INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 9, 2014

**Draft Minutes**

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

Member Absent: K. Bolinger

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard

Guests: R. Schneirov

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. D. Bradley: I’ve given J. Maynard my thoughts on the Biennial Review and to follow up on previous advising comments, I don’t think the word “advising” appears in the Biennial document. We need to deal with it because advising is a critical part of the faculty role.
      1. C. Olsen: It should be a part of our job, but faculty need to be compensated for it in some way.
      2. D. Bradley: My view is that we should, and I’ve talked to J. Powers, J. Maynard, and R. Williams regarding this. We should specify a “normal load” for faculty advising. If a faculty member’s advising load is greater than that you need to find release somewhere else. Ninety percent of the faculty, however, would fit into the twenty to thirty student range.
      3. C. MacDonald: There are many things which are an equally large load, like dissertation supervision.
      4. C. Olsen: The nature of what faculty has to do has changed fundamentally over the years. When I first came here we were handed a stack of folders. Now we have changed so fundamentally what we are assigned. To allow faculty to do it and do it well, we have to give them some understanding or recognition of the time it’s taking.
   2. J. Maynard: No Report
2. Chair Report: R. Guell
   1. We received a briefing by the President’s Advisory Council on healthcare costs and the Wellness Initiative.
   2. As many of you already know, I will appoint a member of FEBC to go to the budget committee.
   3. I am somewhat concerned that at CAAC that they’re more comfortable letting long programs that refuse to shorten their credit requirements than I am. That is because the President and the Board will be mighty unhappy if we do not live up to our commitment to address this. If something is not done then it will be up to S. Powers to decide about these programs. I will fight for faculty but some of these programs have to be caught by a reasonable filter.
      1. A. Anderson: Many have cut hours back. They are looking seriously at larger ones because they know someone will eventually make a decision. I don’t think they’re that comfortable with the time limit, and they know what they need to do for the programs and the students.
      2. K. Yousif: Can you relate to them the lively discussions we’ve already had about it here?
      3. R. Guell: I will communicate that to L. Rosenhein and D. Malooley. I view part of my job to be avoiding unwanted actions and one of those unwanted actions is the Board of Trustees changing curriculum.
3. Approval of the Minutes of September 2, 2014: A. Anderson, V. Sheets. Vote: 8-0-0
4. AAUP Report
   1. R. Schneirov: Thank you, Chairperson Guell, and other members of the Executive Committee, for this opportunity to present AAUP’s concerns to your body. We have five major points, most of them having to do with shared governance, a major tenet in a functioning academic community.
      1. We continue to recommend that faculty representatives in the Executive Committee establish some form of regular interaction with the Board of Trustees. This was the subject of a recent policy document published in the latest issue of Academe, which we urge that Senate and Administration leaders read. If you are not a member of AAUP, it is online. We appreciate and support Chairperson Guell’s work to try to further communication with the Board. It is sad that students get a representative on the board while faculty have none. We suggest that a preliminary step could be taken on the faculty side by forming an ad hoc faculty committee dedicated to greater dialogue between faculty and the Board.
      2. Over the past four years the Indiana General Assembly along with ICHE has increasingly micromanaged institutions of higher education in areas such as how many hours constitute a major and the content of our general or foundational education programs. In the interests of the integrity and high standards of academic communities in Indiana, AAUP recommends that faculty from the different campuses of public universities cooperate in lobbying the legislature and ICHE so that legislators can take our practices and concerns into account when legislating on matters that need to be our primary authority. AAUP stands ready to use our contacts with faculty senates throughout the state to further such cooperation. There are active AAUP chapters on seven campuses throughout the state including IU-Bloomington, Purdue, and IUPUI. We also recommend that the university-paid lobbyist cooperate with faculty representatives and our AAUP’s lobbyist when it comes to bills that impinge on academic freedom, including, particularly, primary authority over the curriculum. That hasn’t been the case in the past here at ISU. It would enhance our influence on the General Assembly and ICHE.
      3. AAUP is concerned that the starting or floor of part-time lecturers remains at the level of $3000 per course; the same is true for instructors. It has been at least several years since ISU raised its minimum salary level for part-timers to $3000, but despite the University’s public commitment to raise these salaries by the same percentage that tenure and tenure-track faculty salaries rise, they have remained stagnant. We also remain concerned about the cutback in hours of contingent faculty in order for the University to save on benefits. This is a fundamental equity concern. Why is ISU saving money at the expense of its lowest-salaried faculty members who have the least power and are the most vulnerable?
         1. D. Bradley: That is being done.
         2. R. Schneirov: I contacted M. Green and cc’d R. Guell on this. M. Green denied that this was the case. He said 52 of the 180-some lecturers are getting $3000 per course.
         3. D. Bradley: If people are being paid $3000 it’s the Chair’s or Dean’s decision. R. Williams said they have the authority to make those decisions. M. Green is not privy to those decisions.
         4. R. Guell: If I may set the stage on some of this, my understanding—and J. Maynard has a better history of it than I do—is that you (R. Schneirov) were instrumental in getting us to the goal of $1000 per credit hour almost a decade ago. That was largely irrelevant until the current President made that come to fruition. The floor has remained $1000 per credit hour since that time. Some get more than that, especially when the market says they have to, but it was just last year those who were on a fall appointment and got a spring appointment, got the two percent. They maintained it this fall. For everyone similarly situated that will again occur this fall. The across the board raise will go to those continuing into spring. What I understand the issue to be is that we should start indexing the $1000 floor to across the pay increases. Keep track of the multiplier.
         5. S. Lamb: And then there would be a moving floor. I must admit that I’ve always felt very positive about paying three thousand when it was less than that, but I didn’t understand that the floor wasn’t moving up.
         6. R. Schneirov: It should be but it’s not.
         7. D. Bradley: Effectively it is.
         8. R. Guell: Only if you’re hiring the same people.
         9. D. Bradley: And it should have gone up. Our part-time faculty have been rewarded substantially more over the last six years than everybody else in terms of benefits and in terms of going full-time.
         10. R. Guell: The structure you created helped them, and they benefited from that goal. The point is that the next step is to index the floor.
         11. D. Bradley: In my view it was already authorized. I’m lost as to why that didn’t happen. Full-time lecturers got many of the same benefits.
         12. C. Olsen: Part-timers have been very affected by the limit to three classes.
         13. R. Guell: That’s a separate issue with the Affordable Care Act and the problem with people being off and on health insurance. When they are given health insurance in August and taken off again in January it is a lot of work.
      4. Regarding the dispute over textbook adoption, two officers from AAUP are investigating details of this particular case, and we expect to issue a report with recommendations on textbook selection. Our chapter favors maintaining the individual right of faculty to choose textbooks unless there are compelling reasons to deviate from this principle. Our initial perceptions in this case are that a) there are no compelling reasons for this course to require a common text and b) even if a common text were warranted, the decision process followed, as we understand it, was flawed.
      5. Regarding the departmental intervention carried out by one of the Deans of the university, we are concerned about the process under which the Dean intervened. Of course, we recognize that trouble departments in the University should be subject to outside intervention from time to time. An improvement plan is one way of doing this. In this case, the department’s rules and prevailing academic culture were not adequate for effective governance. However, the manner of devising and implementing this particular improvement plan was inconsistent with shared governance at the departmental level. Why? The plan was devised in a top-down fashion with no faculty input whatsoever, even though the faculty leaders in that particular college requested such input. What can justify a Dean refusing such input? Whenever a department is involved, a robust faculty role is appropriate in a system of shared governance. We ask that the Executive Committee consider a resolution supporting such a collaborative approach in any new cases that arise.

With regard to the Dean’s improvement plan, we think there were positive and negative features. With regard to the deficiencies in the report, AAUP suggests to the Executive Committee that it call for five changes. Specifically:

1. The plan should explicitly describe a mechanism for faculty members to participate in setting agendas for departmental meetings.

2. The admonition against using email for communication should be removed.

3. The ad hoc option of seeking third parties outside the university to assist in resolving future disputes should be removed. There are existing procedures already in place for this purpose, which are specified in the bylaws of the college.

4. Some kind of oversight review of the chairperson’s assignment of teaching responsibilities should be established.

5. Authority conveyed to the chairperson in this plan should be diminished. The Dean’s plan claims to rely on the ISU Handbook but he has misinterpreted it in refusing to recognize that faculty have crucial roles in the domains he specifies. These mistaken assertions of chairperson faculty authority should be removed from the plan, and the faculty members of the department should be apprised of their responsibilities in these areas. In short, we are concerned that faculty members have been guided into a misunderstanding of the authority structure appropriate to shared governance.

AAUP will have some things to say about annual reviews of tenure-track faculty. We will be weighing in on this question next month.

1. For Endorsement:
   1. Nominations for VP for Student Affairs Search. Motion for Endorsement: A. Anderson, S. Lamb. Vote: 8-0-0
      1. Connie McLaren (Scott College of Business)
      2. Christopher Fischer (College of Arts & Sciences)
      3. Brian McGowan (Bayh College of Education)
      4. David Malooley (College of Technology)
      5. Lisa Borrero (College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services)
2. Biennial Review Draft Proposal
   1. C. MacDonald: After last week’s meeting we took many of the comments under advisement and C. Olsen wrote a new version which I presented to R. Guell, S. Lamb, and J. Maynard, who suggested their own revisions.
      1. R. Guell: We are voting on this next week. We need to have this done by October 1.

*(Committee engaged in considerable discussion and editing of entire document. Proposal will be written again for perusal by the Senate at its meeting on September 18.)*

1. Adjournment 5:15pm