FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee will meet at 3:30pm, Tuesday, March 25, 2014, in HMSU 227

## AGENDA

I. Administrative Reports: President D. Bradley, Provost R. Williams
II. Chair Report: S. Lamb
III. Approval of the Minutes of March 18, 2014 (File 2)
IV. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
V. FAC Motion in response to the charge to examine the possibility of revising the timing governing the constitution of Standing Committees to facilitate consistent operation and earlier beginning of committee work: D. Hantzis (File 4)
VI. FAC Motion in response to charge to review Proposal for a Council on Research and Creativity: D. Hantzis (File 5)
VII. FAC Motions in response to charge to review the current practice of adjusting the schedule of probationary reviews of tenure track faculty hired with prior service credit toward tenure: D. Hantzis (File 6)

# INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY 

FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

# EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 

March 25, 2014
3:30pm, HMSU 227
Minutes

Members Present: S. Lamb, R. Guell, T. Hawkins, B. Kilp, C. Olsen, V. Sheets
Members Absent: C. MacDonald, A. Anderson, K. Yousif
Ex-Officio Present: President D. Bradley, Provost R. Williams
Guests: D. Hantzis

1. Administrative Reports: President D. Bradley, Provost R. Williams
a. D. Bradley:
i. The commission will soon be abandoning weights and have a flat dollar value associated with each degree, and will be giving ISU credit for that decision.
ii. Bids on construction for Mills Hall and the track are looking good. Also this week we anticipate bids for renovation of the fountain.
iii. We also have some encouragement from the legislature that they may help with restoration and maintenance of Hulman Center.
2. R. Guell: Was the audio issue ever resolved?
3. D. Bradley: Yes, though the Larry Bird Statue Dedication and the Convocation were difficult to hear, it has since been fixed.
b. Provost R. Williams: No Formal Report.
4. Chair Report: S. Lamb: No Formal Report.
5. Approval of the Minutes of March 18, 2014: V. Sheets, B. Kilp 6-0-0
6. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
7. FAC Motion in Response to the Charge to Examine the Timing of Standing Committees to Facilitate Consistent Operation and Earlier Beginning of Work: D. Hantzis
a. R. Guell: The timing as I see it is we have to vote this here. I will sit down with volunteers and put together materials for the officers to pick a slate as quickly as
possible. Executive Committee elections are April 7. We will only have about a week to arrange this, so the timing is going to be very difficult.
i. D. Hantzis: We did discuss when the first meetings should occur; it needed to be clear that the committees needed to be up and working. Extension can be done by resolution until August 9. We expect there will be some pushback on changing informal processes on bringing new and old Executive Committees together.
ii. R. Guell: It won't be unfair if we have election of officers on the $7^{\text {th }}$, and we can consult everyone.
iii. D. Hantzis: So the slate will be the same.
iv. R. Guell: Yes.
8. FAC Motion in Response to the Charge to Review Proposal for a Council on Research and Creativity: D. Hantzis
a. S. Lamb: Was there any discussion with either of the two chairs of the separate committees?
i. D. Hantzis: I consulted with K. Yousif and a couple of members of FAC who had served last year on the Arts Endowment and Research Committees. We dealt with some questions and concerns, but primarily with the concern that proposals that fall under certain criteria would be given less attention. We also talked about some proposals that were sent to the research committee and they decided they should be sent to the arts committee. At least this way the same body will look at all proposals. I think people were generally concerned that it be clear; that accounted for the one against and one abstention in the vote. We don't want things to be underfunded due to the combination of these committees.
ii. B. Kilp: I was the liaison to the Arts Endowment Committee, and the first time they met it was about J. Gatrell's proposal and they voted to not even discuss it. They felt the whole focus of each body is so different that the University would not care for creativity. Since I've been here I've seen proposals about research on music get shunted over to Arts, and Arts would deny it on the grounds that it wasn't art.
iii. D. Hantzis: FAC didn't author any of this. All FAC did was vote to endorse J. Gatrell's proposal as written. One of our members was concerned about being on the committee and not feeling she was qualified to decide on proposals in highly technical areas.
iv. C. Olsen: Is Dr. Steiger involved in this? It says "faculty and student research and creativity." I see nothing here connected to student research and creativity.
v. R. Guell: I would like to move to table this. R. Guell, B. Kilp Vote: 6-0-0
vi. V. Sheets: I like this and still do, and I think it's a good way for us to move, but I am also aware that there's been very few proposals submitted to the Arts Endowment Fund and that this would perhaps encourage more. My question was-all the deans are included as administrative representatives. It seemed administratively heavy but no one from OSP is on the list, when in fact one of the goals is to encourage more activity there. I wanted to offer that before we table.
vii. D. Hantzis: I do have to say I really didn't think we were to revise as much as respond. We would have if we thought that was what the charge was.
viii. R. Williams: Was this from before Dean Maurer was on board?
ix. D. Hantzis: Yes, we were asked to review this before.
9. FAC Motions in Response to Charge to Review Schedule Adjustment of Probationary Reviews of Tenure Track Faculty Hired with Prior Service Credit Toward Tenure: D. Hantzis Vote: 6-0-0
a. S. Lamb: it seems that which you've received is that which the College of Business has been doing; and I thought everyone did it that way.
i. D. Hantzis: Arts and Sciences is the only college that doesn't do collegewide reviews of everyone. College-wide reviews there are third and tenure only. The Handbook gives permission for more than that.
ii. S. Lamb: If you have two years of service you have a third-year review?
iii. D. Hantzis: Not now. If you come in with three years of service the first review was a third-year instead of a fourth. The grid is out of date because it doesn't allow for credit. There is no title, no date, no authoritative language. Academic Affairs had no information on this.
iv. R. Williams: J. Maynard and S. Powers created it three years ago. S. Powers tweaked it two years ago. Every college is treating this differently. We needed a systematic approach. They did not consult with officers at that time.
v. D. Bradley: Are we sure people are getting advance credit and sufficient evaluations? Some getting advance credit for tenure is not a benefit. It might be good to address that to make sure people are getting sufficient credit.
vi. D. Hantzis: FAC looked at the language to create that. It said if you are hired with credit for prior service you will also have a college review.
vii. B. Kilp: One of the things I don't understand is that we hire someone in August and they are turning in review papers in September.
viii. D. Hantzis: In my time here the Senate has tried to abolish that, and twice it was denied.
ix. R. Guell: People have literally fallen down on the job in their first month and to not have a review of any kind makes it so you can't get rid of the person who shows up as an alcoholic, for example. For those who are doing a good job it's positive.
x. B. Kilp: If you are able to do it in January and have one complete semester, you have something to measure.
xi. D. Hantzis: You are not guaranteed a second year by AAUP. We'd have to give them one more semester of employment to remain in good faith.
xii. D. Bradley: I thought it was March and December. I think it should be done in January.
xiii. B. Kilp: It just seems like they have no chance to practice.
xiv. D. Hantzis: It's fairly rigid in schedule.

Motion to Adjourn 4:01

Motion in response to the charge to examine the possibility of revising the timing governing the constitution of Standing Committees to facilitate consistent operation and earlier beginning of committee work. (approved February 24, 2014)

## Rationale

The current constitution specifies that the membership of standing committees each year waits until the first meeting of the Senate in August for confirmation. This often means that new standing committees begin meeting no earlier than mid-September and often later. The recommended revision in the By Laws constitutes Standing Committees in April of each year and extends the term of service on Standing Commitees to match that of the Executive Committee (August 10-August 9).

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends the following revisions in the relevant sections of the University Handbook, ByLaws to the Faculty Constitution:
246.1.1.4 Term. Terms of service for these faculty members shall begin with the
academic yeaf August 10 and continue until August 9 each year. Appointments shall be announced upon University Faculty Senate confirmation at the first last meeting of the University Faculty Senate in the new each academic year. Appointment to a standing committee, except for the Faculty Dismissal Hearing Committee, shall be for a period of two (2) years. Three (3) members will be appointed in even years or four (4) in odd years, depending on the committee; reappointment to a committee is not precluded.
246.1.1.5 Officers. Each standing committee shall elect its own officers from among the faculty in its membership.

### 246.1.1.6 Regular Meetings. Each committee, except the Faculty Dismissal Hearing

Committee, shall meet at least once each month during the academic year at a

Indiana State University Policies regularly scheduled time and place which shall be published as soon as the schedule is established.

## [Insert]

246.1.1.6.1 First Meeting. The first meeting of each Standing Committee, except the Faculty Dismissal Hearing Committee, shall be in August, prior to the first meeting of the Faculty Senate, if at all possible.]

FAC further recommends that the Executive Committee submit a resolution stipulating that the term of service of the 2013-2014 Standing Committees extends through August 9, 2014.

## Observation about impact of changes on current process of "slating" Standing Committees

In addition to the changes in the By-Laws, necessary to accomplish the change in the constitution of Standing Committees, FAC recognizes that the process by which the Executive Committee has slated standing committees will also change. The Constitution and Handbook are silent on this process-stipulating only that the composition of Standing Committees are proposed by the Executive Committee and confirmed by the Senate. Currently, an ad hoc committee of the prior and new Executive Committee officers meets in the summer to prepare a slate to be submitted to the new Executive Committee for approval and submission to the incoming Faculty Senate at its first meeting in August. FAC recognizes the value of involving both the outgoing and incoming officers in developing committee member slates. We recommend:

1. the officers of the current Senate will prepare a slate prior to the April meeting of the newly elected Senate at which its officers are chosen. The slate can be shared with the incoming officers of the Executive Committee soon after their election, revisions made as needed, and the slate will be presented to the current Senate for approval at its final meeting in April.
2. FAC recommends that Standing Committees be encouraged to meet before the end of the spring semester (or as soon as possible after August 10) to elect officers.
3. Officers will work to identify a time to schedule the committee's first meeting, which is mandated to occur prior to the first meeting of the Senate in the fall term, if at all possible. It would be helpful if the Executive Committee liaisons are identified as quickly as possible as well.

## Relevant Statements from the Constitution of the University Faculty (FAC recommends no change in the Constitution in response to this charge.)

245.7 Article VII: Committees of the University Faculty.
245.7.1 Standing Committees. The standing committees of the University Faculty are created by the bylaws of this Constitution, which determine the size, composition, tenure, and duties of these committees. Standing committees are responsible to the University Faculty through the University Faculty Senate.
245.7.1.1 Open Meetings. Meetings of the standing committees are open, except when a committee determines otherwise.
245.7.1.2 Appointment of Members. Appointive members of the standing committees shall be appointed by, and may be discharged by, the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate with
the approval of the University Faculty Senate. The membership of the standing committees should reflect the heterogeneous character of the University Faculty.
245.7.1.3 Representation. The members represent the University Faculty, not the college/library to which they may belong, and no college/library is as such entitled to representation on a standing committee.

File 5
Motion in response to charge to review Proposal for a Council on Research and Creativity. (approved 5-1-1; March 3, 2014)

The Faculty Affairs Committee endorses the "Proposal for a Council on Research and Creativity" prepared by the College of Graduate and Professional Studies. The original proposal follows.

## Proposal for a Council on Research \& Creativity

Objective: To create a single unified Council for Research \& Creativity that will assist in the development of relevant policies and procedures that relate to faculty and student scholarship, as well as ensure the continued delivery of two independent grant programs: University Research Grants and the Arts Endowment. The proposed CRC will also receive and comment on annual reports on research administration, compliance issues, and student participation in scholarly activities.

Rationale: The current bi-furcated nature of the University Research and Arts Endowment Committees have not enabled faculty to play a prominent role in the policy making process and does not necessarily provide an effective mechanism for highlighting the important role scholarship plays in the lives of the university, its faculty, and our students. Additionally, the proposed unification of two related standing committees will streamline the current governance structure while ensuring the independence of the two critical grant programs: University Research Grants and the Arts Endowment Grants.

The proposed revision to the ByLaws of the University Faculty replaces section 246.8 University Research Committee and deletes section 246.10 Arts Endowment Committee.

### 246.8 Council for Research \& Creativity

### 246.8.1 Membership

246.8.1.1 Faculty Representation. Nine (9) with at-least three (3) members of the faculty from departments constituting the performing, visual, literary, and interpretative arts and three (3) members with prior extramural funding.
246.8.1.2 Administrative Representation. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Deans of the colleges, including the Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies, and the Dean of Library Services, and
the chairpersons of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
(IACUC).
246.8.1.3 Student Representation. One (1) graduate and one (1) undergraduate student with at least one of the students pursuing a major or minor in the performing, visual, literary, and interpretative arts or a related field.
246.8.2 Duties. The purpose of the council is to enhance scholarship, research, and creative activity at the university and to advise the administration on relevant policies. The committee shall:
246.8.2.1 Recommend the establishment or change of University policies and procedures related to scholarship, research, \& creativity.
246.8.2.2 Administer the Arts Endowment Fund, University Research Fund, and such other research funds as may be designated by the University administration.
246.8.2.3 Annually review a summary of the activities of the university's extramural grant activity, major scholarly initiatives, and any compliance issues (IRB, IACUC, and anonymous summaries of research misconduct) and provide faculty feedback.
Current Statements in the ByLaws of the University Faculty
246.8 University Research Committee.
246.8.1 Membership
246.8.1.1 Faculty Representation. Nine (9).
246.8.1.2 Administrative Representation. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Deans of the colleges, including the Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies, and the Dean of Library Services.
246.8.1.3 Student Representation. One (1) graduate and one (1) undergraduate student.
246.8.2 Duties. The purpose of the committee is to further the development of research at the University. The committee shall:
246.8.2.1 Recommend establishment or change of University research policies and procedures. 246.8.2.2 Administer the University Research Fund and such other research funds as may be designated by the University administration.
246.10 Arts Endowment Committee.
246.10.1 Membership.
246.10.1.1 Faculty Representation. Seven (7) with interest in the performance, literary, visual, and interpretive arts.
246.10.1.2 Administrative Representation. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Deans of the colleges, including the Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies, and the Dean of Library Services.
246.10.1.3 Student Representation. One (1) graduate student and one (1) undergraduate student. 246.10.2 Duties. The purpose of the committee is to further the development, exhibition, publication, and performance of art works by the University Faculty. The committee shall:
246.10.2.1 Recommend establishment or change of University policies and procedures that determine the disbursement of funds for meritorious arts projects.
246.10.2.2 Administer the University Arts Endowment Fund and such other funds as may be designated by the University administration.
246.10.2.3 Provide assistance to faculty on methods of applying for University Arts Endowment grants.

Motions in response to charge to review the current practice of adjusting the schedule of probationary reviews of tenure track faculty hired with prior service credit toward tenure. (approved 7-0-0; March 3, 2014)

## Background/Rationale

This charge originated with FAC, in consultation with members of the Executive Committee, when members learned that Academic Affairs sent departments who had hired tenure-track faculty who were awarded credit for prior service a grid dictating an alternative probationary review schedule for such faculty. The entire text of the document sent to departments is copied into this motion as it was sent by AA to chairpersons in fall 2013. The document carries no attribution of authorship and no reference to authorizing policy. FAC attempted to learn the history of the document from staff in Academic Affairs; Barb Anderson, reported that the document "came with her desk" and she was directed to send a copy each fall to chairs of departments that hired faculty with an award of credit. Nancy Rogers, our AA liaison, reported that she found no additional information about the form. Several department chairs reported that they had never seen and/or had no recollection of the document or the adjusted schedule of review.

FAC members' discussions of the process of annual review and the impact of credit for prior service did not identify sufficient justification for adjusted review. We concluded that the practice of distributing the "grid" to departments who should be ended effective immediately. Further, FAC recommends a revision in 305.4.6, the policy stipulated Notice of Reappointment or NonReappointment to remove the words "at ISU." It is the only one of the three statements that includes that language. Removing it avoids a potential conflictual reading of expected dates of notification by those faculty in their first year "at ISU" but not in their first probationary year. That recommendation appears as "Part Two" of the motion.

## Recommendation

Part One. The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the current practice of adjusting the schedule of probationary reviews of tenure-track faculty hired with an award of credit for prior service be ended and that the first probationary review of faculty hired with credit be conducted as the year of review that is equal to the number of years of credit plus the year of current service to ISU. This means that a faculty member hired with 2 years of credit for prior service would undergo a third probationary year review in his/her first year in a TT position at ISU, a faculty member with 3 years of credit would
undergo a fourth probationary year review, or a faculty member with 5 years of credit would undergo tenure review in his/her first year at ISU. Adoption of this motion would eliminate the use of the grid currently distributed by Academic Affairs to govern the review schedule for probationary faculty hired with credit for prior service. (See AA Grid copied below.)

Part Two. The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends the words "at ISU" be deleted from the policy governing the date of Notice of Reappointment or NonReappointment in the first probationary year.

## Current Handbook Language (revision in bold)

305.4.6 First Year Notice of Reappointment or Non-Reappointment. During the first year of the probationary period at Indiana-State-University, faculty members shall be notified of their reappointment or non-reappointment by written statement from the University President or the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, no later than March 1.
305.4.7 Second Year Notice of Reappointment or Non-Reappointment. During the second year of the probationary period, notice of reappointment or non-reappointment shall be given no later than December 15.
305.4.8 Third Year and After Notice of Reappointment or Non-Reappointment. Starting with the third year of the probationary period, notice of reappointment or non-reappointment shall be given at least twelve (12) months before the expiration of the appointment.

Copy of the Grid as provided by Academic Affairs.

Note that the current grid does not recognize the possibility of a candidate awarded five years of credit for prior service.

## EVALUATION TABLE FOR YEARS OF CREDIT

| Year | Number of <br> Years of <br> Credit | Year 1 | Year 2 Evaluation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | 1st year | 3rd year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 2 | 3rdyear | 4th year |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 3 | 3rdyear | 5th year |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | 5th year | 6th year/tenure review |

