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UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

2012-2013

November 15, 2012

3:30 p.m. Federal Hall, 303

Present: V. Sheets, A. Anderson, Scott Buchanan, Stan Buchanan, J. Buffington, J. Conant, R. Fairchild, C. Fischer, E. Glendening, A. Gurovich, D. Hantzis, M. Haque, E. Hampton, M. Harmon, T. Hawkins, N. Hopkins, R. Johnson, B. Kilp, J. Kuhlman, E. Lorensen, M. Miller, A. Morales, C. Olsen, C. Paterson Stemmans, T. Sawyer, E. Strigas, C. Tucker, B. Yousif,

K. Yousif

Special Purpose Faculty: M. Morahn

Absent: R. Baker, C. Ball, K. Bolinger, R. Johnson, E. Lorenzen, R. Peters

Ex officio: President Bradley, Provost Maynard

Deans: T. Allen (Grad Studies); K. Brauchle (Ext Learning), A. Comer (Library); L. Maule (Univ. College); B. Smith (SCOB), J. Murray (A&S) , B. Williams (NHHS)

Guests: M. E. Adams, L. Bates, L. Benjamin, R. Guell, C. Hoffman, (S. Loughlin, Tribune Star)

S. Powers

1. Memorials:

a. Elena Adams-Banks read by Mary Ellen Adams

Approved by acclamation

b. Stan Evans read by Laura Bates

Approved by acclamation

1. Administrative reports

President D. Bradley:

1. Presentation made to the State Budget committee requesting flat funding from the State and the Commission is recommending a $3 million reduction. We can expect something in between.
2. University Budget Committee has begun meeting to deal with a perceived gap in the budget. The Committee will meet again in early December and again in mid-January.
3. Ground breaking for the new dormitory that will house sororities formerly in Lincoln Quad.

Provost J. Maynard: No report.

1. Chair report, V. Sheets: Welcome everyone.

I am pleased to come before you today, a week before Thanksgiving. And in that spirit, I want to thank all of you for your participation in this system of shared governance.

Shared governance is to me both a privilege and a duty. In many ways, I am an odd character to be leading governance. I have far less interest in political processes than in teaching my classes and working in my lab; but I’m sure the same is true for many of you. In this way, we feel the duty of shared governance.

However, shared governance is also a privilege; one that we must defend. It is our means of assuring that the mission of Indiana State University is one that we can support and that also supports us.

To work in shared governance is to work not only to solve today’s problems—which need to be solved—but to participate in a larger, long-term discussion about the nature and philosophy of our institution and even of higher education in general.

To work in shared governance is to recognize that while one person may have “an” answer to a problem, the best solutions come from consideration of multiple perspectives—taking advantage of the experiences and insights of multiple audiences. Few academic policies have a singular effect on all disciplines and policies thus need vetting from faculty with different sources of knowledge, styles of pedagogy, and program objectives. Shared governance recognizes that from our differences come our strengths.

Finally, to work in shared governance is to accept that an open, deliberative, collaborative, and democratic process is more important than the endpoint and to recognize that building a groundswell of support for implementation of a solution assures success far greater than can be achieved through top-down dictates no matter how “right” or benign.

Shared governance is not easy; it takes time and sometimes mistakes are made; I’ve done this a while. I can point to mistakes some of my own doing. But I can similarly point to our successes. Like random assignment in experimental design, though not perfect, it is the single best strategy for long-term success.

So again, I thank you all for your participation in and support of shared governance.

I also want to express my thanks to one person in particular today. Pat Kennedy has served the Senate for over four years now. This is her last Senate meeting. Pat has decided to retire at the end of this month. I would ask the Senate to join me in expressing thanks to Pat for her service.

IV. SGA Report, J. Loudermilk: No report

V. Special Purpose – **Michelle Morahn’s statement**:

It has been brought to my attention by more than one lecturer (special purpose faculty) that once again, special purpose faculty were not included in the raises that every other sector of ISU received beginning in November. This is not the first time, nor the second that this has happened.

We realize that continuous employment is usually one of the standards for raises. Even though many of us do work under semester to semester contracts, we still have been employed for long periods, year after year in many cases. A few people, due to their long employment, make over the $1000 threshold. It would seem fair that any raises granted to others should also apply to their hourly rate.

This sends a message to lecturers and special purpose faculty that their work is not valued as highly as anyone else on campus. We are expected to perform at the same level as instructors and tenure track faculty and we all experience yearly evaluations to assure that we meet the standards set by ISU. Yet, we are overlooked when it comes to salary increases. It becomes discouraging. We are the ones who deal with so many of our incoming freshmen. We are the ones who can most aid in retention, since many of us are teaching Foundational Studies classes. It would seem that rewarding our efforts should at least be as important as rewarding everyone else who works as hard to help ISU meet its goals.

We hope something can be done soon to correct this problem, so we can continue to attract and retain quality faculty as well as quality students.

VI. 15 Minutes Open Discussion:

a. **J. Buffington’s statement**: ISU Foundation and Scholarship Concerns

At its November 14, 2012 meeting SAC expressed the following concerns about the Faculty Scholarship and the ISU Foundation:

1. The newly designed website—it seems that it is now much more difficult for users to navigate the website, especially those users who wish to donate money.  With the old website, it was easy to donate; our complaint was that the only way donors could earmark a donation for the Faculty Scholarship was to check “Other,” and then write in (hopefully) “Faculty Scholarship.”  We were hoping the new website would have a check box for Faculty Scholarship.  I have been directed to ask Senators for their comments on the user-friendliness of the donor portion of the website.
2. A second related issue is: are faculty who intend to donate to the Faculty Scholarship actually seeing their dollars go to that scholarship?  In fall of 2011, we asked the foundation for a list of donated amounts.  In March, we received that information on a month by month basis.  The numbers didn’t seem to match those of known contributors; Charles Hoffman, for instance, has donated large amounts to this scholarship, and those amounts did not seem to be covered by the monthly figures we received.  In addition, some faculty have reported that their Foundation receipts show they have donated to the ISU Foundation, but there is no information about whether that donation went to the Faculty Scholarship.  When we donate to the women’s basketball team, we do get a designation that the money went to this team.  Do you know if Faculty Scholarship donors should be receiving documentation of where there money went?  I have been directed to ask Senators if they have been receiving such acknowledgement.

SAC carried these concerns to Rex Kendall, the newly appointed Director of Alumni Affairs . His response was immediate:

“I am including Catherine Saunders and Amy Westgard in my reply.  They will be able to help us sort out solutions to your concerns and provide answers to your questions.  Given that  I am new in my role and the questions are directed to an area that I am not completely familiar with at this time, it will be in our best interest to seek assistance from more knowledgeable and informed colleagues.   Catherine and Amy will assist in providing answers.  I am not certain of their calendars or availability tomorrow (Thursday) to respond with answers to your questions by the time the Senate meeting convenes.  However, if we cannot get a response to you by the 3:30 Senate meeting, please share with your Senate colleagues that you have asked the questions and answers will be forthcoming.

“As always, please let me know if I can be of additional assistance.  In addition, please stop by the Foundation Office to say hello when you are in the area.”

SAC will work with the Foundation to resolve these issues.

b. **C. Hoffman’s statement:**

*The first University Handbook was published in 1961 under a different name and, over the last 50 years, has been revised and updated in response to changing times and conditions.*

*Over those years, it has provided an easily-accessible repository of University rules, regulations, and procedures in a single place, so that, especially when disagreements occurred, everyone could go to the same place to determine how to proceed. This has worked marvelously well. When disagreements have occurred, solutions have frequently resulted from consultation.*

*We have been able to work together for the benefit of all. On the rare occasions when the Handbook has not been helpful, it has been updated to address current issues. It is a living document which has been adapted to changing times.*

*One basic principle enshrined in the Handbook concerns shared governance, in which different constituencies are guaranteed input (either primary or advisory authority) in matters pertaining to themselves.*

*It is beyond dispute that the Trustees have, under Indiana law, ultimate authority over the operation of the University, but even they, under the Handbook, seek and receive advice before making decisions. Because of this, Trustees have benefitted from a variety of perspectives before making decisions and, hopefully, have avoided (or at least minimized) unintended consequences of their actions. Also important is that stakeholders – all members of the University community (even when they disagree) – have been able to "buy in" to decisions because they have been heard.*

*I have served under five University presidents and every one of them has been impatient with shared governance because, in their view, it moves too slowly, preventing them from quickly instituting changes which they believe necessary and appropriate. As you all know, the Senate and its standing committees have, when asked to do so, expedited consideration of matters deemed to require immediate attention. Democracy IS slow, but no better form of governance has yet appeared.*

*The proposed "Policy on Policies" changes the whole notion of shared governance by permitting, perhaps even encouraging, Trustees to consider changes without the input they formerly enjoyed. This is a bad idea, both for them and for ISU. Not only should we not encourage, but we should strenuously object to decision-making outside established channels by the creation of a "back door" through which those channels may be bypassed.*

*I look forward to your discussion of this most important issue.*

c. **R. Guell’s statement:**

Colleagues,

My reaction to the Policy on Policies proposal of the President was visceral. The President has proposed an inflammatory change to process with an irresponsibly short timeline for response. To wit: he put a proposal to utterly eviscerate shared governance on the Board agenda on the Tuesday before the October Board meeting. This is the regular pattern from a predictable negotiator. The President offers an incendiary proposal in hopes of getting an only slightly less onerous policy approved by the Board. Rather than taking the bait directly, I wish to offer an argument for why respecting shared governance and diffuse primary authority is better FOR THE BOARD, FOR STUDENTS, and FOR THE PRESIDENT, than the governance structure where the President makes every decision. I would also point out that for the 40-plus years we have operated under the Handbook, there was no question about how the Handbook was to be amended and by whose authority.

But here is my argument for shared governance:

Viewed from the outside, universities are oddly structured. They are not structured like for-profit businesses where bosses decisions are final and the boss is only subject to the will of a board. Nor are they structured like Presbyterian churches where no one can make a decision without the blessings of a committee. This is why, in 1966, the American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges settled, together, on principles that should govern universities. As such, public universities are structured to fit their constituencies: their students, their communities, and the taxpayers that support them. Shared governance adds value to this structure largely because the principal means by which we carry out our operations is through mostly tenured faculty interacting with students. Tenured faculty are the lifeblood of an institution. An institution’s tenured faculty, when excited about its students, is a strong force doing great service in the public good. Its tenured faculty bend heaven and earth to offer stimulating in and out of class experiences because tenured faculty have a far greater long-term stake in the intellectual life of a university than do any other category of employees. We see administrators come and go. Steve Lamb has seen five Presidents, at least six provosts and every dean in the history of the College of Business. Because tenure insulates us against termination for grounds short of clearly troubling acts, tenured faculty can, when battered by its administration, become an immovable object; sometimes for the good and sometimes, frankly, not. Because tenured faculty rarely move to other universities simply as faculty, we are bound, one to another and to ISU. That is why the organizational structure of a university has shared governance. Taxpayers need educated students. Students need enthused faculty. Tenured faculty provide the greatest enthusiasm. Tenured faculty maintain their enthusiasm when persuaded and lose it when they are not.

It is this way because though, administrators can prod, push, order, threaten, or pay stipends to get their way, their most powerful tool is their power of persuasion. That power of persuasion moves us to acts we might not otherwise consider. It is through shared governance that we are convinced. A convinced faculty takes ownership of a new direction and can push it further than administrations imagine. A convinced faculty spend their weekends and evenings emailing each other with ideas about how to bring the best pedagogy to students and how to get the most effort from students. An ordered faculty, a threatened faculty, even a faculty paid a stipend for an act for which they have no emotional stake, produce far less and at ultimately a much higher price.

Make no mistake. The Policy on Policies is not the innocent set of clauses intended to clear up ambiguities that it purports to be. There are no ambiguities. Anyone can propose consideration of anything but the entity with primary authority must render a judgment according to its established processes and that judgment is taken, by the President, to the Board of Trustees. The proposed Policy on Policies is an insidious attack on shared governance that will haunt every faculty member for years to come. It will haunt faculty in 2020; in 2030, and beyond. It will empower an impatient, imprudent, cocksure administration to impose its will on a faculty. The faculty can respond using an authority even the board of trustees can’t overcome: the inalienable power to lose enthusiasm. Lost enthusiasm among tenured faculty is deadly to a university. It makes it impossible for new faculty to be hired because applicants sense the emotional detachment of the faculty interviewing them. It is a death cycle for universities. Some of us came very close to that experience once and we have no desire to return to those days. However, we will not sacrifice shared governance in order to preserve peace because it is shared governance that is the means by which we not only preserve peace but the means by which we share sacrifice and enjoy prosperity.

The administration is, perhaps, justifiably frustrated by the Faculty Senate’s actions regarding grade changes last year and suffrage this year. The Faculty Senate of last year rejected the grade change schemes because members found them unwise. On the other hand, members largely embraced the University College idea because it was viewed as a direction forward that we could take together. The Faculty Senate last year proposed a means of providing suffrage for multi-year, non-tenure track faculty. This year’s Faculty Senate was uncomfortable with the direction taken but wants to take another stab at it. The history of democracies is that they are inefficient.  But when they are united in purpose, they accomplish great things. The same is true with universities. The President’s proposed Policy on Policies should be rejected as an obvious and egregious attack on what distinguishes the academy from other enterprises: vigorous, thorough, thoughtful, and civil debate leading to a unified purpose. I urge the Faculty Senate to insist on nothing less than a maintained respect for primary authority within the context of shared governance.

d. **S. Lamb’s statement**

Dear Colleagues.

Over the years it has become my enjoyable responsibility to soften Bob Guell’s colorful language. In this instance, I have again done so. But make no mistake, the President’s proposed policy on policies will neuter shared governance. Robert is right on target. It is more dangerous to the institution than any policy that has been proposed. It is uncalled for. While Dr. Bradley has been at the institution, faculty governance has been extremely responsible, making every effort to provide timely input to initiatives.  Virgil is committed to this established path, and is willing to explore other initiatives that will expedite the governance process.

Understand that President Bradley’s proposal will ensure that only his vision for the institution will prevail. The Executive Committee, after hearing from the Senate, must develop a counter proposal that reassures the advisory and primary authority of faculty governance, Virgil is up to the task, and Robert has a worthwhile counter proposal as well. Otherwise, goodbye, shared governance.

e. AAUP ISU Chapter response to Policy on Policies statement … insert here

**K. Yousif: Letter to Board of Trustees**

To:         ISU Board of Trustees

From:     Executive Committee, AAUP ~ ISU Chapter

              Richard Schneirov, Keri Yousif, Dennis Bialaszewski, Richard Lotspeich

Date:      15 November 2012

Re:        Comment on proposed policy change: *205 ~ Policy on Policies*

The ISU chapter of the American Association of University Professors supports the ISU Faculty Senate's opposition to the new "Policy on Policies" proposed by the Bradley administration.   In our view the proposal is a dangerous innovation that would give undue power to the University President.  He or she could override the customary constraints on all stakeholders whenever it suits his or her purposes. It would render much of the *University Handbook* null and void and undermine the structure of effective governance at Indiana State University.

Approval of the "Policy on Policies" would abrogate ISU's long history of shared governance based on the framework of primary and advisory authorities, replacing checks **and balances** with unchecked, arbitrary executive power.  More broadly, this change of authorities abrogates a central principle followed in American government and many organizations that comprise American society:  the supremacy of rule of law, which sets firm limits on arbitrary power.

The proposed new policy would undermine the existing governance mechanisms that moderate ill-conceived or mistaken administrative initiatives and that provide widespread legitimacy for initiatives approved by the faculty and other constituencies. Without genuine shared governance, the academic community can easily become polarized on issues that could otherwise be resolved by discussion and negotiation.  The proposed policy will radically change a system that has served ISU well and demoralize the faculty who are honestly engaged in governance.

The “Policy on Policies’ would also undercut the existing division of labor in campus governance in which the Faculty Senate and its committees take testimony from campus stakeholders, exhaustively discuss issues, and reconcile divergent campus interests in the course of vetting proposals for change in areas where faculty have primary authority. The Board of Trustees is not structured to take on this function of campus governance, nor does it have the resources to do so.  It would be inappropriate to burden the Board with this task.

The carefully considered policy positions of the national AAUP are dedicated to a system of shared university governance and other institutions that protect academic freedom. That system of shared governance and the academic freedom it protects are among the major reasons that the U.S. is a world leader in higher education.  The proposed new policy contradicts the spirit and practice of shared governance as long practiced in American universities, including ISU, while threatening the promise of academic freedom.

f. **D. Hantzis statement:**

I appreciated Dr. Guell’s statement recalling one of the formative points of shared governance when the American Council on Education, AAUP, and the Association of Governing Boards joined together.  I am very familiar with ACE and AAUP so I decided to look at AGB statements on shared governance.  In 2010, AGB issued a new statement on Board Responsibility for Institutional Governance.  It is a statement that we might want to encourage our colleagues and, perhaps, our board to read carefully (<http://agb.org/news/2010-03/statement-board-responsibility-institutional-governance>).  The statement strongly reaffirms the need for and value of shared governance.  AGB comes to this reaffirmation after reviewing current concerns about institutional operations.  The report includes observations of these concerns, two of which I think we have been hearing often during the past few years.  First, AGB notes the concern, especially from external bodies, about effectiveness as measured by responsiveness to persistent societal and economic changes impacting our work.  The concern about efficacy connects with the second concern cited by AGB--pace of change.  As with most sectors, new media technologies were expected to transform operations in higher education--increasing efficiency (at least efficiency defined as a measure of time).  And, as with most sectors, the transformation has been slow to arrive.  AGB’s response to the concerns is an explicit statement of continued support for shared governance.  The statement recognizes that shared governance has fostered excellence and innovation by faculty.

g. A plea was made that faculty stop sending students to request prereq overrides for math courses and to get into sessions that are closed.

h. Issues regarding the child care center remodel and rest rooms.

Provost: We have been working on this issue. Plans are in place and we are working on

solutions to resolve issues.

President Bradley: We are making plans to remodel the child care center. There was a

lot of misinformation between facilities and the academic programs and what the

standards were for national accreditation, but we are moving forward with the remodeling process.

VII. Business items:

1. **MOTION TO APPROVE** the Minutes of **September 27, 2012** as corrected (A. Anderson/N. Hopkins; vote: 26-0-0).
2. Next Faculty Senate meeting will **be December 6,2012** in HMSU Dede III.
3. **MOTION TO APPROVE** CAAC Appointments: Jeffrey Decker confirmation; Larry Rosenhein Alternate (N. Hopkins/J. Kuhlman ; Vote: 26-0-0)
4. **MOTION TO APPROVE** Department of Art name change to Department of Art and Design

(N. Hopkins/A. Anderson; Vote: 26-0-0)

1. **MOTION TO APPROVE** Multi-disciplinary Studies Minor

(N. Hopkins/A. Anderson; Vote: 26-0-0)

1. **MOTION TO APPROVE** Foundational Studies Block credit for AAS
2. Anderson/A. Morales; vote: 22-3-1)

VIII. Discussion Item - Policy on Policies

a. V. Sheets introductory remarks: Policy on Policies has been approved by the BOT which is why I bring it to you today for discussion. I do not speculate on the policy’s intent, this policy may hold merit on campus wide policies those pertaining to harassment, weapons, or protection of minors, but its current formulation seems much broader. The president has indicated a wiliness to modify it, and the Executive Committee has charged the officers with this task. It is towards this end that I ask for your comments and assistance.

b. N. Hopkins comments and question to President Bradley: Can you give me any instance at ISU where a procedure such as this would have improved the results of any policy we passed?

President’s comment: It was not my intention to create a major angst. There is nothing in the Hand Book that speaks to how one changes the Handbook nor addresses what primary authority means. What I would like to see on a policy on policies is two things:

1) A general outline (discussion) of how to do changes in the Handbook which would be more detailed.

2) If a group proposes a change in any area that there would be a discussion.

The Trustees need a way to see how general comments come to a conclusion, and how a change is made. It is not a way (nor would I use it) to get around shared governance. Having a time line is important, but 60 days does not need to be the time. The Board of Trustees (BOT) approved this policy for nothing else then sending it out for discussion. They will wait to February for recommendation from faculty. What I am looking for is some sort of a timeline. There are things we have been discussing for years that have not come to a head yet. For example, the role of instructors. The Trustees are committed to representation by all full time employees. The Executive Committee many times feels like they can’t discuss things that the Faculty Senate does not approve of…what the Senate passes should be what the BOT approves but in some cases there is a need for discussion and understanding by the Board of what the faculty actually would like, not what they wouldn’t like.

c. **Aaron Morales’ statement:**

I am okay with a timeline but 60 days is far too short. I suggest at least a semester, or an academic year.

The policy as written was clearly not what the president stated his intentions were.

We, the Senate, might like to compose a document of our own that meets the needs of the president's stated reason for wanting a Policy on Policies.

Furthermore, there is no invitation for the chair of Senate to speak with the Board of Trustees, rather than simply making a statement. I suggested that we allow the chair to actually engage in a dialogue with the Board to apprise them of the Senate's wishes.

**President’s comments** … The Trustees do have ultimate authority; but, do not like to use it until they get advice from various constitute groups.

d.. **T. Hawkins’ statement:**

The Policy as written is fundamentally flawed.  I expressed my opinion that the manner in which the policy was introduced has contributed to the charged (and negative) reaction from faculty.  In light of the president's apparent willingness to revise the language of the policy to address faculty concerns, I asked that the language in the original draft of the policy be withdrawn from consideration by the Board.  This would allow concerned parties to construct a new version based on negotiation rather than fiat.

President: I would be happy to go to the Board in December and ask for comment on Policy on Policies with a new date for comments on proposed text. I would ask that you remember that this is a policy document but giving me something like 20 pages long would **not** be useful. I want something that described the process and put it in primarily authority and will come to conclusion in a certain amount of time or a variable amount of time depending on the policy and timeline that would be reasonable.

e.**. J. Conant statement:** Thanked the President for his willingness to determine if the Board will allow the Chair of the Faculty Senate to have an enhanced speaking role at Board meetings, and stated that the Senate would be anxiously awaiting the answer.

f.. **D. Hantzis’ statement**:

I want to be clear that the Association of Governing Boards recognized the same concerns that appear to be generating this “policy on policies” and found that there is a way to respond to those concerns without diminishing shared governance.  I also want to comment on President Bradley’s example.  I think it is ironic that you chose to use the 120 hour rule as an example policy; the faculty asked for a speedier implementation of that policy and the administration denied that action, choosing a delay of one year.  I also want to agree that we need to be certain to create opportunities for sharing information and engaging faculty in discussions, especially when the Senate takes up constitutional and by-law changes.  I know I felt the suffrage motion seemed a bit naked when it was brought to Senate in August; the discussion of the motion took place in April and the vote had to be delayed until the next meeting.  I think the Senate should identify tactics that promote informed discussion that can figure as “guidance to the BOT.”  We have done that kind of work.  The Senate did an amazing job organizing faculty participation in the biennial review procedures and FAC did a tremendous amount of that kind of work last year in its deliberation of the charge to consider extending voting rights to Instructors.  That does not require weakening shared governance.

IX. Standing Committee Reports

AAC – B. Kilp - Approved the plan to make position of Director of the Honors program to

be a full time, full year position.

AEC - K. Yousif: Met and made recommendations for awards and allotments. The Chair of the committee, Dr. Jim Wurtz will be working with OSP to notify all applicants following the Thanksgiving break.

CAAC- Small program modifications and await reports from provost re texbooks.

FAC - D. Hantzis: FAC has met weekly.  We have completed action on several of our

Priority charges, some of which have been mentioned in Musings.  We meet again after break and hope to complete work on two additional charges; if we are successful we will have completed all charges we planned to address during the fall term.

FEBC - S. Buchanan: Working on recommended policy re retired professors.

GC – C. Olsen: There was no report from Grad Council. We are meeting Tuesday after break and the Tuesday after that.

SAC J. Buffington: Working on course evaluation policies and making satisfactory process on charges.

URC J. Conant: The University Research Committee met on Friday 10/26 to make recommendations on the allocation of fall research awards.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.