

#5  
Indiana State University  
Faculty Senate, 2021-2022  
December 2, 2021  
3:30 p.m. via Zoom

Members present: S. Ahmad, A. Akgul, S. Anderson, A. Arrington, A. Arrington-Slocum, S. Arvin, A. Badar, C. Ball, L. Brown, T. Dean, C. Drew, L. Eberman, S. Ferng, J. Finnie, A. French, J. Frost, R. Guell, J. Gustafson, T. Hawkins, K. Hinton, D. Israel, A. Jay, D. Knaebel, A. Kummerow, J. Liu, J. McKirahan, L. McQuiston, T. Nesser, R. Peters, D. Selman, E. Southard, L. Walters, K. Yousif

Absent Members: A. Czyzewski,

EX-Officio Present: President D. Curtis, Provost C. Olsen

Guests: A. Solesky, A. Angel, J. Trainer, K. Woods-Johnson, R. Gonser, S. Patton, S. Powers, T. London, K. Butwin, A. Hay

**1) Memorial Resolutions**

**a) Dr. Richard Stebbins Prepared and read by Caroline Mallory Dean of the College of Health and Human Services**

The Dean's Office of the College of Health and Human Services invites faculty and staff to join us in remembering our friend and former colleague, Dr. Richard James Stebbins, who passed peacefully on August 8, 2021 at the age of 93.

Dr. Stebbins was on the faculty in physical education contributing his teaching, scholarship and service for over 24 years. He served as both as Acting Chair Physical Education for Men and then as Chair for the Physical Education Department. Dr. Stebbins retired from Indiana State University in 1988. We remember him for his teaching and mentoring.

WHEREAS, Dr. Richard Stebbins, retired Professor and Chair in Physical Education of Indiana State University, died on the 8th day of August two thousand and twenty one; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Richard Stebbins had dedicated his service to the Physical Education Department where he was admired by his colleagues and students at Indiana State University; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Indiana State University by this Resolution expresses to his family our condolences and convey our appreciation of the dedication which he gave to our University; and

We ask that this resolution be included in the minutes of the ISU Faculty Senate and that a copy be sent to the family of Dr. Richard James Stebbins.

**b) Dr. Tom Sauer prepared Robert Perrin Emeritus Chairperson of English and Chris Olsen Interim Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and read by Dr. Chris Olsen**

**THOMAS G. SAUER  
1945–2020**

## IN MEMORIAM

Thomas Sauer began his undergraduate studies at the University of Notre Dame in 1963. He spent his sophomore year abroad, studying at the University of Innsbruck (1964–1965), after which he completed a BA (summa cum laude) in English in 1967. After completing his bachelor's degree, Sauer was drafted into the US Army and served during the Vietnam War. Following his honorable discharge, Sauer began graduate studies in Comparative Literature at Indiana University. He received a Fulbright Fellowship in 1967, which allowed him to study at the University of Munich. On his return to Indiana University, he earned an MA in 1972 and a PhD in 1979, with a dissertation titled "A. W. Schlegel's Shakespearean Criticism in England, 1811–1846."

Sauer's academic career began at Indiana University, where he was a Visiting Assistant Professor of Germanic Languages (1979–1980). His next teaching position was as an Assistant Professor of German at the State University College of New York, Fredonia (1980–1981). Sauer then became an Assistant Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures at the University of Virginia (1981–1988) before moving into the position of Assistant Dean of Virginia's College of Arts and Sciences (1988–1990).

Sauer came to ISU in 1990 as the Associate Dean for Student Affairs in the College of Arts and Sciences, with a secondary appointment as an Associate Professor of English. In 2007, Sauer became Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a position he held until he retired in 2010.

Sauer's scholarly work included the 1981 publication of his revised dissertation—*A. W. Schlegel's Shakespearean Criticism in England, 1811–1846* (Bonn: Bouvier)—as well as articles in publications as diverse as *German Quarterly*, *Dreiser Studies*, *Colloquia Germanica*, and *The Dictionary of Literary Biography*. His conference presentations treated the writings of Schlegel, of course, but also Paul-Michel Foucault, Bernd Heinrich von Kleist, Gotthold Lessing, Botho Strauss, Bertolt Brecht, Friedrich Dürrenmatt, Thomas Mann, and Milan Kundera.

Sauer's teaching at ISU began with Major World Authors (English 235), but, beginning in 1997, he taught Shakespeare (English 460/560) every semester at 8:00AM in Root Hall. Comments by colleagues who observed his classes and from student evaluations incorporated words like *energetic*, *demanding*, *dynamic*, *intense*, *thoughtful*, *inspired*, *challenging*, and *stimulating*—which is especially impressive at such an early hour in a classroom without windows.

Tom Sauer served the College of Arts and Sciences as Associate Dean, Interim Dean, and Dean. He began as Associate Dean for Student Affairs, a challenging position he held for more than a decade from 1990 to 2001; he was Interim Dean for the 2001-2002 academic year, returned to Associate Dean between 2002 and 2005, with primary responsibilities for budget and personnel, and then was Interim Dean again between 2005 and 2007. In 2007 he became Dean of the College, a position he held until his retirement in 2010. It is impossible to overstate his deep impact on Indiana State University during his many years of devoted and inspired leadership. He was an advocate for students, a great supporter of faculty and staff who worked with and for him, and a steadfast advocate for the values of a classical university education. He continued to teach his beloved Shakespeare class every year that he was in the Dean's office.

He was involved in many major curriculum changes during these years, including two comprehensive and difficult revisions of the Foundational Studies and Honors programs, both of which still reflect critical pieces of his vision and passion. He had a tremendous impact on the organization, leadership, and evolution of the University's largest and most diverse college, something of which he was rightly proud. He recruited faculty, chairpersons, and associate deans who remain at ISU in part because of his example and inspiration.

One of his great passions was study abroad, and he and his wife Kathy endowed a scholarship to help students spend a semester learning abroad. Just before his death they endowed still another scholarship fund for CAS students who need help to finish their degrees—the Dr. Thomas G. Sauer and Kathleen P. Sauer Bridge the Gap Scholarship. Beginning in 2022 the College of Arts and Sciences will select one student each year to receive the new Dr. Thomas G. Sauer Award for Excellence in Study Abroad. Tom will be greatly missed by his colleagues and friends who were lucky enough to know him; his impact on ISU remains profound.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University expresses to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further expresses its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which he gave to his students, the Department of English, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

- b) Lee Anne Luttrell prepared Ms. Amanda Solesky Senior Instructor of the Department of Applied Clinical and Educational Science and Dr. Vicki Hammen Professor of the Department of Applied Clinical and Educational Services both of Bayh College of Education and read by Amanda Solesky**

#### **In Memoriam**

#### **Lee Anne Luttrell**

Prepared by Amanda Solesky and Vicki Hammen and presented by Amanda Solesky

Lee Anne Luttrell was born March 5, 1968 in Terre Haute Indiana and passed on Wednesday, October 6, 2021. She grew up in Rockville, Indiana.

Lee Anne graduated with a bachelor of arts in Communication Disorders in May of 1990 and a master's degree in Speech Language Pathology in summer of 1991. Both degrees were from Indiana State University.

Lee Anne began her career as a Speech Language Pathologist (SLP) in 1992 with HealthMarx Inc. providing therapy services in extended care and rehabilitation facilities. She then moved on to The Indianapolis Speech and Hearing Center from 1992-1996. While there, she provided therapy to pediatric and adult clients, ran a Parkinson's disease support group, was the lead SLP for a developmental preschool established with the Butler University Communication Disorders Program, and provided outreach programs with the United Way.

Lee Anne then moved locally and worked as the SLP for the Paris, IL School District #95 providing services to the preschool through high school population from 1996-1999.

After that time, Lee Anne then branched into working as a private contractor with First Steps of Indiana providing services to the birth to age three population. She continued this early intervention work over the years from 1999-2004 and then again in 2009-2012. Beginning in 2005, Lee Anne was hired at Indiana State University as an adjunct clinical supervisor in the on campus, Rowe Center for Communicative Disorders. In 2012, she became a fulltime, temporary faculty member in the Communication Disorder Program at ISU and in 2014 she became a full time faculty instructor.

In 2020, Lee Anne was promoted to the level of Senior Instructor in the Applied Clinical and Educational Sciences (ACES) Department.

As a senior instructor, Lee Anne remained a clinical supervisor in the Rowe Center and taught undergraduate classes in Phonetics, Articulation Disorders, Language Disabilities, Introduction to Voice, Fluency and Neuromotor Disorders, and the graduate Early Intervention course. In 2017, she became the External Placement Coordinator for the Communication Disorders Graduate Program. In this role, she arranged placement sites for school and medical practicums and managed supervisors, clock hours, and paperwork. She also served as the Student Organization Sponsor for the National Student Speech and Language Association (NSSHLA) from 2012-2021.

Lee Anne and Amanda Solesky collaborated on two presentations related to the ISU Thrive Learning Community and the FCTE on the topic of student learning and feedback. She also contributed to the CD program Career Readiness Certificate and contributed to research with Dr. Shawn Huisinga on accessibility of books. The research was funded by the Indiana Campus Compact.

Lee Anne was well thought of and respected by students in the CD program. Year after year students listed her Phonetics class as their favorite and she was consistently recognized as having contributed to student success at ISU. Upon learning of her death, many students wrote that she was the reason they stayed with the program and that she inspired them to become a speech language pathologist. Some of the comments shared by former students include: "Mrs. Luttrell was such an amazing professor and incredible woman whom we all looked up to as an instructor, clinic supervisor, and professional in the communication sciences and disorders field. She was always so sweet, kind, and optimistic." "Every single time I went to Mrs. Luttrell's office during my time at ISU was a great memory. She always made me feel loved, valued, and was always present for me in the absence of my own family." "Her warm smile with her gentle and kind presence will truly be missed."

Lee Anne is survived by her husband Aaron, and beloved sons Ross and Will. She was incredibly proud of her sons and very involved in their activities and education. Lee Anne was kind to all and graced us with her wisdom, knowledge, humor and friendship. We were blessed to have known her.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Lee Anne Luttrell's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which Lee Anne gave to her students, the Department of ACES, and the University.

Be it further resolved that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to her family.

## **2) Administrative Reports**

### **a) President D. Curtis**

Thank you to everyone for all of the wonderful work in another challenging year. It takes everyone to help move the students towards their path of a degree.

In nine days we will once again have students walking across the stage. We will have the graduate ceremony on Friday and the undergraduate ceremony on Saturday. I look forward to seeing the joy on the faces of the students and their families.

### **b) Provost C. Olsen**

The last few weeks of the term are always filled with exhaustion.

For Fall, we generally have about ninety percent of applications in by this time of the year. We are 60% ahead of applications from last year and 56% ahead in admissions. In a good place right now.

In the Spring term we will be starting the Community Health Initiative. This will require testing for those that have not turned in their vaccination status. Those that miss their required test will go through a multi-step process from existing procedures. The first step will be a letter and a required test to be taken within three days. The second notice will be a letter of admonishment sent to the employee, chair, and dean with a letter going into their personnel file with testing to be done within three days. The third time the employee will be referred to the discipline and dismissal committee under policy 501.2. Fourth step would be the outcome of that procedure. We are at 85% percent of the faculty having turned in their proof of vaccination so we don't expect many issues. The test will be offered free of charge.

## **3) Chair Report: K. Yousif**

Today we have a full agenda with policy revision and several circular items. Policy 912 revisions come from what FAC provided for us along with the executive committee and Katie Butwin's input. There are two distinct pieces to this policy. This first is conflict of interest regarding external employment and the second is conflict of interest regarding sexual, physically intimate, or romantic relationships with a student.

Update on the provost search: Open sessions with the three candidates begin next week. The sessions will be held via Zoom to allow the greatest number of attendees. There have been some changes to schedules and I will send out an updated email showing those times.

Lastly, remind students, faculty, and staff about the Sycamore Community Health Initiative that starts January 1<sup>st</sup>. Ask them if they have a plan, ask them if they need help to create a plan, ask them if they need more information. COVID-19 is still here we must continue to protect ourselves and students.

## **4) Staff Council Report: M. Leek**

At this time we are working towards a number of goals for Spring.

## **5) Temporary Faculty Advocate Report: C. Spicer**

So far it has been a really good semester. Temporary faculty are wondering about the \$500 raises and if they will be getting them. Other faculty have gotten letters about what they will

be receiving and we have not. It has been several years since we have gotten a raise. We don't get the same benefits as faculty so can we look forward to anything?

With the Sycamore Community Health Initiative how will you keep track of the lecturers that only teach in the Spring or Fall? Will they have time to get their proof of vaccinations turned in?

C. Olsen: The \$500 across the board was for full-time regular employees only. We have done raises for part time lectures in the past when we have done raises based on percentages, but never when it was a blanket raise.

With the proof of vaccination, the testing requirement stops as soon as it is turned in.

**6) SGA Report: A. Nettrouer**

No Report.

**7) Approval of Minutes of (October 28, 2021)**

Motion to approve L. Walters, A French: 32-0-2

**8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion**

**a) Discipline and Dismissal**

R. Guell: My advice is if a discipline and dismissal committee is formed that it be one committee that has alternates on it, so that it would allow for consistent recommendations to the administrations on the determinations rather than form them as on as needed basis.

**b) Plagiarism**

D. Selman: I have been seeing an increase plagiarism. I wasn't sure if this was the correct platform to bring this up. I was also wanting to know if there is any information on trends for this issue.

K. Yousif: Craig Enyeart's office used to track this information so that would be great place to start.

**c) COVID Vaccination**

A. Kummerow: What about the distance faculty? How do we identify the faculty that aren't on campus?

C. Olsen: Faculty that don't have any interactions with students don't have to worry about it. We will rely on departments to let us know if a faculty member teaches online classes but have lab/on-site supervision.

A. Arrington-Sirois: What about requirements for a booster?

C. Olsen: At this time we are not requiring proof of booster.

**d) Provost Candidates**

D. Israel: I was somewhat surprised by the provost candidates coming to campus via Zoom next week and the week after. I am concerned and I really hope that the committee is doing its very best to make sure that everybody knows about this so that this very important process will be well attended. As a chair I hope that you would request help letting people know. I know this is not a case where we should be worried about overloading people's emails. This is a case where more information is better. A simple announcement in ISU today would not be adequate.

K. Yousif: We can send out an email using the Blackboard site to make sure that all faculty get it. I believe we just received the corrected dates and times.

**9) Revision of Senate Nomination Procedure, Policy 145.3.3.1 (FAC)**

*Passed 11.02.21 at Senate Executive Committee, 7-0-0*

Motion to approve A. Kummerow, E. Southard: 31-0-0

Motion to approve amendment R. Guell, L. Eberman: 33-0-0

R. Guell: Fifty percent doesn't mathematically make sense if a department has an even number as one can't vote for themselves. The number needs to be thirty-three percent.

D. Selman: We were just focused on trying to find an answer to the issue. Thank you for catching the issue and fixing it.

**10) Revision, Search Committee Membership Nominations, Policy 146.2.2.2.1 (AAC)**

*Amended and passed 11.09.21 at Senate Executive Committee, 9-0-0*

Motion to approve L. Eberman, E. Southard: 32-1-0

L. Eberman: This is related to the procedures section. First, there is a spelling error under confirmation of nominees in section one. It should be "or" not "ore". In reference to number four it focuses on self-disclosure of ethnicity and gender only and this might not be the only diversity we could consider. Instead of anticipating all the ways one might self-disclose, we could instead ask each candidate to submit a statement, including also how they might represent or be an ally to diverse and minoritized populations as a member of the committee.

K. Yousif: You were talking about the procedure section that won't go in the Handbook. AAC wanted to have a set of procedures that clarified who was to do what and what order things needed to happen. So they drafted what we thought was a well-crafted set of procedures. You are suggesting that we can add something to number four about self-identification for diversity?

L. Eberman: I just think that gender identity and ethnicity are only federally defined characteristics of diversity and that there are people that work in that space that serve as allies or experts. Even if we are unable to have representation from those communities because those individuals are unavailable or unwilling to volunteer, people in those areas that are familiar with them can volunteer to do this.

K. Yousif: I can add that to the notes. I am not sure if that holds us up on voting for the revision of the policy but I can add that into the procedures. We had planned to make the procedures available on the Senate webpage and the new Canvas Senate site where a new chair of AAC or the chair of Faculty Senate would have access to this.

A. Kummerow: Can you clarify "if appropriate"?

K. Yousif: This was a change at Exec. There was considerable concerns by Senate Exec members that service is not required of all regular faculty. We wanted to make sure that we weren't disqualifying someone based on criteria that did apply to them. We tried to solve that by adding "if appropriate".

**11) Graduate Faculty Policy:**

Graduate Faculty Policy Library, policy 315 (tabled at Senate meeting:10/28/21)

Motion to untable E. Southard, L. Brown: 31-1-0

Motion to approve C. Ball, A. Arrington-Sirois (from 10/28/2021 meeting): 31-0-0

K. Yousif: Let's take it piece by piece.

L. Eberman: For clarification. Does this place the program director in a position where they could evaluate other graduate faculty? We have program directors in positions where they

may not have a terminal degree. I am curious how those that don't have a terminal degree would be in a position to evaluate or terminate someone that is graduate faculty. I am curious if that was discussed and how graduate council landed on that?

R. Gonser: First, program directors nor any other faculty member, have the right to eliminate graduate faculty status. All they are doing is starting the review process as anyone can do by going to the Graduate dean. A graduate student might go to them and they would go to the dean to get the review started. Department chairs are also graduate faculty so it would be the program director responsibility to initiate that if it was a department chair that is being called into question. Program directors are called coordinators in the School of Nursing. This would be the University policy but that wouldn't mean that the School of Nursing couldn't write their own policy. This would have to be the minimum level that it could be set to.

A. Arrington-Sirois: It is hard for me imagine why a program director wouldn't just go to the department chair if they felt there was a need to review a graduate faculty. Is there something I am missing as to why the program director wouldn't just report it instead of making that request?

R. Gonser: It doesn't preclude that from happening. Program directors do have some autonomy from chairs in the fact that they do graduation and pre-graduation check out, and they can submit changes to the admissions process without going through the department chair. It just recognizes that program directors do have a lot of knowledge and in some departments it might be appropriate for them to do that. A graduate dean can do this without ever talking a chair or dean as the policy is currently written.

A. Arrington-Sirois: Those are all just examples of administrative duties over students so this seems a little bit different.

R. Gonser: Not necessarily administrative duties over students. Graduation check out is not just over students. It's checking to make sure that graduate faculty have done everything that should have done for the student to be prepared for graduation.

R. Peters: In the College of Technology the PhD in Technology Management is outside of any department and it has a program director for it. That program director serves as a quasi-chair so this make perfect sense for that program.

R. Guell: There are a least two MBA programs that are like this.

R. Gonser: There are eighty different programs and there are many different ways they are set up. Thank you for the examples.

## **12) Expectations for Graduate Faculty**

### **Procedures for Review of Graduate Faculty**

Motion to approve both file 5 and 6 D. Israel, E. Southard: 24-4-1

*R. Gonser showed where these files will be placed on the Graduate School website under faculty resources.*

L. Eberman: My initial thought when reviewing these documents was that these are already the expectations of faculty in Section 300 of the Handbook relative to our teaching, advising, and behavior as faculty. So could you speak to why this is necessary for graduate faculty specifically versus the standards that we are being held to a faculty at large? Another issue is regarding whether someone should be teaching our undergraduate students if their graduate faculty status is being revoked.



R. Gonser: There are a lot of different types of individuals involved with the graduate faculty staff. This will incorporate all of that. Those that are not on campus while working with our graduate students may not be looking at the Handbook so having this will be useful. We also need guidelines as we review any graduate faculty and it needs to be easily found by both the reviewer and reviewee. A lot of these do come already embedded in documents, so having a little bit of redundancy is good. We also tried to stay in line with the current policy.

L. Eberman: As a faculty member that primarily teaches graduate students I understand the difference between the different programs and how we go about facilitating different graduate faculty. The context of bringing in external people does make sense to be able hold people accountable. That said I would expect reinforcing some of the things we already have in regards to training should be a component of these expectations. I think it's important to acknowledge that the first document relevant to expectations assumes that graduate faculty does all of those duties and I don't think that is accurate. In the procedures section 4b indicates that somebody needs to have experience teaching graduate students to serve on that evaluation committee, someone could be teaching a short amount of time and be able to serve on that committee. I think there a required amount of time for someone to be teaching to be able to serve on that committee to evaluate teaching status.

R. Gonser: That is why they have to be tenured.

L. Eberman: That would assume that someone would come here not tenured. People can come here tenured and be graduate faculty their first year. I am not sure if I ever got an answer as to if we pull graduate faculty status if they should be teaching any student.

S. Arvin: Librarians have graduate faculty status. The document states in 4C that "representatives from each academic college" are eligible for the committee, which would not include the library as it is written right now. Our big concern is that librarians have graduate faculty status but we are not typically instructors of record. There are right now some librarians that are instructors of record for courses but I don't think any of them are graduate courses. We do sometimes help with advising. This could easily be amended in the procedure. If we as librarians don't know enough about being graduate faculty then there needs to be a conversation. We worry that we could be evaluated and not have representation.

R. Gonser: The discussion that came up at Graduate Council is that there is no academic graduate program in library sciences. If there are issues with library graduate faculty then those would be internal conversations. If they are teaching they would not be teaching for that academic program any more or if they were on a committee they would be asked to return to that committee. They are not recruiting, advising, or mentoring in a sense of culminating research so that is why they were not included.

S. Arvin: I think it is a good thing that we are clarifying what the expectations of faculty are. I think it is a good thing to have a procedure to review. I did think about that as well. If a librarian is teaching it usually is as an adjunct for another department so if there was a problem the chair of that department could simply not assign them to teach classes in the future.

K. Yousif: This also is not Handbook language. This will be on the graduate webpage to be used and enforced.

R. Gonser: This is kind of a global issue that I think L. Eberman hit on a couple of times. This committee is not designed to take the place of the discipline and dismissal committee.

This should not be used to remove a faculty member from the university or a department. That is a completely different process. We don't anticipate many cases. There are steps and processes that should be handled prior to getting to this process but if it does get here we do need a process in place. We have been doing the faculty review process for two or three years without an official process.

D. Selman: The expectations that are listed here look like it was directly lifted from the current document on that website. What is missing is that graduate students have a responsibility in this as well. I know that this is about faculty but the other documents list student responsibilities.

R. Gonser: On that some website if you flip to students there is a list of the student responsibilities and they will still be on the student page.

D. Selman: But in the context of students they need to be held accountable as well.

R. Guell: If a faculty member only teaches graduate courses then there becomes nothing for them to do when they are relieved of their graduate faculty status. Does this not become synonymous with discipline and dismissal?

C. Olsen: We have faculty that are licensed in a certain way and that is part of why they were hired. It is a realistic question and a fair consideration.

S. Powers: We have had a non-reappoint due to the loss of licensure.

K. Yousif: I will just echo what R. Gonser has stated. They have been reviewing and revoking graduate faculty status for the last couple of years without any clear or transparent policy posted anywhere. That has been the primary concern of the Senate Executive Committee and its officers. The processes should be available and easy to locate. This not yet a perfect document.

L. Eberman: Let me clarify. It seems like file 4 is policies and files 5 and 6 are procedures and guidelines. Are we simply endorsing these or are we voting to approve? If we are saying they are not a "perfect" document they could be modified.

J. Gustafson: Graduate Council is different than other academic units on campus in that it is a Faculty Senate committee. This will be something that has to go through Senate since it affects the faculty.

K. Yousif: Any policy can be amended and revised.

L. Eberman: I think that clarity is important. To me if it is not in the shape that it needs to be in that might indicate that I am not ready to vote to support it. If it were revised or continued to be worked on there might be support.

R. Gonser: These put into place university guidelines and policies. A call will then go out to departments and programs if they want to write their own but these would be the minimums they would have to have.

D. Selman: Regarding performance reviews, how does the outcome of this procedure or process decision make it into triennial review or promotion and tenure applications?

R. Gonser: I am not sure because the committee makes a recommendation to the graduate dean and they choose to accept or reject that and then pass it onto the provost. The provost has to make that decision. The committee does the investigation for review and then they make a recommendation.

R. Gonser: That is a question that is outside of this because this process was already in the policy library. I am not sure what has happened in matters before this.

D. Selman: That is something this body needs to address.

A. Kummerow: We can certainly deal with what we have on the table since it something that is happening. We can just add another charge back to Graduate Council to address those questions.

D. Selman: That might actually be a FAC charge on how it would make it into the review processes.

K. Yousif: It can be a charge to both. My concern is we are reviewing and revoking graduate faculty status with no clear procedure or policy. There is no clear policy anywhere that has the collected expectations.

### **13) Revised policy 912, revisions 11-15-21**

*Pending action at Senate Executive Committee, 11/30/21*

Motion to approve 912 to 912.5. J. Frost, A. Anderson.

Motion to recommit 912 to 912.5 to FAC and that the committee be instructed to reconsider the question of chair approval and non-work hours. T. Hawkins, L. Eberman: 33-0-0

Motion to recommit 912.6 to FAC and that the committee be instructed to reconsider question of sexual or intimate relationships between faculty and students, including situations where faculty are not directly responsible for instruction, advising, or supervision of a student with whom they enter into such a relationship. R. Guell, L. McQuiston: 32-0-0

D. Selman: Fellow Senators, as the chair of FAC and a participant in answering the charge from Exec to address the weaknesses in our policy 912 regarding conflicts of interest and commitment I provide this statement of context. It is important to understand that this document is the product of over 100 hours, 2 years of research and negotiation by FAC (current and former members), the General Counsel's Office and Senate Exec. Much of what you see in this document was reached through negotiating in good faith, it is not perfect and much of it was reached through compromise. There are particular parts of this proposed document that were and are supported by FAC. However, there are some significant differences from what we, FAC, negotiated and approved and what you have in front of you today. Certainly Senate Exec has the right and responsibility to change and edit proposals as it sees necessary, and I respect that. There are, however, two (and possibly more) concerns that I would like to bring to your attention.

Concern 1. Regarding P 912.3.3. External Employment Not Consistent with Faculty Responsibilities

Senate Exec Proposal:

912.3.3 External Employment Inconsistent with Faculty Responsibilities. Outside employment including teaching for another institution of higher education during the period of appointment should be reported via the reporting mechanism identified by the Office of Academic Affairs. The report should be made with adequate time for the chair to make a determination about whether or not the external teaching will be approved. Faculty may appeal the decision of the chair through existing faculty grievance processes.

FAC APPROVED:

912.3.3 External Employment inconsistent with faculty responsibilities. Outside employment within this category is defined as employment that (a) is sustained or ongoing for a period of 12 weeks or longer; (b) occurs during the term of the faculty member's contract; and (c) is not reported annually by the faculty member as part of the regular faculty review process as defined in 311.1.1. Such ongoing or anticipated employment will be reported to the Chairperson no later than September 20 for the current academic year. New employment initiated after September 20 will be reported to the Chairperson within four weeks of beginning the new employment. Procedures for reporting will be adopted by the Provost.

Our concern: The Senate approved version requires approval by the department chair for what a person can do on their free time. It uses the teaching as an example but the way this is written it can be interpreted as anything. Coaching your kids soccer team? You need to report and get approval. Opening a winery or an ice cream shop? You need to report and get approval. Working security? You need to report and get approval. Teaching motorcycle safety? You need to report and get approval.

Invited to teach a class on your specialty at London School of Economics for pay? You need to report and get approval. Teaching piano lessons in the evening? You need to report and get approval. Running for School Board? Report and get approval. My point here is that this is a reach into the private lives of faculty, requiring approval of what we can do with our skills, our craft, and our most valuable commodity our TIME. The thing we have worked on to become experts in. Not only is it invasive it has the potential to be used punitively. The only reason that we could imagine that the University has any right to reach this far into the private lives of faculty, to control what we do with our labor, our skills and our time, is if there were documented deficiencies in our ISU assigned responsibilities. If we are doing our jobs and meeting our responsibilities as assigned why do we need approval for what we can do on our own time? If there are deficiencies, we already have a process for that—Biennial Review, Discipline and Dismissal. I anticipate the one case that will be cited here—that a faculty member was teaching 3 courses somewhere else and was neglecting the service responsibilities at ISU—this is a chair problem and we have a process for that. Which is why FAC approved this language: 912.3.5 Recommendation of Limitation on External Employment. A Chairperson may recommend that a faculty member limit or discontinue ongoing engagement in external employment when there is a documented failure of the faculty member to adequately perform their assigned duties.

I have heard from faculty across campus in the last 24 hours that there are very grave concerns—here are just a few of them:

“This will absolutely stifle creativity and entrepreneurship. Many of the things we do outside the classroom inspire new innovations inside the classroom.”

“We are employees, not serfs. I did not sign up for this.”

“I make \$38,000 a year as an Instructor at ISU –yes that means I am “Regular Faculty” and NOW I need to get approval to supplement my income in order to survive. Morale is already awful around here, this will make it worse. If we were paid a living wage we wouldn't need side hustles.”

“So, because a chair neglects to take seriously their job in the review process we now are going to give that chair more tools? Seems like a chair problem—not a faculty problem.

How is this possible? I keep my job in the [redacted] industry so I have a handle on the latest technology and developments. I bring those to my students. Now I need approval from a vindictive chair. Great. Going back to the [redacted] industry full time is sounding better by the day.”

I am certain that with more than 24 hours to review this proposal the list would continue to grow.

K. Yousif: I sent this out on the Thursday before Thanksgiving break. What I sent out yesterday was just a few revisions that didn't change the nature of the document. I appreciate you sharing what you have received from other members of the faculty.

C. Ball: As a member of FAC both last year and this year, I echo the concern that the policy under consideration today – though negotiated in good faith – contains some meaningful changes that were not considered or approved by FAC. I would like to raise two additional issues that I believe merit further consideration.

The first issue is the second to last sentence of 912.3, which reads “Those external activities not related to university employment or service shall take place during off-work hours or during authorized leave.” I have not been able to find a definition of “off-work hours” in the policy library, and I believe that faculty teaching schedules are idiosyncratic and variable to the point that this policy is open to misinterpretation by both faculty and administrators. For example, Policy 310.1.1.4 Time for Teaching Assignment stipulates that regular full-time teaching faculty are expected to be available for assignment “when classes are normally scheduled,” which may include hours outside of the regular business day. Thus, the definition of working hours may differ substantially across faculty members, and this would be further complicated when all other aspects of faculty responsibilities are added to the mix. In my role as faculty ombudsperson, I have seen far too many situations in which vague policy language is used by administrators to selectively restrict or punish faculty who are perceived as problematic in some way, and I believe this language would be vulnerable to just that kind of misapplication.

The second issue arises in two places. First, in the last sentence of 912.3, which reads “Employees who fail to meet these expectations will be subject to employee discipline under staff or faculty discipline policies” and again at the end of 912.3.4 that reads “and additional disciplinary action contemplated in the Faculty Handbook.” Neither of these were included in the original policy language recommended by FAC, and both represent a significant escalation in potential consequences for faculty who may fail to comply with this policy for any number of reasons. It is unclear who would make such a determination about the consequences for noncompliance or what steps should be taken prior to formal disciplinary proceedings. As disciplinary action is already provided as an option within the originally referenced 350.2.9.3, this addition seems unnecessary and overly reactive. Again, the option of disciplinary action against a faculty member without first attempting to resolve the matter in a less punitive manner opens the door for inequitable treatment and misapplication. I believe that the addition of this language should be properly considered by FAC prior to a full Senate vote.

K. Yousif: It is looking quite clear to me given the statements made that this is something we should table and send back to FAC.

T. Hawkins: I move that a motion be sent back to FAC and that the committee reconsider the question of chair approval and off work hours.

K. Yousif: I would ask FAC to do the same careful reading of the second half of the policy. I have had some questions/comments sent to me and I will forward those on to you.

T. Hawkins: We need to deal with that second part as the first motion did not deal with that part.

R. Guell: I would like to make a motion to table the second part and recommit it back to FAC with specific instructions. I would like note my instructions. If I may the relationship definition overly specific as it defines it as two. It suggests that more might be okay. It suggests that a faculty member could solicit a student that is not in their classes. I certainly hope that whatever comes forward doesn't allow that to happen. Students should be off limits period. The policy doesn't distinguish between student employees and graduate assistance. We should not be regulating student relationships just because they are student workers.

D. Selman: B. Guell, I think you are dictating what FAC needs to come up with though this charge. We are open to a certain charge from the Executive Committee but this sounds like you want to write the language.

R. Guell: I do not want to write the language but I do want these issues to be addressed.

K. Yousif: I have all of R. Guell's concerns and will forward them.

## 14) Curriculum

### Suspensions:

**Music with Concentrations in Instrumental Conducting, Music Education, and Music Performance** <https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:5366/form>

*Passed 11.02.21 at Senate Executive Committee, 7-0-0*

### **Nutrition Major**

<https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:5329/form>

*Passed 11.16.21 at Senate Executive Committee, 9-0-0*

### **Pre-Dietetics**

<https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:5328/form>

*Passed 11.16.21 at Senate Executive Committee, 9-0-0*

Motion to approve all three suspensions: L. Brown, L. McQuiston: 30-0-0

### **Suspension, Baccalaureate Track for Students Entering with R.N. Licensure**

See curriculog: <https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:5575/form>

*Passed 11.16.21 at Senate Executive Committee, 9-0-0*

Motion to approve suspension: L. Eberman, L. Brown: 29-1-0

K. Yousif: They have a limited number of students and don't want to put resources toward this program.

A. Kummerow: That is correct.

### **New program: Data Science, B.S.**

See curriculog: <https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:3970/form>

*Passed 11.16.21 at Senate Executive Committee, 9-0-0*

Motion to approve: J. Frost, L. Eberman: 27-2-0

D. Israel: Will the math senior seminar would be included or are you envisioning that as something separate?

L. Brown: We are planning on those being separate.

T. Hawkins: I am surprised about how little is written. It is one thing for there to be so little when we are suspending a program.

L. Brown: There are a lot of attachments to this.

T. Hawkins: There is a section that ask for the rationale of this program and it was left completely blank.

D. Israel: Are there thoughts of other concentrations?

L. Brown: We haven't worked out every detail. We will most likely have amendments to approve in the future. We just wanted to make sure that we had support before we went further.

**15) Adjournment 5:33 pm**