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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 2, 2014

3:15pm, HMSU 227

**Minutes**

**Present:** R. Guell, S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, E. Hampton, C. Olsen, V. Sheets, K. Yousif

**Members Absent:** none

**Ex-officio Members Present:** J. Maynard

**Others Present:** N. Hopkins, A. Payne, S. Powers

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. Provost J. Maynard: Dan is currently out of town, but we met with the Board of Trustees here last week. The meeting went well. The Board are considering two important issues :

 One was on having the Faculty Senate Chair and others to be able speak to the Board about issues at the Board meetings.

R. Guell: My understanding is that there is a desire to substantially shrink speeches, so that we aren’t spending as much time up front. My statement this time was not on any of topics in front of the board, but on status of chairs.

J. Maynard: The other topic was about the Board of Trustees operating via committee. There would be subcommittees essentially on compliance and finance. There seems to be much less energy towards this direction now. They will most likely review their calendar of activities, and use seminars more intentionally, so if issue is pressing, they can be informed and have more informal discussion.

R. Guell: It seems that the more financially minded Board of Trustees members are starting to get nervous about financial matters, particularly about: the lack of attention paid to budget issues, and the lack of concern about voting to approve hefty debt increases without in-depth analysis of the issues in front of them.

J. Maynard: Yes, it seems they are concerned about risk management and financial management.

S. Lamb: Giving the Chair of the Faculty Senate the opportunity to speak will demand that the Chair be able to speak on each significant issue. It also speaks to the respect that the Board is giving to faculty governance.

D. Bradley is meeting with the Commission this Friday to talk about the budget requests, and in particular, the capital budget. The $64 million for renovation and additions to Health Sciences will be a tough sell.

C. Olsen brought up distance education and international students, and it is true that some nations make us seek approval to operate there. However, it is not a total door slam. I you want to start a program targeting a specific population, we could investigate it.

A. Morales had raised a question in Senate about changes which made it difficult for faculty to participate in the Honors Program. I can find no evidence to support this. The SCHs still go with the faculty member, so nothing has changed. There may be a problem with interdisciplinary studies.

R. Guell: We are really talking about two things here. One is that when programs such as Interdisciplinary Studies or the Honors Program are given an FTE budget to borrow faculty to do something, the FTE goes there (.25). The other model gives the home department the SCH generated by the faculty member, and gives them the funds to teach the courses there that the faculty gave up to teach in the other program. This boosts both the numerator and the denominator, but it does not necessarily achieve the goals of the SCH.

J. Maynard: Either can work, and I can understand the value of either.

K. Yousif: One other thing: there may need to be a re-evaluation of programs growing that lag in terms of how it functions. They can’t continue with same level of faculty.

J. Maynard: the Honors program can’t handle a larger number of students. G. Bierly handling 60-100 theses per semester is too many. We need a cadre of talented faculty to read those. One person can’t do it all.

1. Chair Report: R. Guell : none
2. Approval of August 19, 2014 Minutes: A. Anderson, K. Bolinger. Vote 9-0-0
3. For Passage on to Senate
	1. Slate for Provost Search Committee- N. Hopkins (S. Lamb, K. Yousif. Vote:7-2-0)

Elaina Tuttle (CoAS)

Kimberly LaGrange (SCoB-Instructor)

Cat Paterson (CoNHHS)

Mary Howard-Hamilton (BCoE)

1. R. Guell: I passed on to AAC via the convener, D. Richards, that Exec wanted an instructor to get serious consideration, as well as the Senate officers’ preference to include someone with significant Exec experience on the slate.
2. N. Hopkins: After I was elected Chair of AAC, we discussed the search, and sent out notice to faculty including through global email, asking for nominations. We asked for those making nominations to make sure their nominees were willing to serve. There were many self-nominations. For those who did not indicate that they had checked with their nominees, I emailed their nominee to check. I heard back from all but one. I passed names to committee, and we had total of 31 nominees. They were not evenly distributed among colleges. AAC met last Wednesday to decide on the slate. After going into executive session, we discussed amongst ourselves those that we did not know personally. Then each person wrote a slate of eight. There was a lot of overlap amongst the slates, and our top four became first draft of the slate, adjusted to deal with the concern regarding inclusion of an instructor.
3. K. Bolinger: What rank are E. Tuttle and C. Stemmens?
4. N. Hopkins: They are both full professors.
5. V. Sheets: We want instructors in these roles, so that we are treating them as equals, but will they be teaching a 5-5 load as well as doing this, or will they get credit for taking on this significant workload?
6. N. Hopkins: They are volunteers, or agreed to stand. I don’t know that any would get a reduction in their workload.
7. V. Sheets: I find it problematic that sets it up to encourage people to take on more than their fair share, especially for those at the lower echelons.
8. N. Hopkins: Even when they are willing to do additional things like this, at their annual review, they are only evaluated on their teaching, so it is not clear this service will do them any good.
9. V. Sheets: A workload reduction would be appropriate.
10. N Hopkins: That would be a problem to do for Fall at this point for semester.
11. C. Olsen: The objection I continue to have is about instructors and workload, and integrating them as full member of the faculty. I have several and have never given a 5-5 load. They teach a lot of students, 150-200 students/semester (4-4 load). As regular faculty member, I am concerned they will be asked to do more and more. I agree that regular faculty are regular faculty, but we need to set some guidelines.
12. S. Lamb: I am happy with the individuals on the slate. I believe they will represent ISU extremely well. We do need to pass word to J. Maynard and the President that in this instance, there should be a reduction of a course for this assignment for the contract faculty member.
13. N. Hopkins: At least for Spring.
14. K. Bolinger: It is not unlikely that any provost candidates should be questioned regarding tenure. I would like to see more recently tenured people or assistant professors on the slate, as their concerns might not be addressed by this committee
15. N. Hopkins: There were only 1 or 2 assistants and 1 associate who was not tenured on the list.
16. K. Bolinger: None of the people on this list have tenure/promotion as a priority.
17. N Hopkins: E. Tuttle can bring a chair’s perspective on this.
18. K. Yousif: I agree with K. Bolinger that a since junior people will be working much longer under the new provost, so we need to have a more junior person on the slate.
19. N. Hopkins: The ones we had were not particularly suitable. Do we need to beat the bushes?
20. K. Yousif: Were any recently promoted?
21. N. Hopkins: The tenured people have served on P&T committees within their departments.
22. R. Guell: Two on the slate “grew up” here. Another concern, given the makeup of the other appointments, and likely Staff Council, and SGA chairs, is that the committee may end up being entirely women. The bylaws allow the President to confer with AAC and choose a member to deal with representation issues. I had a conversation with the President and Provost, and they indicated that they were receptive to that perhaps being a need.
23. S. Lamb: In previous slates, for similar searches, the President have used that power to supplement the slates for one lack or another. It is nearly impossible not to have some party underrepresented when the committee can only choose four. It is best not for us to attempt to achieve any greater perfection than that which has already been achieved. The slate is quite reasonable. In my mind, it is so important to have people familiar with a broad range of issues, rather than have emphasis on a single issue. When the faculty quiz the candidates, they will need to have a broad set of experience to fathom whether the candidates will be appropriate for this institution.
24. R. Guell: Part of what need to do with this slate, is to project a message of seriousness about what we say about ourselves. Regarding community engagement, the inclusion of C. Stemmens is an important statement. We have the Unbounded Possibilities program in Biology, so the inclusion of E. Tuttle fits this. In terms of aggregate talent and experience, this slate when matched with whatever person(s) the President chooses to add is about as good as we can expect it to be. President will address serious underrepresentation when it occurs.
25. J. Maynard: If AAC had brought a slate of four white men before the group, you wouldn’t approve. We have worked hard to diversify this campus, but this slate doesn’t reflect this, given that it includes no department chair, no men, and no assistant professors.
26. N. Hopkins: E. Tuttle was interim chair for a semester.
27. R. Guell: The gender issue can be solved with 246.2.2.2.2. In the history of the place, in hiring of previous provosts, I have shaken my head at each slate, for a variety of reasons. If we could spend time, if bylaws allowed, this body could construct a slate that would make this body happier than this slate, but that is not the process. We have to take the AAC slate or ask for another.
28. Motion to reject slate: K. Bolinger, K Yousif (3-5-1)
29. K. Bolinger: The whole idea of tenure nationwide is changing, so we must get the perspective of more junior faculty, and we can’t from this group.
30. S. Lamb: Those who are going up for tenure and promotion are going up under the existing rules. They are not as aware as senior faculty that there are differences in the processes from institution to institution. They will not be champions of revising the system as they are going through it.
31. C. Olsen: The demographic balance does not bother me as much as the lack of broad engagement with the university. While I know most of these people, I haven’t run into them doing university level service.
32. S. Lamb: M. Howard-Hamilton’s teaching area helps her understanding of these issues.
33. C. Olsen: She is only at the graduate level.
34. R. Guell: True.
35. J. Maynard: None of this is personal. These are four of finest faculty members I know. But to have such a slate on such a diversity-focused campus….
36. N. Hopkins: No-one on AAC was entirely happy with the slate, but we each got a part of what we wanted.
	1. Curriculum
		1. Architectural Engineering Major (S. Lamb, A. Anderson. Vote: 9-0-0 )
			1. A. Payne: The new program is a hybrid of interior architectural design and construction management. It is very diverse, and graduates will work in professional design including in general architectural offices. The niche is in desperate need of people in this area. As construction is growing, but some are reluctant to hire architects, so they could hire our graduates instead.
			2. C. Olsen: has been thru CAAC?
			3. A. Payne: Yes, it was unanimously approved.
			4. C. Olsen: I am concerned that in the four-year plan it shows three required courses in the 1st semester, which I thought we aren’t supposed to do any more.
			5. S. Powers: Can students who transfer in start there, that is can they start the major after their freshman year and still complete the degree in four years?
			6. A. Payne: There is some flexibility in the program, so yes, after 1 year they could transfer in and still complete in four years, but for those transferring in after 2 years, it would be impossible. The courses could be rearranged so students can complete it in do in six semesters. There is nothing limiting with the prerequisites.
			7. K. Bolinger: It says you need no new resources—is that accurate?
			8. A. Payne: Yes. All courses offered are covered by faculty load. These are all pre-existing courses that are not fully enrolled at this time. If the program takes off, resources will be need but probably not for four years.
			9. J. Maynard: Why is there no course credit for the internship?
			10. A Payne: Construction has done this for a while. It helps keep hours down, but also want internship to happen so that students are better prepared for their senior year (and more employable) without requiring an additional semester’s course credit or cost.
			11. R. Guell: So can they do an internship in the summer, register, and owe nothing?
			12. S. Powers: Yes. It works like a co-op or like semester long off-campus programs.
			13. V. Sheets: Who checks to make sure they are valid internships, and who does this work for no credit?
			14. A. Payne: Lee Ellington, who is the Program Coordinator. He does it for the benefit of the students.
			15. K. Yousif: The program has a high credit load.
			16. A. Payne: Yes, this is why the internship is zero credit. With coming accreditation changes they will be reducing major hour requirements, so the hours will come down.
			17. R. Guell: Is there compensation for the program or coordinator in summer? Not really. They do get a course release during the year.
			18. K. Yousif: You have done a nice job documenting the need for this program externally to ISU. Is there a need on campus? Is it a major that is requested? Or is there a group that would shift to this major?
			19. A Payne: Yes, we have had inquiries, and many new freshmen will be able to shift into it once it is approved.
			20. S. Lamb: Could you explain building information management modeling?
			21. A. Payne: It allows us to create a 3D model in the computer of every piece of a building, down to the number of ceiling tiles, chairs. The model can be manipulated, cost-analyzed, and sustainability-evaluated. It is the gold standard for the field.
			22. S. Lamb: Has it been taught at ISU previously?
			23. A. Payne: We currently use in four courses, and have two faculty proficient in it. They are doing professional development to stay up-to-date in it. It integrates all systems: vendors design, etc.
37. Course Evaluation Discussion
	1. R. Guell: I sent out a list of people to volunteer to help choose the list of questions
	2. S. Powers: Last Spring, we had a problem with the eSIR. Our contract had phrase that said if anybody copied a question from eSIR for their own use, we were responsible for monitoring and turning them in. According to E. Kramer, this is very unusual, in the vast number of contracts we have, usually the vendor should take responsibility, but e-SIR refused. This type of contract we cannot afford to enter into for compliance reasons. In addition, we couldn’t use it in the summer, many faculty said it didn’t get sent out to students on time, and was expensive. We quickly convened a group and sent out an RFP this summer. We had 2 vendors who followed the instructions, and a third looked promising, but did not follow the directions, which never bodes well. The committee consisted of about 10 people, and we attended two webinars, asked questions, and weighed the pros and cons. We went with My Class Eval from IOTA. It is all online, with lots of flexibility. It includes cafeteria style evaluations, so that the university can have a standard set of questions, as can colleges, departments, and individuals. It can do all styles of questions, plus it includes a bank of standard questions. It allows reporting out in lots of ways, and is good at urging to students to complete it. Additional features include: Faculty get a reminder when is live; students get a list of all classes they need to evaluate; students can start an evaluation and finish it later; students get three reminders; faculty get reminder about response rate, so can prompt students to complete the evaluation; students can print a ticket to prove they have completed it (without faculty seeing individual student results; and it is closed to faculty until after date we choose. They also have done research which has found that the higher up the source the reminder email comes from (e.g., the President) the higher the response rate is. We are currently trying to select five standard questions for all courses then more can be added from there. We have purchased a level that will allow us to have up to 20 different evaluation offering periods during the year; it can handle 8 week classes, summer school, and mid-term evaluations. It also provides the opportunity to use to evaluate advising as well.
	3. R. Guell: Much of this ties in with what FAC is charged with from the Departmental Success Taskforce. If we need the university level questions chosen very quickly, will you be able to bring them to us or Senate for endorsement this year? Is it imaginable that the questions could come to the Exec meeting on September 16th, and the Senate of September 18th for our endorsement?
	4. S. Powers: We are starting with a bank of 165 questions. Large sections of questions are eliminated by the desire for universality. WE are keeping in mind what people doing faculty reviews need (what info do you need to make the determination that someone is doing an effective job); as well as providing meaningful feedback to instructors themselves. We should be able to get down to 25 quickly.
	5. K. Yousif: Evaluations will be going all electronic?
	6. S. Powers: Yes.
	7. K. Bolinger: Will everyone have to be evaluated? Some have opted out in the past.
	8. S. Powers: Yes.
	9. K. Bolinger: What about the issue of ownership of the results?
	10. R. Guell: That is the next to be resolved.
	11. S. Lamb: Will SAC and FAC have a chance to look at the questions?
	12. R. Guell: They have the universality issue but not the specific questions. If I could get them by Monday, I could try to coerce them into it, but the only way with full legitimacy, is with the approval of the full body. So if we try to send the specific questions through every level of governance, they will not be approved in time to use this semester. We need full on governance support for the principle and the specifics.
	13. C. Olsen: I would second that. Will the university level questions, as much as possible, link to handbook principles (e.g., syllabus)?
	14. S. Powers: Yes.
	15. R. Guell: I am worried about the summative question, and whether we can agree on the wording of it (#40)
	16. S. Lamb: If we boil it down to 5 questions instead of 40, it might be that all are significant enough that we don’t need a summative question.
	17. J. Maynard: I’ve seen the bank of questions, and you would have to be pretty unreasonable not to agree with them.
	18. S. Powers: They are well tested questions, well -researched. They know they get valuable response from students.
	19. J. Maynard: We have a similar issue related to advising. To roll out the survey to students, we have a deadline of early October. We need to get those questions defined quickly.
	20. V. Sheets: Those should really come through faculty governance as well.
	21. R. Guell: They can follow the same principles/ process.
	22. E. Hampton: can departments or colleges add additional questions in the same way for advising?
	23. S. Powers: Yes, it is possible, but it will makes timeframe shorter.
	24. R. Guell: Here is what I want to have happen. I want FAC and SAC to understand, when they discuss the principles of the Taskforce reports that they will get a chance to review the specific questions for both the teaching and advising assessments. However, in order to put evaluations in front of students this semester, we will have the groups pick the questions that will be used this semester. FAC and SAC will get that list later in the semester and will be asked to review those in order to decide what they will be going forward.
38. Replacement for Assessment Council
	1. Carrie Ball or Randy Peters
		1. K. Bolinger: C. Ball is diligent, and I can say she would be a good candidate.
		2. A. Anderson: I nominate C. Ball (A. Anderson, C. Olsen Vote: 9-0-0)
39. Biennial review discussion
	1. Led by C. MacDonald, C. Olsen
		1. C. MacDonald: One of the things we did is to eliminate the weights, since they were a pain in the neck and not particularly useful. We have added ranks instead. For most faculty, teaching would have to be ranked #1, with the only exceptions being allowed for faculty who have other administrative assignments or are on sabbatical during the evaluation period. If you do not meet expectations for the are you have ranked 1, you will be considered Contributing Below Expectations overall.
		2. E. Hampton: How would this work for those exceptions?
		3. C. MacDonald: We expect that anyone wanting to rank something other than teaching as #1 would have to have a discussion with their chair.
		4. C. Olsen: The only ones who would even potentially qualify would be those with administrative assignments or full year sabbaticals. Most faculty still choose teaching as #1. But we wanted to recognize that it doesn’t make sense for everyone to choose teaching as #1.
		5. S. Lamb: In our previous discussions, we agreed that the major emphasis is on the role of teaching, and we did agree that we would put more teeth in it.
		6. K. Bolinger: We need more explicit criteria for the categories. People still will ignore them. For example, my extra departmental award was ignored. Faculty can still say that isn’t what we meant.
		7. C. Olsen: The creation of detailed criteria is for departments and programs to do. The other point is for the second and third ranks to give faculty flexibility, in choosing service or scholarship as their #2 priority. We have to give faculty some input into recognition of what they are doing.
		8. S. Lamb: I think as far as defining meeting or not meeting expectations, that was well-defined. We need more teeth. We did agreed failing to meet teaching expectations, means failing overall.
		9. V. Sheets: You have made an interesting case with regard to the rankings. What happens if you fail the category you have ranked 2 or 3?
		10. C. Olsen: The same as what happens now. You would be put on an improvement plan, but you would not be denied a raise.
		11. V. Sheets: Departmental committees will have to make a decision – a person could still fail overall.
		12. K. Bolinger: What about at the high end? Do you have to exceed expectations in all three categories?
		13. C. MacDonald: This is just a first very rough draft – we are not done yet. However, the high end will work like it has in the past.
		14. R. Guell: I would like a draft by next week’s Exec, so it can go to the Senate.
		15. J. Maynard: We are focusing on just cleaning up around the edges. Not making major changes.
		16. E. Hampton: The ranking is a vast improvement over the weights, but I wonder if we will need to create different criteria for each rank, so that the expectations for a rank of 2 are different from a rank of 3.
		17. V. Sheets: Yes, unless you only look at the ranking afterward.
		18. C. MacDonald: We also have raised the bar regarding the bottom category of does not meet expectations, with the idea that it may make faculty more willing to use this category.
		19. K. Bolinger: People still won’t be willing to put their colleagues in the bottom category.
		20. R. Guell: We need to create a standard that we can defend with open, smiling, proud faces. When we defend it to the Board of Trustees and/or the press we have to mean it.
		21. S. Lamb: I would advise caution on use of ranking. E. Hampton makes a good point – this may make it too complex. We would have to define expectations more clearly. If we stiffen up the definitions, that’s about all we can accomplish.
		22. K. Bolinger: The ranks will allow faculty to say I am better in scholarship than in service, so I won’t do any service.
		23. R. Guell: You have argued on many occasions that faculty are not motivated by money, but now you seem to be arguing they are minutely motivated by money.
		24. K. Bolinger: Not motivated, but demoralized.
		25. R. Guell: I think the risk is really tiny.
		26. C. MacDonald: Another change we discussed was for the award to be a stipend, rather than going to base salary.
		27. S. Lamb: I disagree with that. We won’t be able to keep up with salaries.
		28. C. Olsen: For me, the compression model worked well, so we should continue to do that. The main reason for stipends instead of going to base is to reduce the harm done by this process. As a chair, I spend much of my time trying to create a collegial atmosphere, but much of my work is destroyed in that 2 hour biennial review meeting. Moving the award to a stipend means that colleagues will not resent each other for decades, but only for a little while.
		29. R. Guell: Jack, is the administration’s disagreement with making the major University awards a permanent of base salary one based on principle or is it merely financial? It strikes me as deeply odd to award temporary success permanently, and permanent success temporarily. Is it that you have rolled your eyes at some outcomes of some of the recipients? If that is the objection, I see it as not a good enough principle to reject the idea. Permanent great behavior should be acknowledged and awarded to base, temporary great behavior should be awarded with plaque and a check and that’s it. I hope we can transition to that process.
		30. C. Olsen: We have some issues with including instructors in this process. We will have to make hard decisions. Instructors don’t have three domains. Including them into this, especially when apportioning the numbers of exceptional faculty a department can have will significantly advantage certain departments, which have lots of instructors.
		31. R. Guell: Perhaps we need a separate system for nominating instructors.
		32. C. Olsen: We didn’t think about that yet. Another possibility is to make this just a post-tenure review process.
		33. R. Guell: Great instructors should be reviewed and eligible for performance based raises.
40. Adjournment 5:30