow one suggestion:

310.1.2.1 Required Elements. Each outline and syllabus shall include contact information for the faculty member, office hours, a list of texts and materials required, information relating to how grades will be assigned, and reasonable expectations that students may have for feedback on the assignments, projects, examinations, and/or other assessments given. Faculty are encouraged to refer to departmental guidance but may reasonably deviate from it.

Dr. James R. Buffington, Chair
University Student Affairs Committee
229 Scott College of Business
X2281
jbuffington@indstate.edu