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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2012-2013

April 30, 2013

3:30pm, HMSU Dede III

**MINUTES**

Present: V. Sheets, A. Anderson, C. Ball, K. Bolinger, Scott Buchanan, J. Buffington, J. Conant, B. El Mansour, R. Fairchild, C. Fischer, E. Glendening, A. Gurovich, E. Hampton, D. Hantzis, M. Haque, M. Harmon, T. Hawkins, N. Hopkins, B. Kilp, J. Kuhlman, M. Miller, C. Olsen, R. Peters, T. Sawyer, C. Tucker, B. Yousif, and K. Yousif

Absent: R. Baker, Stan Buchanan, R. Johnson, E. Lorenzen, A. Morales, C. Stemmans Paterson, E. Strigas

Ex officio: President Bradley, Provost Maynard

Deans: R. Comer (Library), L. Maule (Univ. College), B. Smith (SCOB), J. Murray (A&S), R. Williams (CNHHS), K. Brauchle (Ext. Learning), B. Sims (COT), B. Balch (BCOE)

Staff Council Representative: No representative

SGA: No representative

Special Purpose Faculty: Michelle (Micki) Morahn

Guests: R. Guell, L. Kahanov, S. Powers, L. Spence, and J. Thomas

1. Administrative Reports:

President D. Bradley

* Legislature wrapped up Friday, and ISU will see a $340,000 reduction in the state budget appropriations as compared to this year.
* Science laboratories funding was reauthorized, about $4,000,000, as well as Normal Hall ($16,000,000). Anyone with anything in Normal Hall should remove it soon as work will begin within the next year.
* The Board of Trustees meets this Friday. The agenda is posted.
* Commencement is at noon on Saturday.
* Thank you for all the accomplishments.

Provost J. Maynard

* Indiana Principals’ Academy was approved by the Legislature. It will be housed at ISU beginning this summer.
* Thank you for all the accomplishments.

1. Chair Report:

V. Sheets

* Chair led Senate in applause to thank Tom Sawyer for many years of service to ISU and to institutional governance.
* Chair reminded FS of reception for Provost Jack Maynard on Wed, May 1.

1. Staff Council Report: No Report.
2. SGA Report: No Report.
3. Special Purpose Advocate Report:

Michelle (Micki) Morahn-No report.

1. 15 Minute Open Discussion

* *Has the position of Vice President for Student Success been filled permanently?* 
  + Response-*J. Powers has been appointed with a two-year contract.*
* *Begging the indulgence of my fellow Senators at this final last meeting of the senate, my comment is something of a story.  Out of sequence, let me note that the April 2nd minutes of the Executive Committee included a response from the President to a question of how we will determine the success of a retention initiative--how many students do we need to “break even.”  The question seemed to refer to an earlier discussion with the President not documented in minutes; that discussion must have included the cost of the initiative.*

*To date, I have learned nothing of this initiative as a Senator, chair of FAC, a member of the Foundational Studies Council, an academic advisor, or a member of the Student Success Council.  I did, however, learn about the initiative from one of my advisees.  She assumed I knew that she had been assigned an outside Academic Coach since, to her mind, such a person would benefit from a relationship with her academic advisor.  My student gave me the letter from ISU inviting her to take advantage of an academic coach--Coach Kimmy (who is her coach and the campus director of the ISU contract).*

*My student told me that she suggested to Coach Kimmy she might not be the best student for the program because, well, she is extraordinary--a double degree student who has achieved junior standing after three semesters, a section leader in the band, and carrying a gpa that is to be envied.  My student shared with me her early conversations with Coach Kimmy because she was a bit troubled by the language used by Coach Kimmy--I think that is because she is well trained in persuasion.  She told her coach began each call with “What problems have you had at ISU this week?”  Coach Kimmy told her that ISU had hired her company to help students succeed and that ISU was particularly worried about academic advising.  She asked my student if she had any trouble with her academic advisor and to be sure and tell her because she (Coach Kimmy) would “put some muscle behind it.”  My student assured her that “my advisor is fine.”  My student has become increasingly disappointed in her interactions with Coach Kimmy who has not called her since spring break (though the letter promised something else).  She told me that another of her friends was asked to join the program at spring break because ISU needed more participants but the coach has not called her either.*

*In addition to observing that her academic advisor should know about her academic coach, my student suggested that if ISU was paying outsiders to work with students, they should think about paying alumni because there are so many good ones and they need jobs.  I suggest that faculty should be informed about, enlisted in, and accounted to about such projects.  If there is one thing we all--administrators, staff, and faculty--share, it is a commitment to student success.*

* There was discussion about information/communication flow at the University.

1. Informational Items

AAC Staffing Report [Files 0 and 1]

* Highlights of the report were given.
  + Overall increase in employment at ISU.
  + Tenure/TT Faculty make up 69% of employees instructing students. This percentage has increased over the last three years.
  + Staffing overall has increased 1.8%.
  + Salary has increased approximately 7% across all categories.
  + Retirement contributions are similar across all employee categories.
* *Why have the administrative/executive/professional employees had the largest salary increases?*
  + Comment-*These numbers are based upon the pool of salary money and therefore would be impacted by the number of employees.*
  + Comment-*There was a salary study done within classified and mid-level executives during this time. Base salary adjustments were the same for all categories.*

1. Business Items
2. Approval of the Senate Minutes 4-18-13 [File 2]

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the Senate minutes of April 18, 2013 (N. Hopkins/A. Anderson; Vote: 26-0-1)

1. Academic Calendar [File 3]

* The proposed calendar would allow for an 11-week summer school format, with 3-4-4 terms. Courses could be 3, 4, 7, 8, or 11 weeks long. Courses would meet five days a week. This would be recorded as one single summer term.
* *We are still missing one instructional day in fall and spring. Can we have our instructional days back?*
  + There was much discussion regarding instructional days and days desired for orientation and advising.
* The administration in meeting with the Executive Committee agreed to take a serious look at moving to 15 week fall and spring terms.
* *My department is not in favor of this summer change at all. We offer a series of two-semester courses. Fifteen week courses are condensed down to 5-week courses for summer. This would make those into 4-week courses. There are also 15 labs going along with this. Essentially students would have to do four labs a week with reports on top of the lectures. We would be okay if we could have a modified start date to run the two courses over the 11 weeks. Also, if there are only one set of grades turned in at the end, our students must pass the first course to take the second. This would be a problem.*
  + Response-*Grades are currently rolled every week. We are going to try to discourage alternative start dates, but if there is a pedagogical reason for such, that would be open to discussion.*
* *32 start/stop dates seems very “student unfriendly”. Why is this allowed?*
  + Response-*I think this depends on the level of the student. If you have a graduate student only taking courses in one department, flexibility seems to make sense.*
* AAC spoke favorably of this calendar at the EC meeting.

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the revised academic calendar and request investigation of a 15-week fall and spring term calendar (T. Hawkins/A. Gurovich; Vote: 20-6-1)

1. Summer Pay Policy [File 4]

* This would establish a pay-scale based in part on the number of students enrolled in a course. It also allows for a stipend for overseeing independent study projects. This was approved at EC with the following correction: “4-8 students=2%; 9-15 students =…” should read “4-7 students=2%; 8-15 students=…”
* *I am concerned with the proposed summer pay policy. While I applaud the acknowledgement that independent study sections are part of a faculty workload and should be compensated, I take issue with the hidden message contained in the payment of faculty during the summer based on enrollment.*

*When I first heard about this proposal, it was advanced with the goal of making summer courses more predictable for students. I encourage this goal. The thought behind this proposal is that courses which are under-enrolled, as spelled out in the proposed document would still be able to take place, with a reduction in compensation for the faculty member teaching the course.*

*This would make summer courses and instructional assignments more predictable, in that some courses which would not have made enrollment would now be allowed to proceed.*

*This carries with it the message that the proposed course is necessary for student program progression and should be provided. If a course is deemed as necessary for student progression, and scheduled as such, it should be offered.*

*While this proposal does allow for more courses to be offered, it carries with it the message that faculty compensation should be based on number of students in a course. This is a dangerous message and one that has the potential for de-professionalization.*

*This message is made clear with the inclusion of greater pay provided for larger courses. This sends a message that instruction is more highly valued if provided to more students. Certain courses allow for large enrollments, by design. Others do not. Additionally, the number of students in a course does not carry with it a one-to-one correspondence in the amount of faculty effort.*

*The number of students in a course should not change the pedagogical approach to the course. The course content should influence this. Thus, with this proposal we are differentially rewarding amount of grading necessary. This is another dangerous message which should not be institutionalized through policy.*

* A wording change was proposed to change “…study sections may be…” to “…study sections will be…” in bullet 3.
* *This was driven by having a sense of surety in our summer offerings so we could get students through in four years.*
* *Do these number ranges represent enrollment at the beginning of the course or end?*
  + Response-*This would usually be at the beginning.*
* *Clearly there is still some uncertainty. But the uncertainty is far, far less than it had been before. The numbers in these categories go down much further than they did before. Now every faculty member has the ability to monitor enrollment from six months out. If you are scheduled to teach a course with just 2, 3, or 4 people in it, and it is getting closer, you should be thinking, “Am I going to teach this at 2% if it is in that category?” There is a whole lot more certainty than it is now.*
* There was discussion about where the numbers came from for graduate courses and if accreditation standards were taken into account.
  + Response-*It makes sense that if there is a set of rules or numbers that an accrediting body is setting, then the dean or provost most take that into account so the faculty are not penalized.*
* This would be effective summer 2014.
* *Does this include supervised internships?*
  + Response-*It is difficult to get one document to fit across all situations across campus. The Provost’s office doesn’t want to micromanage this. I hope common sense will be applied at the chair and dean levels.*

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the summer pay policy with above changes (R. Peters/B. Yousif; Vote: 19-7-1)

1. EC Textbook recommendations and Textbook Taskforce Report [Files 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]

* The Taskforce Report, SAC report, FAC report and EC recommendation were presented. The EC response was changed in three places at the EC meeting.
  + 3c addition- “The University shall establish default guidelines for textbook adoptions.”
  + 3d wording change-“Chairs shall place orders…” changed to “Chairs shall ensure orders are placed…”
  + 3e wording change-“may” should be replaced with “shall”
* EC wanted to keep textbook decision-making as close as possible to the faculty and the discipline. The taskforce report called for a university textbook oversight committee. Neither SAC nor FAC felt comfortable with this.
* *It would make sense that when a faculty member forwarded their choice of a textbook, that they also forward that choice to the chair. That way the chair would know if a book had been chosen. The chairs are being kept “out of the loop”.*
* *In 3d, what is meant by “at the time of student registration”?* 
  + Response-*The time a student can physically register for a course.*
* Deadline dates will be included in the academic calendar.
* Some of the information chairs are receiving from the book store is incorrect.
* Discussion was held about textbook buy-back and book store policy.

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the EC Response to the Textbook Taskforce Report (T. Hawkins/B. Yousif; Vote: 25-1-0)

1. University College Taskforce Report [Files 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]

* The taskforce report was sent to CAAC, FAC and SAC. EC passed the following motion: ***MOTION TO APPROVE*** *FAC’s motion regarding governance structure (with wording changes), CAAC’s recommendation regarding the resolution of disagreements, and to send all committee reports to the Foundational Studies Council for their creation of a policy regarding the University College (T. Hawkins/K. Bolinger; Vote: 6-0-0)*
* CAAC and FAC both felt the Foundational Studies Council should be severed from CAAC and made the governing body of the University College. CAAC felt that if a dispute arose between the academic dean and UC dean, the Provost, as the university’s chief academic officer, would resolve the dispute.
* Wording changes were made to FAC’s motion …*an autonomous…* to …*a college…* and added at the end of the sentence …*consistent with the university faculty constitution.*

**MOTION TO APPROVE** FAC’s motion regarding governance structure (with wording changes), CAAC’s recommendation regarding the resolution of disagreements, and to send all committee reports to the Foundational Studies Council for their creation of a policy regarding the University College (D. Hantzis/M. Harmon; Vote: 26-0-0)

1. Appointment of Acting Chair [File 16]

* Tabled at EC until fall 2013.

1. Legal Topics Recommendation [File 17]

* This was a recommendation from FAC that the administration create a workshop annually for faculty regarding legal issues associated with various aspects of our jobs. The administration was favorable to this recommendation.

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the legal issues/topics recommendation (A. Anderson/A. Gurovich; Vote: 26-0-0)

1. Adjournment

**MOTION TO ADJOURN** (T. Hawkins/A. Anderson; Vote: 26-0-0) Time: 5:00