INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

**Executive Committee**

November 11, 2014

**Minutes**

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

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

Guests: C. Blevens, D. Hantzis, M. Sacopulos

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. D. Bradley: I was on the road again this week, meeting with the legislator in Fort Wayne. We talked about performance funding and why we’re more valuable than the Commission seems to think. I think we have a receptive audience in terms of those things, but we will have to keep talking. IPFW has some of the same issues regarding funding. D. McKee and G. Goode will be at a Commission meeting on Thursday, and it will make a recommendation then.
	2. J. Maynard: No Report.
2. Chair Report: R. Guell: No Report.
3. Approval of November 4, 2014 Minutes: V. Sheets, C. Olsen. Vote: 9-0-0
4. Informational Item: Proposed Drafting of University Handbook Section 912: Policy on Amorous and Familial Relationships, Merging with Section 502: Nepotism
	1. M. Sacopulos: The first document you have is on Section 502, Nepotism. This policy has been on the books for a long time and addresses the hiring of relatives. It doesn’t address academic issues. I was approached by the Provost and D. McKee over the summer about trying to develop an amorous relations policy that will apply to all circumstances. I took a look at what other institutions had, and tried to keep it as abbreviated as possible. We can’t assume everyone has the same ethics or the same cultural background. We provided the rationale section to explain why we have this policy. The next section is on the susceptibility to exploitation. People immediately jumped to the idea that we are opening ourselves to harassment claims. They are correct, but it’s a broader issue of the ethics of our work. We talk about susceptibility to exploitation, professionalism and how it is undermined, the effect on morale, etc.
		1. K. Bolinger: Is it meant to advise about a faculty member and student as in their student or as in any student?
		2. M. Sacopulos: A student with which they have some kind of power over.
		3. K. Bolinger: So by this, a faculty member in a relationship with a graduate student from another department is defined as ethical.
		4. R. Guell: Let me make clear that where we are is that M. Sacopulos has drafted this, and it will go to the Board of Trustees under the Policy on Policies in December. It will be up for comment after that. We don’t need to think about adopting this and sending it in to Senate. Please make suggestions, but we are not editing or voting.
		5. D. Bradley: We would like to hear about anything glaring in here before it goes to the Board.
		6. M. Sacopulos: After we explain the importance of this, we get to the statement of policy. What we are saying here is we realize from time to time there are relationships that cause conflict and when they happen, here is how to handle it in an ethical way. R. Guell raised the issue of familial relations that cause the same problem. We talked about folding the Nepotism section into this. The two-page document you have in front of you will be the final product, and the Nepotism section will not exist. It will be combined and stand as Section 912.
		7. R. Guell: When I became involved in this it was because we had the six that turned into seven faculty/student relationships—some perfectly appropriate, some questionable—and trying to draw a line that was not about being someone else’s priest, but honoring the integrity of the education process and the evaluation process. I think M. Sacopulos has come close to what we were looking for in terms of what could and couldn’t happen in that if you found yourself in this kind of relationship you must tell your chair and sever the evaluative aspect of the relationship. For example, my son is taking my Econ 100 class and J. Conant is grading his work. Any other questions or comments? I suggest that between now and the December Board of Trustees meeting you send M. Sacopulos an email with your concerns, and please copy me.
		8. V. Sheets: I would echo that. Having seen it, I think it is very close to what I find to be appropriate. I was initially very worried about the outcome. This seems to capture nicely where we should be.
		9. M. Sacopulos: If you look at other institutions you can find policies that are pages long. I tried to capture concerns and ways to approach it in an abbreviated way.
5. FAC & SAC Report on Whistleblower Policy
	1. R. Guell: While we have M. Sacopulos here, are you prepared to receive our concerns with regard to the Whistleblower draft? You have both FAC’s and SAC’s response on this policy. Let us start with C. Blevens. Could you give us what SAC had to say?
		1. C. Blevens: Essentially when our first discussion took place I contacted M. Sacopulos to ask if perhaps there might be some background information on something that had been offered by the Board of Trustees that we might find beneficial in our response. She referred us to the policies 246.14.1 and 246.14.2. Based on that, our committee concluded “If it ain’t broke don’t fix it.” We prefer it stay as it is. We do not recommend changing the language.
		2. D. Hantzis: Our discussion at FAC came to the same conclusion. We had S. Powers as Ex-Officio with us, and she attempted to suggest some of the things that led us to consider the addition of the word “Handbook,” but as you have seen in the motion, members felt overwhelmingly that this was unnecessary and brings no additional benefit. We specifically thought that sometimes what is a “Handbook policy” is not clear. Does it only refer to policies printed in the Handbook, or does it include those referred to in the Handbook, but not printed therein, such as the Biennial Review Policy, for example? We talked about some of our members in clinical and science areas and talked about policies they have to follow. The narration is pretty clear. Some could not tell the difference between a process and a policy.
		3. D. Bradley: People could be retaliated against, it has been said. Retaliation is not possible—or is not allowed—under any circumstances. If someone complains about something, you cannot retaliate. I think the one thing I see is a difference between the Whistleblower Policy and a normal grievance is that the normal grievance is the start of a shared governance process. If it falls under the Whistleblower Policy it will be handled administratively. You can’t retaliate against people for doing what they think is right. Another thing the faculty needs to decide is for what things they do not want to follow the grievance process. The Whistleblower Policy provides anonymity to an extent. In general whistleblower policies are intended to protect those who make known things of a serious consequence—systemic things. I think the retaliation consequence is not really something that is to worry about here.
		4. D. Hantzis: The final paragraph in the motion you received from FAC, I think, is in part a response to something the President said. The final clause is unchanged and promises procedures will be developed. They do not exist. It is not clear how it will be pursued. It mandates that procedures will be developed and as far as we can tell, they have not been developed. Until they are developed, how would one know what falls under the whistleblower policy and what does not? It is FAC’s suggestion that it is certainly worthwhile for the Board of Trustees to meet that mandate since this has been in the Handbook for more than a year.
		5. K. Bolinger: Retaliation can occur in a way that is not overt or blatant. Scheduling retaliation, for example. In that case going through the usual ranks would have been a not very promising prospect for that faculty member. At least some articulation is needed.
		6. R. Guell: M. Sacopulos, any comments?
		7. M. Sacopulos: I think it’s important to note we have developed a draft of procedures and had some conversations with R. Guell about appeal processes and how they would play out. My biggest concern is that we have clarity about what situations follow which processes. I don’t want to be stuck not knowing where things go. One thing in other Indiana procedures concerning whistleblowers is deciding whether it belongs in other adjudicate processes on campus. If it applies to a process that is already there, you send it there and that contributes to the integrity of the system. Grievances and appeals are sent to the appropriate entity. I want clarity so I’m not constantly in some battle as to where it goes. Simple forum shopping is not wanted. I think that’s fair. It is not the intent to limit or push people out of the grievance process, but at attempt to clarify the policy where there is no place to deal with certain categories of wrongdoing. Definitions are currently very broad. I would like a final resolution that provides clarity. We don’t have ethics offices, etc. like other campuses in the state.
		8. D. Hantzis: I’m not sure adding the word “Handbook” provides clarity. Also, it seems this issue of forum shopping would be made clearer in the procedures. That does not necessitate the inclusion of the word “Handbook.”
		9. R. Guell: I would like to volunteer myself and C. MacDonald to work with C. Blevens and D. Hantzis to make a statement we can endorse, which would appear on the December Senate agenda. It is possible, depending what happens during the Senate meeting on Thursday, we will have a formal Executive Committee meeting next week. It may dissolve quickly, but we may need to do that.
6. Handbook Change Suggestions from Taskforce
	1. Motion #3
		1. 350.2.9.1.3 Deficient Performance
		2. 350.2.9.1.3.1 Time for Response
		3. 350.2.9.1.3.2 Right of Consultation
		4. 350.2.9.1.3.3 Written Admonishment
		5. 350.2.9.1.3.4 Continued Deficient Performance
		6. 350.2.9.1.3.5 Request of Denial of Across-the-Board Pay Raises
		7. 350.2.9.1.3.6 Right of Rebuttal
		8. 350.2.9.1.3.7 Dean’s Prerogative
		9. 350.2.9.1.3.8 Personnel Files
			1. Motion to Untable: K. Yousif, A. Anderson. Vote: 9-0-0
			2. Motion to Substitute “Pending Adoption by Executive Committee.” K. Bolinger, V. Sheets. Vote: 9-0-0
			3. V. Sheets: We tried to take into account, maybe not with success, the ideas from the last meeting—in particular, C. Olsen’s notion of shaming and the threat of shaming. The first opportunity is an informal matter, and you only make it formal when nothing changes after that. That is when the time clock starts. If that still isn’t leading to resolution then you go to the Written Admonishment. At that point it does get shared with the personnel committee. We can seek consultation but not necessarily have to call a meeting. Then you have five days to take action. To me that is the threat of shaming. When the Personnel Committee gets a copy of the Letter of Admonishment then the faculty member and the Dean are notified. The dean has a variety of options. The faculty member has an opportunity to rebut anything that is placed in their personnel file. We moved the departmental personnel committee’s statement into the personnel files section. What we have in here is that all of the written material would be seen by the personnel committee at the point of the next review.
			4. C. Olsen: On the written admonishment is where I’m having trouble, because it says a copy will be provided. 350.2.9.1.3.4 says the same thing. They are very similar. I thought in 350.2.9.1.3.3 it would be “may” instead of “will.”
			5. R. Guell: The information has already given them the nudge.
			6. C. Olsen: I don’t want to do anything formal at this point. I want to have a way to put in writing the steps they need to take and give them a chance to respond short of sharing it with the whole department.
			7. C. Olsen: There should be a step in between. If you have 350.2.9.1.3.3 you don’t need 350.2.9.1.3.4—you’re already informing the dean and personnel committee.
			8. R. Guell: But at 350.2.9.1.3.4 you tell the dean they didn’t resolve the problem and keep them informed.
			9. C. Olsen: We should have a way to put something in writing; lay out the steps to take and give the faculty member a chance.
			10. V. Sheets: I could see at that point laying it out in writing.
			11. K. Bolinger: But once it’s written it goes to the personnel file.
			12. R. Guell: It doesn’t have to go to the personnel file. Quite literally you could draft a letter and say, “This is my draft. Do you really want this letter in your personnel file?” That provides the chair with that intermediate step.
			13. C. Olsen: I don’t disagree. If it wasn’t for the bottom of personnel files being basically open. It says “copies of materials placed in the personnel file.” We need to tell faculty that their files are open.
			14. R. Guell: Why are they not already open to the personnel committee?
			15. K. Yousif: 350.2.9.1.3.3 seems like it would be given to personnel backwards. If they received a written admonishment and they fixed it, why would the personnel committee need to see that? The person has remedied it.
			16. R. Guell: That goes to my underlying question, because this replaces a policy that already has the step in it that you’re talking about. You only get a written admonition after you get the notice. The Taskforce essentially replaced the process you’re looking for with something else.
			17. D. Hantzis: The only assumption in the policy is that the deficient performance will continue. What happens if it doesn’t? If the deficient performance is remedied or effectively countered? There needs to be something else in the file that says it’s been fixed.
			18. K. Yousif: I don’t want to wade through people’s errors or bad choices that have been remedied. I do want to see blatant, continued deficient performance.
			19. D. Bradley: You don’t want it to disappear, so that there is a record, in case it recurs.
			20. J. Maynard: I think we want the option to identify ongoing patterns. Hopefully people have enough sense to look at whether it’s corrected.
			21. S. Lamb: I agree there needs to be a pause. 350.2.9.1.3.3, in the next to last sentence, a date by which the deficient performance must be remedied. If such a remedy occurs, it is deemed closed by the faculty member and the chair. Then cool it and go forward, if there is a remedy at that point.
			22. R. Guell: Can I suggest 350.2.9.1.3.3.1? “If by the determination of the chair the deficient performance has been remedied, a letter will be placed in the personnel file indicating so.”
			23. C. Olsen: I would say put the letter in there but don’t send it to everyone. If it starts up again in a few years then the letter is there to see.
			24. V. Sheets: This is not the first instance. This has been ongoing. I still like it going to the personnel committee I don’t know if it goes in that section. Either way that generates the next letter.
			25. D. Bradley: V. Sheets’ email says it. If the faculty want to be the evaluating body, then they need to be aware of what’s going on. If chairs are bosses, you don’t have to. If chairs aren’t bosses, but you have a personnel committee, they need to know what’s going on. It is that cut and dry.
			26. K. Bolinger: For example, if I’m not showing up to class, students say I’ve been ditching, I correct it for the semester—at that point the personnel committee knows I have corrected it. I’m going fine and five years from now I go back to that behavior. My performance would be at the next step. I am with C. Olsen.
			27. D. Bradley: Even if it is just the way you said, if the personnel committee is involved in biennial review, in tenure decisions, they need to know.
			28. R. Guell: In terms of knowing where we are, could we agree with what D. Hantzis has indicated in adopting V. Sheets’ methodology rather than trying to imagine a circumstance where it is remedied and another circumstance where it isn’t and simply vote on the last sentence of 350.2.9.1.3.3 on changing “will” to “may.” I wouldn’t agree to it but it does fairly cleanly articulate the difference of opinion. It’s a simple substitute we can have a vote on.
			29. E. Hampton: I would disagree with “may.” It should be “will” or “will not.” I don’t think “may” works for us in this instance. It needs to be followed consistently. If personnel committees are looking at written admonitions the question is should it be continued?
			30. J. Maynard: I will argue for “may.” Some of these issues are so minor. I don’t want them blown up. Other times the issues are very serious.
			31. D. Bradley: What about down at point 7—“…shall be provided at the time of the next review.” “May” could work as long as you don’t change point 7.
			32. V. Sheets: At the time of the event it’s a “may,” but at review it’s a “shall.”
			33. E. Hampton: But documents taken are shown and shared with the committee. There has to be a mechanism. There should be someone who extracts the admonition and gives them to the committee.
			34. D. Hantzis: In terms of point seven, it might be better worded “copies of these materials shall be provided.” I’m sure everyone thinks everyone else follows the rules and plays fairly. Not all of any kind of admonishments should be included, just the ones that fall under this policy. This could be read as a much broader assertion that things are made available. Materials generally under this provision should be.
			35. R. Guell: I suggest in 7 it is “copies of these materials from the personnel file.” Now it reads, “All documents associated with this policy shall be provided.”
			36. C. Olsen: That is still dramatically different. We have had lengthy discussions. The point of having two separate reviews was that the chair would have information the chair may or may not want to share. I am not obligated to share everything I know about faculty member “X.” the point of having two separate reviews at the Biennial Review is that the chair has additional information. That’s why there are two separate, independent reviews. That’s a dramatic change.
			37. J. Maynard: I think you still have independent reviews. Your interaction with the faculty member, and if you are reviewing a basic core of traits instead of your opinion as well.
			38. K. Bolinger: This is where I don’t like it on the written admonishment. Things were done in confidence but things involving students are horrendous. That becomes everyone’s business.
			39. C. Olsen: If we change it to “may” at first, then later it says it will be shared anyway.
			40. R. Guell: I believe we are at an irreconcilable difference. By unanimous consent, I will say where we are and vote on “shall” vs. “may.” At this time, no one has thus far said anything about 350.2.9.1.3, 350.2.9.1.3.1, 350.2.9.1.3.2, we will vote on changing “will” to “may” in 350.2.9.1.3.3 and a change on 350.2.9.1.3.4 on subsequent deficient performance: “If a chair determines a sufficient remedy has been accomplished, a letter stating that will be placed in the personnel file.” In point 350.2.9.1.3.7 we have the change that has been articulated.
			41. S. Lamb: This matter seems very important. It’s hard to believe that perhaps C. Olsen and V. Sheets could not come up with one more draft addressing this and bring this to closure. I believe this could be reworked successfully.
			42. R. Guell: That would lock us in on a formal meeting next Tuesday and on the 20th.
			43. D. Bradley: On point 350.2.9.1.3.5 basically I would like to see at least one more possible action prior to initiation of formal dismissal procedures.
			44. C. MacDonald: What else is there?
			45. D. Bradley: Suspension without pay, for instance. I think you have to think that when someone loses a tenured position, that is a substantial loss. I think a suspension is good.
			46. R. Guell: I would ask that we not include that here at this time, but J. Maynard include it as an authority in removal from the classroom he’s putting in the Policy on Policies and if it ends up being a small February insertion, that would be fine. The pulling out of the classroom under what J. Maynard has circulating among the officers would be the authority of the Provost and the President, not the Dean.
			47. J. Maynard: My proposal is for the extraordinary thing that happens that does not allow is to go through this process but requires immediate action. If we articulate one thing you have to articulate everything.
			48. D. Bradley: I just want something in between.
			49. R. Guell: Unless we have due process on that akin to the dismissal process, which opens up more language to fold in, I don’t want anyone to have the authority to suspend a faculty member without due process. It doesn’t matter whether it’s before or after, there is no such thing as an emergency suspension without pay. If you pull someone out of the classroom that’s fine. A suspension without pay is for most folks the same as termination. That requires prior due process.
			50. K. Bolinger: When you’re dismissed from a tenured position that’s life altering. You’re done in academia. Suspension gives a semester to ponder what they’ve done and change their ways.
			51. R. Guell: Figuring out the prior due process, like there is with dismissal, is too complicated to do over the course of the next few minutes.
			52. D. Bradley: If the faculty member does not acquiesce to the dean’s action that would start a due process clock and a grievance is filed. All you’re saying here, I think, is that this is one of the consequences. If you question the reasonableness of the action you file a grievance.
			53. S. Lamb: Steps have been taken. If the faculty member agrees, I would suggest the inclusion of the work “suspension” at that point may indicate agreement.
			54. R. Guell: I think that word is nuclear in this policy.
			55. D. Hantzis: I also echo what R. Guell just said. If we move to leave without pay it isn’t the same as dismissal consequences, but the same as dismissal in due process. How will the semester be accounted for? If I go on medical leave how do they evaluate that? Sometimes leave without pay is voluntary, sometimes not. What happens to healthcare? We may need another level, but I wouldn’t put it here.
			56. K. Bolinger: The dean right now can either decide no raise or ask for dismissal.
			57. D. Hantzis: Those are things the dean can recommend to the Provost.
			58. K. Bolinger: Denial of raise to recommendation for dismissal is a big gap.
			59. D. Hantzis: Recommendation of additional action is by the Provost. These actions are by the Provost, not the dean. The dean can do three other things. I am concerned that earlier J. Maynard said that some of these things are so minor. In the opening paragraph, there is no definition of deficient performance under this provision. There is no guideline on how serious the deficient performance must be to fall here. I would also like to mention: it needs to be clear what the deadlines for remedy will be. The next was for section 350.2.9.1.3.4, if it continues after the stipulated date. Once that’s there my question is, what is the timeline governing 350.2.9.1.3.3 if the faculty member fails to remedy the performance? There is no agreed-upon time.
			60. K. Bolinger: That gives me five days to propose a satisfactory remedy.
			61. D. Hantzis: Not everything can be remedied in five days. My question is after the chair has set those dates—we know what happened—the written admonition is to be given but there is no time frame to have that judgment.
			62. K. Bolinger: If you propose a satisfactory remedy in that time frame—there have to be details. You don’t need the language for that. It’s the faculty member telling the chair, “Here’s what I’m going to do to correct it.”
			63. C. MacDonald: It might be very easy to fix. Clearly there should be dates in the proposal. “…by the stipulated time frame or date.”
			64. D. Hantzis: In the third paragraph in the last clause (350.2.9.1.3.8) we have been really careful in the past to use that kind of language. I don’t think they should be treated as if they were accusations. We used the language “concerns” earlier and that would be appropriate here.
			65. V. Sheets: I would suggest in 350.2.9.1.3.5 the sentence begin “Those actions…” could we add “additional” in there? It clears up the confusion. These are taken by the Provost.
			66. D. Bradley: I would ask that those items be put in as possibles but not an exhaustive list of actions.
			67. C. MacDonald: That’s what it reads to me.
			68. D. Bradley: That language does not restrict it?
			69. C. Olsen: In dean’s prerogative, are we in agreement that the first clause is that the dean cannot initiate it on his own?
			70. R. Guell: By unanimous consent, we have at the end of 350.1.3.1 “with the stipulated timeline” between “situation” and the “period.” We have in 350.2.9.1.3.3 after the comma, it’s “his/her deficient performance as was proposed.” We have to vote on whether to change the last occurrence of “will” to “may” in 350.2.9.1.3.3. In 350.2.9.1.3.4 between “continues” and “following a written admonition” add “after the stipulated date.” We have changed the title of this section to “Chair’s Evaluation of Subsequent Performance.” In 350.2.9.1.3.5 we have “additional” between “those” and “actions” and a parenthetical that says “but are not limited to.” After “include” we have in 350.2.9.1.3.7 “All documents associated with this policy shall be placed in the faculty member’s official personnel file.” And in 350.2.9.1.3.8 we have changed “accusations” to “concerns.” Motion to change the final occurrence of “will” in 350.2.9.1.3.3 to “may” and the final “shall” in 350.2.9.1.3.7 to “may.” R. Guell, K. Bolinger. Vote: 5-4-0
			71. Motion to approve all of 350.2.9.1.3 as amended: C. Olsen, K. Bolinger. Vote: 9-0-0.
7. SAC and FAC Reports on Course Evaluations
	1. C. Blevens: Given the concern expressed by Faculty regarding the hasty implementation of the Fall, 2014 course evaluation questions, the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) recommends three key changes in the method for implementing course evaluations:
		1. By way of introduction, all course evaluations should include a statement indicating that the six across-the-board questions were not approved by the Faculty Senate and will not be used for evaluation purposes, e.g., “Students should be aware that these questions will be used by faculty members to inform their teaching.
		2. SAC recommends the evaluation be sent to students during the fall and spring semesters approximately after 85% of the course has been presented and prior to the start of finals. Summer courses will vary from this time frame but should occur approximately twice throughout the summer courses. In addition to including the introductory statement, the evaluation questions should be separated into distinct sections, e.g., “Common Questions Applicable to all ISU Courses,” “Department-Specific Questions,” “Instructor-Generated Questions,” and should be sent to instructors at least one week prior to dissemination to students.
		3. SAC discussed the six proposed common questions at length. None of the questions were acceptable as written. Among the many concerns, SAC members felt the questions were so vague as to render any answer invalid. At worst, the questions would only prove a faculty member’s relative “popularity” rather than provide commentary on the quality of the course. Rather than use the questions proposed, SAC recommends the questions listed below. It is important to note that careful consideration was paid to ensuring all six were applicable to in-class, online, lab courses, and all others, and that the questions were tied to the teaching criteria outlined in the University Handbook.
			1. Course Organization. Instead of “This course is well organized,” SAC proposes *“The instructor provided a syllabus at the beginning of the course that accurately represented how the course was conducted.”*
			2. Communication. ‘’Instead of “My instructor communicates effectively,” SAC proposes *“My instructor seems enthusiastic about the course material.”*
			3. Instructor/Student Interaction. Instead of “The quality of interaction with the instructor is good,” SAC proposes the use of two questions: *“The instructor treated the students fairly,”* and *“My instructor creates an environment in which a reasonably motivated student can learn.”*
			4. Grades and Grading. Instead of “Feedback from my instructor on papers, exams, and other performance measures is helpful,” SAC proposes *“The instructor evaluated work and provided feedback within two weeks (or other time-frame as specified in the syllabus).”*
			5. Student Learning Outcomes. Instead of “The instructor is a very effective teacher,” SAC proposes *“The course challenges me to extend my capabilities.”*
			6. Workload and Course Difficulty. Instead of “Overall, the quality of this course is good,” SAC proposes *“I put a lot of effort into this course.”*
	2. D. Hantzis: First, at an earlier meeting, FAC voted unanimously to support the conclusions by SAC which were completed prior to our work. S. Powers took three actions in the interim to respond to some of that. She sent an email to chairs to address concerns that were raised by SAC and endorsed by FAC. She also spoke with the designers and the President regarding the purpose and use of the questions. They also announced a calendar which sets the terms SAC set. That happened in an earlier meeting. In terms of response to a proposed set of questions the motion included three parts: the proposed set of common questions, additional related recommendations, and our discussion of seven guiding principles for question selection. These included:
		1. As much as possible, maintain the student’s point of view as the subject position of the question (e.g., “I was treated fairly by the professor during the class” rather than “The professor treated all students fairly.”)
		2. Ask only one question at a time (e.g., avoid asking if the professor responded promptly and thoroughly).
		3. Avoid unnecessary qualifiers or modifiers (e.g., see the above concern; also “I feel I can easily approach my instructor” is better asked as “I feel I can approach my instructor”).
		4. Aim for questions that don’t rely on a specific learning environment (i.e., questions should be relevant to nearly all types of classes).
		5. Ensure the question is worth asking.
		6. Use “students learning” as the metric to evaluate a class.
		7. Use validated questions (from the IOTA bank) instead of self-constructing the instrument.
	3. Members identified a set of 10 questions that we believe incorporated the work of the original taskforce and the work shared from the Student Affairs Committee:
		1. 1. I receive helpful feedback from my instructor on class work.
		2. 2. I receive timely feedback from my instructor on class work.
		3. 3. I understand how grades are determined in this course.
		4. 4. This course is well organized.
		5. 5. My instructor seems enthusiastic about the course material.
		6. 6. My instructor provides clear expectations.
		7. 7. My instructor provides clear explanations.
		8. 8. My instructor treats me fairly.
		9. 9. I believe that I can approach my instructor for help.
		10. 10. Overall, the quality of this course is good.

FAC members voted to include number 10, a “grand tour” question, but our discussion included significant concern about the value of any such question and about the likelihood that this question may become the single, cited question (much like question 40 on the SIR) despite the shallow nature of “grand tour” questions. Assuming that there would be pressure to include an “overall” question, we retained it; however, FAC members were willing to exclude it as well.

Additional Related Recommendations: Our discussion of the value of this instrument as one means of collecting data faculty may use to demonstrate and maintain teaching effectiveness noted the importance of ensuring the instrument is robust. No set of 6-10 questions will provide useful data. FAC strongly recommends that the Senate work with Academic Affairs to ensure that the process of developing a viable instrument take seriously the need for college/department/instructor level questions to be added, as provided for in the tool. If the only questions are the common questions, the data are nearly without value to faculty or to faculty review processes.

FAC also wishes to remind the Senate of the need to work with Academic Affairs to ensure that all departments are supporting faculty in collecting student evaluations of teaching effectiveness during the 2014-2015 year to meet the need all faculty have to include such data in annual and/or biennial reviews in the fall.

Our discussions also noted a need for more complete, timely, and regular communication with faculty about the full process. We shared SAC’s concerns about the development, discussion, and dissemination of the plan for fall 2014. FAC members observed that multiple, different deadline dates were given to colleges and departments about submitting additional questions and about the status of questions individual faculty might add; the status of open-ended, narrative questions unclear. FAC asks that the Senate Executive Committee, especially, monitor communication associated with this process and, perhaps, consider means by which to gauge the level of understanding among faculty.

* + 1. E. Hampton: I wanted to react to SAC’s questions. I had a strong reaction to these. These questions posed by SAC significantly deviate from what was proposed from those proposed by the ad hoc working group. These were validated to some extent. The SAC questions are not central to effectiveness. They are not central to my quality as an instructor. The new SAC questions disregard the strong constructs in the taskforce questions—now there is nothing on organization, or communication; these have little to do with interaction or feedback; nothing on the quality of the course or the quality of the teaching. The earlier questions that had been proposed allowed for scaled measurements. SAC’s questions are more dichotomous, and won’t function the right way. Just because the questions were general did not make them vague.
		2. S. Lamb: My reaction to the SAC questions was very positive. I tend to think that enthusiasm is the greatest motivator for students, and that it tapped, as well as creating an environment in which a reasonably motivated student could learn. The effort put into the course is the product of the professor’s ability to motivate.
		3. E. Hampton: Do you teach online? How do you demonstrate enthusiasm in an online course?
		4. S. Lamb: I don’t teach online. I know I lack certain structures; that which has sustained me and my students is enthusiasm.
		5. C. Olsen: In SAC, one thing we did was when we got the first set of questions, we read a lot of literature on course evaluation. The conclusion that the questions proposed were ones we should not ask. Students cannot answer these questions.The literature plainly said these are the questions not to ask. They need to be asked about their experiences in the course—what they are qualified to answer—not “Is this an effective teacher?” Through that you indirectly gauge effort. In some way you have to ask the student about their experience in the class, not whether the class was effective.
		6. K. Bolinger: I have students tell me “I hated this but I am ready to teach them Social Studies.”
		7. E. Hampton: I understand your point but what we are measuring are students’ perspectives. We can accurately measure that. They can truthfully answer their perspective on that.
		8. C. Olsen: They’re not in a position to answer whether the course was effective or well-organized.
		9. K. Bolinger: If you ask a question about effort, it goes over very well with Honors classes. In Foundational Studies classes I will not do so well on that measure.
		10. R. Guell: I want to pose a question to the group—and it was raised a couple of times. What is the value of sticking to the IOTA questions and choosing the best of them?
		11. C. Olsen: All SAC’s questions are from the IOTA database.
		12. D. Hantzis: So are FAC’s.
		13. R. Guell: Is it your general view that it is a priority to constrain ourselves to the IOTA questions?
		14. C. Olsen: I don’t think it has to be IOTA.
		15. C. MacDonald: It makes sense because they are validated.
		16. E. Hampton: We would want them validated in some fashion.
		17. J. Maynard: I agree with E. Hampton on these questions. The parameters we gave the working group—they had to fit every instructional model we have. They are almost pedagogy-free. It is just perceptions from a student who is 18 or 68. I’m not saying the questions are bad, they’re addressing different things. The instructor could provide a disorganized syllabus, but it actually represents how the course was taught. It’s still contextual. I hope each college department takes the time to embellish these. If this is it we haven’t helped ourselves.
		18. K. Yousif: If departments don’t have their own questions these are meaningless. I am not convinced that all departments on campus have common questions that went through their governance bodies. This is more of a priority at this point.
		19. C. Olsen: We read a lot of literature on this, and the original six questions are what everyone recommended not to ask. You will actually get negative evaluations. In other words the question studies that do a longitudinal follow-up will have high marks for a course that is easy. Instructors will do much worse. It will actually discourage deeper learning. They are negatively correlated in follow-up courses. The literature is clear. Also, I have sat in there three years and talked about a university-wide set of questions; the point is always that they were narrow questions tied to the Handbook and Biennial Review language. They were supposed to be tied specifically to that in September before the six questions came out. I asked S. Powers whether the university-wide questions were tied to the Handbook and her response was “yes.” Three days later we got six questions that were completely unrelated to Handbook language. It’s very easy to feel betrayed by the process when we have been told we will get a certain set of questions and we get something completely different.
		20. E. Hampton: I’m not aware of the three years of conversation. I have been opposed the idea of measuring things that have nothing to do with the quality of instruction.
		21. C. Olsen: They don’t measure the quality of instruction.
		22. E. Hampton: The perception of quality of instruction.
		23. C. Olsen: I don’t think people would have agreed to provisions of the biennial review and mandated university-wide questions if they were not told they would be specific to the Handbook.
		24. K. Bolinger: I don’t know that we will craft any new questions here. I would like to look more at the SAC report and talk about what we will do with the data.
		25. R. Guell: The questions will be asked in the fall but not used for evaluative purposes. We will evaluate the questions and the process.
		26. K. Bolinger: Then does the data as it has in the past belong to the professor? Not going forward, we talked about that. But for this go-around, is that data that belongs to the faculty member?
		27. R. Guell: I don’t know that it matters.
		28. K. Bolinger: We just spent a long time about it going to the personnel file.
		29. J. Maynard: The intent is to give ourselves a base of data to analyze the questions and see what modifications are necessary.
		30. R. Guell: In order to be useful to the community they have to be community property. They’re explicitly not for evaluative purposes this term.
		31. S. Lamb: E. Hampton, how do you diminish love of discipline and enthusiasm for content and teaching with whether you give proper feedback and have a pretty syllabus?
		32. E. Hampton: I don’t want to measure those things. Timeliness is provided in the Handbook. Enthusiasm is not something I can quantify.
		33. S. Lamb: I would suggest enthusiasm would even work in the domain of online communication.
		34. D. Bradley: I would like to throw in that I pretty much agree with E. Hampton, but I also think at the level of discernment we are looking for here we are looking to identify in the biennial review those who are doing a bad job and those who are doing a good job and everyone in the middle. I am confident any six questions are going to do that.
		35. R. Guell: I have an outlier perspective. An economist who worked on the evaluation found that when comparing student evaluations, peer evaluations, and expert evaluations, the group that was closest to the experts was the students, not the peers. That lends to my way of thinking to E. Hampton’s thinking. It’s self-serving because I get good evaluations. What I will ask be done is that the immovable objections and irreconcilable forces form the subcommittee to work with D. Hantzis and C. Blevens on some middle ground. E. Hampton and C. Olsen, the two of you are being asked to have met by the first Tuesday in December. You don’t have to come to a consensus but give us something from which to start a debate.
		36. D. Hantzis: I don’t know what can be done now because we are at the deadline. Now we are really talking about the best way to include students in the evaluation. Twenty-five years ago students’ perspectives were not taken seriously. Everyone understands the need for these questions to be robust.
		37. R. Guell: I think it is a valid point that officers and S. Powers and J. Maynard can get us to a point where every college has done what they need to do.
		38. K. Yousif: Why say they are not used for evaluative purposes and new faculty will have nothing else to submit? I would like to be more honest about that.
		39. R. Guell: I will not contradict what we agreed on. My hope is they are using peer evaluations or department questions.
		40. V. Sheets: I wanted to note that while we do want departments to establish questions, there is often overlap. I would like to know what the university’s questions are in order to reduce that possibility.
		41. R. Guell: It is my hope that we can on the first Tuesday in December have a list of possibles that for the January Senate meeting we could propose a set of questions so that departments can take those questions into action.
		42. D. Bradley: If you truly want each department to do it, we have lots of empirical evidence that it will only happen if they have a default set of questions. Trying to police it doesn’t work.
1. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
	1. K. Yousif: Several chairs have asked me to bring up that admins are not authorized to use Curriculog.
		1. J. Maynard: I have an answer for that, and it’s not no, but we need more time to discuss it.
		2. V. Sheets: It’s difficult; my first proposal didn’t take.
		3. R. Guell: I ask for a thorough discussion, because as Senate chair I don’t worry about the eight of you, but about telling the 34 Senators to log into this system, do it once, and only once, in April. Please launch this, for Senate purposes, in August. I don’t want to train a Senator to do this once. I want to train them in August.
2. Adjournment 5:20pm.