

#6

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

January 19, 2017

3:30 p.m., Holmstedt Hall 102

Draft Minutes

Members Present: K. Berlin, L. Brown, M. Cohen, J. Conant, B. Corcoran, E. Gallatin, N. Goswami, R. Guell, J. Gustafson, D. Hantzis, M. Howard-Hamilton, M. Hutchins, B. Kilp, A. Kummerow, S. Lamb, K. Lee, C. MacDonald, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, A. Payne, N. Nichols-Pethick, L. Phillips, A. Solesky, F. Steward, S. Stofferahn, H. Tapley, K. Yousif, T. Hawkins, D. Cooper-Bolinsky

Members Absent: B. Bunnett, S. Buchanan

Ex-Officio Present: None

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley, Provost M. Licari

Guests: L. Eberman, D. McKee

1) Budget Report: D. McKee

- a) If after my presentation there are additional questions or if I haven't covered something you are interested in, I can come in another time. As you know we have a Budget Committee. The Senate Officers, chair of Staff Council, SGA President, the Provost and Division Vice Presidents, as well as President Bradley sit on that committee. I want to share with you today some of the information I shared with the Budget Committee.
- b) The ICHE has six metrics of which ISU participates in four. There is one specifically for Vincennes University and Ivy Tech and one for STEM graduates that applies to IU-Bloomington, Purdue-WL, Ball State, and IUPUI. To fund these pools, there is a reduction in our operating appropriation. In 2018, there will be a 3.6% reduction and 4.3% in 18-19. To that, they add back what you would receive in performance metrics. The result is a \$128K decrease in 17-18 and an additional \$6.5K added in 18-19. Our new governor's budget recommendations came out and they are not as generous. The result for ISU under his proposed budget is a loss of appropriation of \$1.5 million in the first year and a gain in the second year of around \$1 million. There would be a net loss of half a million dollars.
- i) On the expense side, we are looking at a minimal compensation adjustment. Raises of 1.25 % plus target salary adjustments for both staff and faculty. In November, the health insurance premiums were adopted with a 6.3% increase. The steam plant uses natural gas, we contract to receive that. So in terms of our utility budget, with Duke

- Energy, we are using less, but paying more. Also, sewer rates have increased and that has to be factored into the budget. Historically, the University sets aside funds for scholarships, strategic planning budgets, and for capital improvements. The state has decided that universities are to pay for their R&R fees. Universities like Ball State and IU charge their students around \$200-250 per semester for these fees. Should enrollment decline or not be what was expected, we will meet with departments for reallocation. So when you take this all together, we have a budget deficit for 17-18 of about \$1 million. So, as you have heard us talk about it in the past, we have asked each division of the general fund of the University for reallocation. We have also asked auxiliary units (Hulman Center, Athletics, etc.) to identify part of their budget to the reallocation. The Budget Committee will meet next week. The VPs will present as to how we meet these targets. There may be things that are presented that the President will not accept. For instance, if student wage lines are offered up, we won't do that. We want to support students. It would not be feasible to cut the faculty budget.
- c) R. Guell: In years prior, we had large swathes of expenses that were not budgeted that came from differences between revenues and expenses, what business considers profits. We moved those into the budget. Are the remaining ones we know will happen, are they coming out of the 3% reserve?
- i) D. McKee: They will come out of the budgeted reserve.
- d) R. Guell: What are the places we are not budgeting?
- i) D. McKee: As we move forward in budget planning, we will need to address student financial assistance. We allocate more to students than budgeted. Some of that is because we mirror what the tuition assistance is. We have not captured the enrollment that we anticipated. The instructional budget needs to be aligned. Those are the two areas of the "pressure points" that we have.
- ii) R. Guell: One of the things that seem incredibly odd is since we've provided health insurance and retirement to all full-time faculty members, we have had one year full-time faculty members and zero benefits. I find that odd.
- iii) D. McKee: Every year, once we finalize the February 1 payroll, we use that to budget for the next year. If someone gets benefits, we budget it somewhere.
- iv) J. Kinne: Budget reserve is a "pressure point." Can you explain that?
- v) D. McKee: The budget reserve covers certain expenditures where we have a shortfall whether on the budget or enrollment side. Those dollars may be set aside for capital needs. We've been able to invest in various needs; for example, the science building corridors. We've also used some of those dollars for unbounded possibilities and other strategic initiatives.
- e) S. Lamb: Could you tell us the magnitude of the reserve budget that has accumulated?
- i) D. McKee: We have reserves from a lot of places. When you look at our financial statements, we have around \$137 million. They are from several areas on campus. Our operating budget reserve is around \$5 million.
- f) D. McKee: I want to give you a timeline. This past Tuesday, D. Bradley presented to the House Ways and Means Committee. In February, there will be a presentation to the Senate Appropriations Committee.
- g) R. Guell: Were there consequences to any of the institutions who did not follow recommendations 2-3 years ago?

- i) D. McKee: No. The last time we experienced ramifications like that was maybe 2011. All the institutions had gone above what the Commission recommended. We had to testify before the State Budget Committee. The President and Board of Trustees of universities were asked to lower their tuition in some fashion. Two years ago, the Commission suggested an increase of 1.7% and we were at 1.9% so it did not raise questions.
- h) S. Lamb: You talk about \$137 million in the reserve budget...
 - i) D. McKee: It's not a budget. If you look at our statements...
 - ii) S. Lamb: It is a combination of many units.
 - iii) D. McKee: Yes. It is also essentially our investment pool. We're also completing the last phase of the Sycamore Towers. We've been trying to complete those with 80% debt and 20% cash. We will be coordinating with the Sycamore Dining and using cash for that.
 - iv) S. Lamb: I do applaud the conservative approach and the magnitude of the reserve budget. First, is this percentage of the operating budget in line with other institutions? Second, we've had such academic pressures on FTEs and 95% of the chairs are retiring after a few years for good reason. How susceptible is the president to these? He's sitting on top of a healthy reserve budget.
 - v) D. McKee: For your first question. We do compare our reserves to other institutions and the bond ratings do the same. Keep in mind that some of these reserves are from years and years ago. The reality is our reserves are less, not as healthy as other institutions in the state. When you look percentage-wise, ours isn't great. The second question, I can't answer it.
 - vi) R. Guell: Remember, you were in the room when we argued for the average of 3 falls when we were Officers. We have had—that Budget Committee has had—some influence on the way the budgeting has been done.
- i) M. Howard-Hamilton: How has the creation of the engineering program impacted the budget?
 - i) At this point, although the BOT has approved, I've seen some early numbers, but I don't think it's fully budgeted.
- j) L. Phillips: I'm not an economist, but I have to ask, if the pressure points are almost always on the instructional side, does the Budget Committee ever look at higher salaried personnel; e.g., highly paid administrators?
 - i) D. McKee: We've had a lot of enrollment growth and we're not as fast at catching up. I think with our enrollment growth and new programs, along with it, it makes sense that you may have higher instructional costs. Likewise with the student scholarship budget. We have had 30% enrollment growth since 2010.
 - ii) D. Hantzis: We've added a lot of vice presidents. Associate VPs even more so. I saw that \$235K for Res. Life's reallocation. That's pretty close to the salary of those individuals. Faculty are legitimately concerned about that.
 - iii) J. Kinne: Do you know off-hand what percentage goes to executives? Has this gone up or down?
 - iv) D. McKee: We've made a concerted effort to improve salaries. I can't give you an answer.
 - v) J. Kinne: A guess? It'd be helpful.
 - vi) D. McKee: It's in the reports.

- k) D. McKee: We have an RFP to replace Orbitz. It's been a struggle to have online providers to communicate with us with a real live person if your flight is cancelled and you can't rebook. We are finding that's a difficult expectation. We managed to find two that have a real person. We hope to be getting that back in the next month or two. We'd like to have some faculty representation. We hope to start a pilot of Chrome River, a travel system that is integrated with Banner and the Ellucian product we use. We would like to include some academic partners in that pilot. When you are submitting your documents you can send them electronically. We are making some progress, but it is not as quick as I had hoped.
- 2) Administrative Reports:
 - a) President D. Bradley: None
 - b) Provost M. Licari: None
 - 3) Support Staff Report: B. Overpeck
 - a) We did not officially meet in the month of December. We conducted a short January meeting on 1-12-17.
 - b) Currently to report, we have concluded our ornament sale, which totaled \$1,515. That will go directly to our Staff Scholarship.
 - c) The t-shirt fundraiser for United Way was concluded. We were able to raise \$915 for the United Way through this fundraiser. It was such a success we have decided to do a second round of shirt orders. All money earned will go towards our Staff Scholarship. If you are interested in ordering a shirt, the deadline is January 27th. We are currently looking for ideas for a new challenge, so any suggestions would be appreciated.
 - d) Our Executive Committee is looking to propose changes to our Staff Council Bylaws at our next meeting on Thursday, February 9th. The changes include:
 - i) With the addition of the Foundation, restructuring the number of representatives within each division to ensure all staff are represented.
 - ii) Elimination of the Election Committee and the creation of a Chair appointed by Staff Council Representatives carrying out the elections.
 - 4) SGA Report: A. Velazquez
 - a) A student has brought an idea to us. There is now a green wall for us to take a picture in HMSU. The HMSU director works very quickly with us.
 - 5) Temporary Faculty Advocate: M. Muyumba
 - a) Currently when someone leaves, there is a 90 day period after which email is deleted. We would like to change the policy so email is not deleted if someone doesn't teach for a semester.
 - 6) Chair Report: T. Hawkins
 - a) Welcome back. It is good to see everyone again. I would first like to thank those of you who were able to celebrate the end of last semester by attending our gathering with the Trustees. I hope you enjoyed the opportunity to get to know them. It bodes well for the relationship between the Senate and the Board.

- b) Our action Agenda is light today. Following Open Discussion, we will begin with the Traffic Engineering Technology Minor proposal and follow that with the Exec motion to endorse the FAC recommendations on engagement. We will end with the Exec motion to create a special committee of the Senate on faculty culture.
- c) Let me update you on some other issues Exec has discussed during the past two weeks.
 - Concern was expressed by one Exec member about the challenges facing faculty in the event we find ourselves with disruptive students in the classroom. We intend to publicize via the next Musings our sense of ‘best practice’. I also contacted M. Hare to inquire about the possibility of FCTE offering a workshop later this spring on how to deal with disruptive students. She was receptive and plans to put the topic before their planning board.
 - Exec also discussed healthcare concerns in light of the uncertain and evolving climate we are facing. I have contacted D. McKee and C. Barton regarding the possibility of a faculty forum on the topic. D. McKee expressed her willingness to put something together for later in the semester.
 - You may have noted from the 1-10 Exec minutes that AAUP brought two recommendations to Exec. The first resulted in two FAC charges: 1. Clarify the language in Section 305 regarding contracts and letters of appointment; 2. Develop language that clarifies the meaning of an appointment. The second sought to incorporate more explicitly into New Faculty Orientation time for review of academic freedom, shared governance, and disciplinary mechanisms. The Administration has agreed to promote workshops on these topics during the academic year, rather than focusing exclusively on the NFO schedule.
- d) In the month since our last Senate, the officers have met with the university counsel regarding the ‘sanctuary campus’ issue that was raised in December. At this point we intend to investigate the possibility of intermediate steps short of a Senate resolution that the President might support.
- e) I am pleased to report that the Counsel’s Office has completed its work updating the Handbook to reflect official interpretations. These will appear as footnotes to the affected sections. We will hear more from B. Butwin in February on this and other matters.

7) Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes

- a) Motion to approve: (L. Phillips, D. Malooley). Vote: 29-0-2.

8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) K. Yousif: President Bradley is not here, but in the Executive Committee minutes, he said that “the most obvious solution is to run the university like liberal arts colleges—not as many courses or majors. Maybe we should knock it down to 60 credits in the major and knock it down to 60 majors.” I would note the irony of that with the approval of the engineering program and ask him to explain the statement about what “the obvious thing to do” is.
- b) D. Hantzis: During our last two Senate meetings several folks commented on the value of shared governance and how well ISU supports it. I agree. Shared governance requires that those represented can access records of our work. Many of our colleagues ask us often about something they read in the Senate or Executive Committee minutes and I’m

always happy to know they are reading those records. Recently, I've been asked by different people how to access standing committee minutes. I know the Senate chair has reminded committee chairs that minutes must be posted. Last year we decided that the best practice is for committees to post the three things required by the Handbook (schedule of meetings, agenda, and minutes 246.1.1.6 and 246.1.1.8) to the University Faculty Blackboard site, because the Handbook stipulates that the items be published at least to Senators, department chairs, SGA officers, and appropriate University administrators and the Blackboard site enrolls all those individuals and every other faculty member. Last year and this year, I created spaces and appropriate folders for each standing committee on the blackboard site. Before this meeting, I looked at the folders and found that, of the 9 standing committees:

- i) 3 standing committees have posted no minutes or agenda; 4 have posted only one set of minutes, dated between 8/24 and 9/7; 1 has posted three sets of minutes, most recent date 10/4; and 1 committee appears to have posted minutes for all meetings. No schedule of meetings are posted. This is partially prompted by learning that persons expected to be present at a standing committee meeting were notified at 8:30 a.m. of the 12:30 p.m. meeting that day.
- ii) I've also learned that it is not standard practice to send draft copies of minutes to individuals quoted in them who do not ordinarily receive drafts; this makes access to approved minutes even more crucial so that individuals who want to comment on how their statements were represented may do so in a timely way.
- iii) Finally, absence of a schedule that lists at least the regular day and time of committee meetings (even if dates are flexible), agenda to indicate possible items for discussion, and minutes to facilitate responsive discussion, limits rather than extends shared governance.
- iv) T. Hawkins: I will send out a reminder to the chairs of the committees.
- v) D. Malooley: CAAC meets as soon as possible, and we try to respond to curricular issues that appear. Those are applied to an agenda as soon as they appear. Therefore, it's not possible for us to put out an agenda a week before. It was decided several years ago, that we would be held to that standard. If you'd like to change that, the university will need to adopt a new policy.
- vi) D. Hantzis: It's not about the notice, it's the fact that they are not there after the fact. The minutes need to be made available publicly. They need to be posted. There are no minutes posted.
- vii) D. Malooley: They are distributed.

9) CAAC Item

- a) Motion to approve proposal for Traffic Engineering Technology Minor (C. MacDonald, S. Lamb).
- b) Motion to table (R. Guell, K. Yousif). Vote: 31-0-0.
- c) R. Peters: The Civil Engineering major has proposed a minor. The traffic engineering minor provides a necessary pillar in the civil engineering realm and the advisory committee in Indianapolis and surrounding areas support it. Anyone on campus can take this minor. We had to put in a math and an electronics course in the minor. As a 15 credit hour minor it meets minimum university standards. We feel it's a value added for students. Civic engineering technology students who start the program now, one course

is in the major, one course could be used as an elective, and so they would need only one additional course to complete the minor. These are not new courses. They already exist and are being taught. This is a value added.

- i) K. Yousif: Are you saying MATH 115 and ECT 165 are requirements for the major? How many classes are you double-counting and which are truly counting toward a minor. 15 credit hours is small.
- ii) R. Peters: If it is a Civil Engineering Technology major, if it's crafted correctly, there's only one 3 credit hour class.
- iii) R. Guell: That's very similar to a Finance major getting an Economics minor. It's not unheard of to have majors and minors that overlap like this.
- iv) R. Peters: It's open to all majors.
- d) A. Kummerow: There is one course that has MATH 129 or MATH 131 as a prerequisite.
 - i) R. Peters: We just need them to have a knowledge of algebra for the minor. I can't believe it made it this far without us seeing it, but that will have to be fixed before being published.
 - ii) R. Guell: What is the deadline for making the catalog? Can we table subject to a correction?
 - iii) A. Payne: Can we approve as amended?
 - iv) R. Guell: You don't want to create an open ended amendment. It's far better to make an amendment and bring it back to the next meeting.

10) FAC Item

- a) Motion to endorse the recommendations regarding engagement (D. Hantzis, S. Lamb).
- b) Motion to separate (B. Corcoran, S. Lamb). Vote: 24-6-0.
- c) Motion to approve the first recommendation: Vote: 30-0-1.
- d) Motion to approve the second recommendation: Vote: 11-14-0.
- e) L. Eberman: We met as a group and approved P&T documents for each college and identified terms. We met with N. Rogers and H. Miklozek. The definitions provided were from 2010.
- f) B. Corcoran: Practically speaking, we are dealing with two very different issues here that need to be entirely segregated. Given the scale of these issues—this discussion is really about redefining the nature of a discipline's research and instruction...redefining the very identity of this institution, each should receive a separate vote. While I generally support an effort to clarify further the definitions of these terms, I oppose the narrowing of the definitions. Clarification does not necessarily mean homogenization—one size fits all. The current variety of responses to the terms seems appropriate for a university that is not an intellectual monoculture. The real problems begin with the recommendation to emphasize these loosely defined terms in hiring/promotion/tenure. I have two points:
 - i) This apparent effort to add what looks like a fourth category of evaluation (or an overarching lens through which the usual triumvirate of teaching, scholarship and service will be assessed) will not minimize teaching or service as evaluative categories. Rather, this project seems to be an effort to minimize the role of research/writing/publication, precisely the things that drew many if not most of us into the academy and got us employed here.
 - ii) An overt emphasis on community engagement, etc. in formal evaluation is a content issue and thus an academic freedom issue in terms of both teaching and scholarship. I

- think that no matter how specifically these terms are defined, their across-the-board incorporation in hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions will exacerbate the use of the subjective and the personal in professional evaluation. We have a hard enough time appreciating traditional benchmarks of peer reviewed scholarship. When committees and administrators judge content, they are defining the parameters and scope of our scholarly lives, and discriminatory outcomes result.
- g) R. Guell: If we do not value it and the only way to measure and say we value it with any meaning, then it is just words to sit in the 200s of the Handbook. That is the reason for my vote against decoupling.
 - h) C. MacDonald: I should emphasize that anything coming to the Promotion and Tenure Taskforce will come back to Exec and to Senate and whatever the Taskforce comes up with will be emphasized in the three traditional categories.
 - i) S. Lamb: I agree it is powerful, and that's why I don't want to vote for it. I don't want to be homogeneous in our treatment of engagement. The SCOB naturally reaches out to the business community. I would find it hard if I was a chemist or a physicist or a theoretical mathematician to engage the community. We are moving too far away from the definition of a liberal institution.
 - j) N. Goswami: It's difficult to argue against experiential learning and community service, because they broaden the definition of scholarship. The only way a discipline moves forward is by going outside the parameters. However, words like "encourage" and "emphasis" are extremely nebulous. If you are evaluating a tenure track faculty member, what is being looked for? There's a difference in "encouraging" and in having "expectations." If they are not defined, you are not sure what you are being evaluated on.
 - k) T. Hawkins: All we would be doing is asking the Taskforce to talk about these things.
 - l) L. Eberman: There is a lot of emphasis about the expectations on campus. There is no emphasis in some colleges. We already know we are going to have a discussion about guidelines. In that, we can discuss the key pieces, but when we have some colleges really embracing this concept and others not at an institution where this is what we are...
 - m) D. Hantzis: We do have definitions for these words but they are not in the Handbook, so this gives us the opportunity to discuss them. I want to say that the front piece of 305 says community engagement will be considered in the review. It's not being currently looked at. We don't know what it will take. I don't actually think the second recommendation is necessary.
 - n) H. Tapley: It's clear that we are known nationally for this. I'm in healthcare, so it's easy for me to do these, but I think it's a cop-out if you're a physicist and don't have anything to do in the community. To me, we have to make a commitment.
 - o) J. Gustafson: I was worried about engaged scholarship as applied to basic research in math, chemistry, and physics. Why would we de-emphasize this type of research?
 - p) S. Stofferahn: I can assure you that the intent is not to crack down in that way. It's to expand scholarship so those that are excited about engaged scholarship will have it more in their profile.
 - q) C. MacDonald: We have no definition of community in the handbook, and it could be defined globally.
 - r) S. Lamb: I have no fear of a statement that recognizes the individuality of departments and that engagement has to be defined in the context of the discipline. When I see a blanket statement, then I do.

- s) N. Goswami: I would like to second Chris's statement that 'community' is broadly defined. 'Community' includes the students in our classrooms. Other than my family, sometimes most of my time is spent with my students. Statements about people one does not know, and in whose fields one has absolutely no expertise, like the statement that was just made, that people are 'copping out' because they can 'go to a high school' for community engagement, are exactly the kinds of personal and subjective judgements we need to prevent. No one gets to determine the content of one's courses, one's scholarly identity, and one's scholarly agenda.
- t) L. Phillips: The problem for me is there is no peer review. That bothers me. There has to be a method of P&T where we can review each other.

11) Exec Item

- a) Motion to approve a Special Senate Committee on Faculty Culture (S. Lamb, L. Phillips).
Vote: 22-2-0.

12) Adjournment: 5:07 p.m.