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UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

November 18, 2010, 3:30 p.m.

HMSU – Dede III

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, J. Buffington, J. Conant, N. Corey,

C. Crowder, R. Dunbar, R. Guell, L. Hall, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins,

P. Hightower, C. Hoffman, N. Hopkins, J. Hughes, L. Kahanov, K. Kincade,

C. Klarner, J. Latimer, M. Lewandowski, C. Lunce, C. MacDonald, T. McDaniel,

R. Osborn,W. Redmond, T. Sawyer, M. Schafer, V. Sheets, S. Shure,

G. Stachokas, L. Tinnerman and A. Solesky (P.T. Faculty Advocate)

Absent: B. Corcoran, R. Goldbort, J. Kuhlman, J. Latimer, T. McDaniel, R. Schneirov, B. Yousif

Ex officio: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard

Deans: A. Comer, J. Gatrell, Jason Winkle

Guests: N. Merritt (Dean COB) L. Sperry, R. Peters, Y. Peterson

I. Administrative report

President Bradley:

a. NCA team was highly complementary about basically everything we do and for all the hard work that went into preparations. They will ask us to write a report on our assessment program, which will be due December 2013. In many ways I think that is a good thing because it will keep us “on the ball“(focused.) They are going to want information on how we are closing the loop on programmatic/department assessment as well as the Foundational Studies programs. It is already in our plans so this should not be a major hurdle for us. In 2020 and 2021 they will return, so be prepared.

b. This morning I was in Indianapolis with Brian Hasler and Diann Mc Kee making our presentation to the Budget Committee. I believe they were very receptive and for the most part, congenial, especially after I informed them that we have plans to raise tuition. There were no objections even when we stated that we would need monies for repairs and maintenance. They didn’t’ say forget it! So, I think it went as well as can be. I don’t believe the budget will be passed until the very end of the session (both houses are under the same party as the governor), I expect that it will be pretty much what the governor wants, but even then, it won’t be passed until very close to the end of the session. They are very much interested in our student success initiatives and what we are doing to help our students become more successful.

II. Chair report - S. Lamb:

Colleagues;

I want to begin by thanking Rob Goldbort, Nora Hopkins and Jim Hughes for having the courage to speak to the wisdom of gathering more input from the faculty and moving this item to table at the Faculty Senate. We have received quality input from that body.

I was not supportive of tabling; the term cantankerous comes to mind. But the wisdom of the faculty senate prevailed. The motion to table passed. And I do apologize to the Senators for my haste. Frankly, I had been involved with this performance evaluation process for three years, and was sick of it. But I let my personal desires rule.

I must read the position statement that the National AAUP has concerning Post-Tenure Review that I received from Rich Schneirov, who is an AAUP representative at the state level

It reads “Post-tenure review should not be undertaken for the purpose of dismissal. Other formal disciplinary procedures exist for that purpose. If they do not, they should be developed separately, following generally accepted procedures.” This statement is definitive, and there is no doubt that the former form of the Performance Evaluation document was in violation of that principle.

Not only that our handbook states under

**FACULTY DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES in the P*reamble***

Indiana State University subscribes to AAUP guidelines for academic freedom and faculty duties and

Responsibilities

Faculty, Do realize that a newer version has come forth from the Executive Body that incorporates much input from the faculty received from an earlier forum, as well as from opinions sent forward. The newer version is up on the website that Bob has created. The changes are highlighted in Red. We are still receiving input. A forum with the College of Nursing, and the College of Education Faculty took place yesterday, and modifications will be made again.

Performance Evaluation is an agenda item for the Executive Committee again on November 30th. But if the tabling had not occurred, we would have possibly passed through the Faculty Senate a document

Second topic;

There has been concern about a practice of the Senates concerning the issue of friendly amendments. Our current practice does not follow Roberts Rules of Order, but it has been the precedent here since the beginning of time. Now as Charles points out, in a humorous e-mail, there exist numerous instances where we do not follow Roberts’s rules of order. But, this particular practice has bothered a significant number of senators.

I suggest the following: From now on, when a friendly amendment is offered, I will ask if there is any Senator that objects to the friendly amendment. If there is any objection, it will not be accepted as a friendly amendment, and will have to go through the process of a ‘motion to amend’. This will be following the Roberts rules procedures;

In general, let us allow our precedents to continue, until arguments are presented as to the value of doing away with precedent, and then determinations will have to be made. Let us move on.

Third topic;

Another rather significant issued passed through the Executive Committee that I felt should have greater exposure to the faculty body before it was brought to the Senate concerning the incorporation of community engagement and experiential learning into the T and P procedures.

(I am learning)Therefore I have asked Bob Guell to put this motion up on the WEB site for adequate discussion before it is brought to this body.

For your information that motion reads;

***Achievements in community engagement and experiential learning shall be considered toward reappointment, tenure and promotion within each department. The means by, and the extent to which this is to be accomplished is at the discretion of each department, and may be a part of any or all of the three activities under review (teaching/librarianship, research/creativity, and service).***

***Please encourage your academic colleagues to weigh in on this issue.***

***Thank you.***

III. Support Staff report. No report.

IV. SGA Report

Megan Bowers:

* + Blue Crew has worked on themes for all the basketball games for both the men and women’s basketball teams.
  + Themes will be released soon.
  + Help students get excited and motivated to come out and support their school.
* New position within SGA dedicated to working solely with student complaints and advocacy
* Someone will be in the office if students come up with any sort of complaint and will receive the attention they and their issues deserve. Student Media Services
  + Markets firm for student organizations
  + Will help student organizations design flyers, t-shirts, etc.
  + Will educate student organizations how to market their organizations to college students
    - Using means such as social media
      * Twitter
      * Facebook
* Freshman Council
  + Working on a fundraiser for a local charity
  + Planning a program event on campus for spring semester
* SGA Awareness Campaign
  + Student awareness of SGA is not where we want it to be
  + We’ll do a soft launch of trail/errors in December with a full launch of the awareness campaign in the spring semester

V. Special Purpose Advocate Report:

A. Solesky:

I want to express appreciation to all the faculty members who supported special purpose and adjunct faculty during the time additional compensation was addressed.

VI. **Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes of October 21, 2010 as amended**. C. Lunce/K. Bolinger

32-0-1

R. Guell to President: Related to AOP Students (President’s report in Minutes of October 21, 2010) - The Fall enrollment report by college still not on IRT website. Where are we relative to this?

President: I shall have an answer to this before the meeting is over. As far as where we are: we have about 18% AOPs this year – the number varies between about 18-21%. It continues to be my goal to get it down to 10% over the next few years, including a 2-3% drop next fall.

Provost : Regarding the enrollment reports: I talked to Dr. Burger on this issue of both the retention data and the report by colleges and was told it will be December 1 before the reports are up. His staff (Institutional Research) has gotten behind due to reports on Strategic Planning, North Central visit, etc.

What about the 19 peer institutions? President: I sent a letter to T. Lubber - I will assimilate everything that we have. She (Lubber) sent out a memo to all campuses asking if they would like to revisit their peers as well.

VII. 15 Minute Open Discussion

N. Hopkins to President Bradley: Faculty are very anxious to find out whether or not we will be doing any searches this year? We are quickly approaching the point of no return.

President: The provost, deans, and I are presently in discussion about this. We should have this worked out within the next few days.

N. Hopkins: If it is not worked out within the next few days, you should allow us to advertise “subject to available funding” and at least we can get the process started.

President: I believe it will be worked out.

C. MacDonald – three issues of concerns addressed to Provost/Administration:

1. If a faculty member elects to change the time/place of a course…he/she would have to drop that particular course and then have students added back in. Registrar's Office. would have to drop students out of that particular class and add them back manually.

Provost: This doesn’t make sense.

2. After normal business hours, tech support becomes a problem. Classes are held in the evenings and on weekends. There is no tech support after 4:30 p.m. so anyone with a tech problem would not be able to get tech support after hours.

3. Concern related by junior faculty: There are some faculty who are reluctant to electronically record their classes for fear that they will appear redundant – also since their classes are on tape, that we may let a grad student teach the course (replacing faculty lines). This might affect faculty buy in.

R. Guell: I had the opportunity to visit one of our peer institutions as a Higher Learning Commission peer evaluator last week. I came away with a great appreciation for the work of Prof. Tarbox and the creation of the Faculty Constitution and faculty and administrators' responsibilities sections in our Handbook. It is quite clear that our shared governmental structure is not a universal phenomenon and the degree to which shared governance works on this campus is, in fact, the envy of many at other institutions.

S. Lamb: It is the case that our shared governance document is extremely strong. We do need to be very responsible in the use of our Handbook. The more we use it judiciously, the more our procedures can be protected. We have had issues in the past.

J. Buffington: Regarding Standing Committee reports being absent from past Faculty Senate meetings – is this a temporary thing or will we return to this process?

S. Lamb: Perhaps we could leave it to this body to decide whether reports will be a permanent characteristic.

J. Buffington: Announcement of a letter going out regarding the Faculty Scholarship. He urged members to contribute to this worthy cause.

VIII. Handbook Changes FAC

Constitutional Changes:

S. Lamb: The Constitution can be changed by 2/3 Senate vote in order that changes may move to a full faculty vote which requires more than 50% for approval. In addition, at least 40% of the total faculty must vote. Steps are being taken to present these motions to the Faculty Senate and, at the next meeting, we will vote on them.

Discussion and review:

R. Guell and L. Sperry explained rationale for motions to be voted on later (Information only)

a.

**MOTION TO APPROVE THE NON-CONSTITUTIONAL PORTIONS OF THE HAND BOOK.**

(requires two-thirds majority by Faculty Senate)

R. Guell/A. Anderson 33-0-0.

IX. Advising, College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services, Handbook Changes. T. Sawyer presented rationale for change.

Review and discussion

**MOTION TO APPROVE: ADVISING, COLLEGE OF NURSING, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES**, **HANDBOOK CHANGES**J. Kuhlman/C. Lunce 33-0-0.

X. Grievance Policy Changes, By Laws: -; rather minor changes.

L. Sperry presented.

Review and discussion

**MOTION TO APPROVE GRIEVANCE** POLICY CHANGES, P. Hightower/C. MacDonald 33-0-0.

XI. Professional Conduct of Faculty

L. Sperry presented.

Review and discussion

Motion to Approve document as amended C. Hoffman/S. Lamb 31-2-0.

XII. CAAC Items:

* Name change of Health, Safety, and Environmental Health Sciences Department

Y. Peterson presented – Review and Discussion

**MOTION TO APPROVE NAME CHANGE OF HEALTH, SAFETY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES DEAPRTMENT TO DEARTMENT OF APPLIED HEALTH SCIENCES** A. Anderson/P. Hightower 33-0-0.

* Scott College of Business Reorganization

Dean N. Merritt presented – Review/Discussion

**MOTION TO APPROVE SCOTT COLLEGE OF BUSINESS REORGANIZATION**. A. Anderson/J. Buffington 31-0-0.

XIII. Attendance of Senators

L. Sperry presented.

Review/Discussion

R. Guell – This is already in the Constitution of the Faculty Senate. No motion needed.

S. Lamb: Charged Nora Hopkins to work with Darlene Hantzis and Kevin Bolinger to come up with a draft (language)on responsibilities for Senators’ attendance at meetings for presentation to the Executive Committee when it meets on November 30

C. Hoffman – Announcement: (Information only.) Health Benefits Committee – Frank Bel l (emeritus) has resigned from this Committee and Terry Parks will replace him.

Meeting adjourned: 5:50 p.m.