

#17

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

February 14, 2017

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Final Draft

Members Present: L. Brown, J. Conant, R. Guell, T. Hawkins, B. Kilp, C. MacDonald, L. Phillips

Members Absent: D. Hantzis, S. Lamb

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

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: S. Barton, L. Eberman, D. Woods

1) Administrative Reports:

- a) President D. Bradley: I should have information from the House Ways and Means Committee in time for an update at Senate on Thursday.
- b) Provost M. Licari:
 - i) The first candidate for the dean's position in the BCOE was interviewed today. We have another candidate who will begin her interview tomorrow and will finish Thursday evening. There will be two more next week. Other searches are underway as well. I did make an addition to the search committee in CAS to include a Faculty Council representative.
 - ii) K. Cates is retiring at the end of the month after 38 years of excellent service at Indiana State University. I have hired a new administrative assistant, J. Keller, who will be working alongside K. Cates for the next couple of weeks.
 - iii) The other position that we have some movement on is the AVP for Inclusive Excellence, you saw the announcement from D. Bradley. We have hired L. Reynolds. This is a good move for her and for the university.
 - (1) R. Guell: My recollection is that this was going to be a national search and that an ad never went out. So, the intention was to do a national search, but a decision was made to abort that, hire L. Reynolds, and backfill her Title IX spot?
 - (2) D. Bradley: This happened after various discussions. The Title IX job is too big and too draining for just one person. So we came down to either adding a bunch

of staff to the Title IX office, or to reorganize. With L. Reynolds' skills it was a no-brainer. I have not had one negative comment on the announcement.

- (3) R. Guell: I have no concerns about L. Reynolds, but I have concerns about how reporting lines are set and will she report to K. Butwin?
 - (4) D. Bradley: We do not want her reporting to the University Counsel. The people charged with protecting those through Title IX should not report to the person charged with protecting the institution.
 - (5) R. Guell: So the fun of monitoring the appropriate compliance and search process, is that going to be performed by L. Reynolds or who she hires, and that is separated from the General Counsel?
 - (6) D. Bradley: Either place. It's something they can do in L. Reynolds' shop. "Fun" might be a stretch, but it can be part of their responsibility. We have a terrible time keeping people in these positions. We have had turnover for years.
 - (7) R. Guell: My concern is not with L. Reynolds, but with sorting it out.
 - (8) M. Licari: If it's related to searching, making sure that you are treating candidates fairly, that's L. Reynolds.
- iv) The Board of Trustees meeting is next week. COT is the College Showcase for the coming meeting and R. Crumrin is giving a seminar on the library, followed by a library tour.

2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) We have many items on the Agenda today, so I will be brief. C. MacDonald will start with an update on the BR training. We then turn to a CAAC item, the BS in Intelligence Analysis, and then L. Eberman will take us through the many FAC items for consideration. We will have standing committee reports today, and then we need to set aside some time for an executive session.
- b) Senate will be busy on Thursday, both with curricular items and with the FAC material. We will need to be efficient to get through the Agenda; I ask everyone here to do what you can to help.
- c) Finally, I will be making one statement to Senate and I will preview it here:

The P&T Taskforce has now officially sent its proposed 305 language to FAC. This will be FACs primary focus for the rest of the month. As you are all aware, we have already received some expressions of concern from some faculty members who fear the worst. I acknowledge that there is concern among the faculty, and I hope the faculty feels comfortable expressing itself to its representatives. However, right now that concern is fueled by rumor, much of which is simply inaccurate. This does not help the process that we need to follow. We should all welcome inquiries at this point. In response, we should tell our colleagues that FACs deliberations will not be secret. We should repeat that the FAC-approved language will be presented to the campus community when it is forwarded to Exec—most likely by early March. We should encourage our colleagues to review *that* language and then discuss it, based on its merits or lack thereof, when the time comes and, finally, to make their sentiments known to their senators ahead of any Senate vote.

- i) D. Bradley: Assuming that timeline holds, will there be a vote in March?

- ii) T. Hawkins: We won't vote in March, but there will a reading and votes in April at a meeting devoted to this topic.
- 3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes
- a) Motion to approve as amended (L. Phillips, C. MacDonald). Vote: 7-0-0.
 - b) B. Kilp: Early stages of conflict from CAAC and Exec brought on by President Bradley's comments could probably be stopped if some people sat down and talked.
 - c) D. Bradley: They deserve to hear it. Ultimately, they have the responsibility to share their professional opinion on these proposals. To have three people abstain is a waste of a lot of people's time. If someone thinks they might have a conflict of interest, you acknowledge it and then vote using professional judgment.
 - d) B. Kilp: It wasn't that simple. You weren't at the meeting to see it get to that point.
 - e) T. Hawkins: We can only try to express minutes as accurately as we can. We can't add statements to minutes if they occur after the fact. If anyone on CAAC wants to express an opinion in Senate, that's fine. It's appropriate. I am happy to talk with anyone from CAAC.
 - f) B. Kilp: I didn't know that this was the first time that Exec had overridden a CAAC decision.
 - g) R. Guell: CAAC did not make a decision, it was a tie vote. Exec didn't do anything outside its authority. A Department can ask for higher level consideration. They did, and it was given. There is nothing out of order about this process.
 - h) D. Bradley: The Senate will see both results and will ultimately make the decision. People need to be aware that there is no over-riding, no overstepping of bounds or the process.
 - i) T. Hawkins: I will try to make that clear. Like R. Guell said, this is the Handbook process. We followed an appeal that has been legitimately made.
- 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
- a) J. Conant: I wanted to ask about the Career Readiness Taskforce and where it's at.
 - i) D. Bradley: I was just in a meeting at the Lily Endowment. N. Rogers thinks things are going well and it is getting good cooperation. Some departments are ready to implement everything for next fall. My goal, I told them, is that freshmen will be ready. Whatever components freshmen are to get, they will get next fall. In principle, those who graduate from the cohort this fall, will get the full career readiness implementation.
 - ii) J. Conant: I recommend that the task force be called together. They haven't met since last summer.
 - iii) M. Licari: I think there is a lot that is already being done in departments. We have over 300 pages of data from the departments to continue to sift through.
 - iv) T. Hawkins: We don't meet next week, but I'll try to get N. Rogers here the week after.
 - b) R. Guell: My first question centers on student complaints and grievances. We spent a lot of time on this developing policy and procedures. My question goes to the issue of students who have "connections." For example, my daughter-in-law and son, M. Licari's son, J. Conant's son, have been here or will be. If they encounter an issue and wish to

file a complaint or grievance, is it practice to follow the policy or is it our practice to look at it in a different way?

- i) M. Licari: From my perspective, we have to use the processes that we have and granting special treatment is something that will cause problems. Speaking personally, I have spoken to my son, and he needs to navigate the bureaucracy on his own. That's a benefit of going to college, learning to navigate a large institution. Will he have an advantage because he knows more than the other kids? Absolutely. He has met a lot of people, but it's not like he's on a special path.
 - ii) D. Bradley: I think the thing that mitigates this being a significant problem is how many people resolve complaints informally.
 - iii) R. Guell: But the informal resolution is in the process and should involve the chair of the department and the faculty member. The case I have in mind is the faculty member was not able to respond and the chair was not involved and it was handled at a higher level.
 - iv) M. Licari: I think that was an error in not involving the chair and the faculty member in the complaint.
- c) R. Guell: Another concern I have is I believe we have a systemic advising failure in regards to students who have been dismissed from a hard to get into program with enormous numbers of credit hours. They get shoved off without any systemic counseling. You aren't going to be in nursing and you have 80 hours completed. There has to be a place where students get directed. Ten years ago, we sent them to "open preference" to a person who knew the programs and could help the student.
- i) D. Bradley: I think the place they should be sent is the degree completion specialists. They can sit down with them and they can figure out what is reasonable for them based on their goals.
 - ii) M. Licari: They are very closely linked with associate deans and they work with colleges.
 - iii) R. Guell: We just had a poor student with 130 credit hours who just decided to be a social worker. The dean's office just sent them to us.
 - iv) D. Bradley: There's a small chance that was the best decision, but the student clearly needs to be given some options. This is where getting the software fixed could benefit the students.
 - v) M. Licari: I will talk to the completion specialists and get that responsibility assigned.
- d) R. Guell: With the agreement of the Provost to allow the CAS to hire a third associate dean, we will have more VPs, AVPs, Deans, and Associate Deans than before you got here.
- i) D. Bradley: Don't count the development one.
 - ii) R. Guell: I'm not counting that. At the same time we have more students and fewer faculty.

5) Exec Item

- a) Biennial Review Training Update

C. MacDonald showed the updated version and explained the changes she had made. It was agreed that the training will be open starting April 1 and will close September 1.

b) M. Licari: I would like to say publically that this is fantastic and really well done.

6) CAAC Items

a) CRIM, BS in Intelligence Analysis

b) Motion to approve (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips). Vote: 7-0-0.

c) D. Woods: This started about three years ago now. I was contacted by one of our alums, Bob Casey who was at that time retiring from the FBI and then security at Lily. Because this is home he asked if he could make a presentation to our faculty members. He gave us a nice presentation of his view from being in the FBI that the number one thing missing was more formal education and a degree in intelligence analysis. It became apparent that we couldn't do this in our current degree. So I began working with our faculty, dean's office, COT, and had meetings about this. There was a lot of favorable reaction. What I didn't know at that time is there is a very large military market for people doing intelligence analysis and they don't have degrees. I knew from my own experience that this is one of the fastest growing fields in criminal justice. We found out what others are doing and there aren't many programs in this area. We studied the programs we could find, continued talking to our constituent groups, and we developed the program. Last spring, we vetted it with constituent groups, including a retired alum from NCIS, another alum who was an NCIS agent and intelligence officer for the navy, a police chief, other police officers, former CIA agents who all supported and gave insight into the program. What you have before you now is the result. We anticipate that this will be principally an online program. Campus students can take it, but 90% of the classes will be delivered online. We've had conversations with EES who will teach some classes, SCOB, and we are reaching out to other potential partners. So far, we have had a lot of encouragement.

i) D. Bradley: Do you see this as a discipline that police forces might be interested in, or is more intelligence?

ii) D. Woods: I see this with the software and the whole criminal justice system, that even small units may see the need. Several small units may create consortiums where they hire an analyst between them. There are some large police departments that are involved in intelligence analysis and some of our alumni. This is how criminal justice and military systems will get to better practices. This will be a growth area. If we get in now, we could set the curve in this field.

iii) J. Conant: I was chair of the key question committee that was charged with looking at degrees and this was one of the areas with the biggest potential for job growth.

d) R. Guell: What about GIS 451/452? Is that not already offered in our other departments?

i) D. Woods: Yes, S. Aldrich from EES will teach those. Computer Science has looked at this and we have another program that we are working on closely with CS. If there are any places we can make substitutions with courses from other departments, we will do that.

ii) R. Guell: I don't intend to oppose this one, but would ask that every cost-saving endeavor be engaged in.

iii) S. Barton: Most of those would fall in the concentrations. We will be working closely with them.

7) FAC Items

a) Section 305 Clarification

- i) Motion to approve (L. Phillips, C. MacDonald). Vote: 7-0-0.
- ii) L. Eberman: The contract language was replaced with appointment and some editing corrections were made.

After brief discussion on language, the following was adopted by unanimous consent: An administrative or academic unit that seeks to hire a staff member where teaching is likely to be a required element of the assignment shall have a regular faculty member on the search committee.

b) Interpretation Announcement Process

- i) Motion to approve (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips). Vote: 7-0-0.
- ii) C. MacDonald: This should go into the Overview of Faculty Governance document, and it should go in with a notation rather than having to re-approve the entire document.
- iii) R. Guell: Since there is more than 30 days from the Senate meeting until minutes are approved, the language should be changed from 30 days to 60 days.

c) Changes to Section 305.3.2.1.1

- i) Motion to approve the changes as amended (C. MacDonald, R. Guell). Vote: 7-0-0.
- ii) R. Guell: I think it should be the Provost in consultation with the Dean and the Department Chair.

d) Addition of Sections 210.2.1 and 210.2.2

- i) Motion to table (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips). Vote: 7-0-0.
- ii) R. Guell: The comment I made via email with the awkwardness of leaving career readiness hanging. Let me say as the principal voice in opposition to including this in our list, I will acknowledge that the issue has been debated and decided. We need a 210.2.3 authored by someone in favor of this.
- iii) D. Bradley: I agree that we need all three. I am sure University Engagement can come up with a first draft of the language.
- iv) R. Guell: Do you desperately need this for the February BOT meeting?
- v) D. Bradley: No.
- vi) R. Guell: I motion we table for the May meeting.
- vii) C. MacDonald: Do we need to define the word “community” at the end of community engagement?
- viii) L. Eberman: We have referenced it in 305.
- ix) C. MacDonald: Community, broadly defined.

e) Annual Reports Discussion

- i) L. Eberman: This was confusing for FAC. This is the component of what reports we think we should be seeing and then analyzing.
- ii) D. Bradley: Let’s make this part of Blue Reports, we don’t want a committee asking for different data all the time.
- iii) L. Eberman: I think there should be a standing charge for committees to analyze the reports in the spring semester. Also, we should look at longitudinal data. The intention is to review the reports.
- iv) R. Guell: In order for these to be permanent charges, they need to be in 246.

- v) D. Bradley: The only concern I have is that committees need to demand reports when they aren't normally done. Most of this is based on October 1 or the pay raise date. So, have the committees look at it in the spring, not say, September 1.
 - vi) R. Guell: Section 246 enumerates duties. If this is a duty, it needs to be in the Handbook. If it is a charge, that is something else.
 - vii) C. MacDonald: Might I say we do an investigation of what is in 246? This may be duplicative.
 - viii) D. Bradley: L. Eberman should work with L. Ferguson.
 - f) Timeline for Notification of Instructor Reappointment
 - i) Motion to approve amendment changes to 305.11.1.3 to 305 (R. Guell, C. MacDonald). Vote: 7-0-0.
 - ii) R. Guell: This is the same as 305.6.6 language. Why duplicate it?
 - iii) L. Eberman: 305.11.2.1 refers to everyone anyway. Do we need duplicate language?
 - iv) R. Guell: 305.6.6 in combination with 305.11.2.1 makes any addition of a calendar under 305.11.1.3 redundant.
 - v) L. Eberman: We can then append the changes to 305.11.1.3 to what we did earlier in section 305 vis a vis the "contract" to "appointment" change and leave out the calendar additions which are redundant.
- 8) Standing Committee Liaison Reports
- a) AAC (C. MacDonald): Has met and discussed a couple of their charges. They are looking to schedule another meeting.
 - b) AEC (S. Lamb): Absent.
 - c) CAAC (B. Kilp): CAAC has approved a lot of items.
 - d) FAC (D. Hantzis): Absent.
 - e) FEBC (J. Conant): They are talking about parking, a potential benefit of not making part-time lecturers who currently only have a fall permit and then have to pay for a spring only permit.
 - f) GC (L. Phillips): They met and will vote on language dealing with graduate research and thesis committees and grad faculty committee membership. They will also discuss 4+1 programs.
 - g) SAC (R. Guell): Meets tomorrow morning.
 - h) URC (L. Brown): They will meet this semester to review grant proposals.
- 9) Executive Session
- a) Motion to enter (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips). Vote: 7-0-0.
 - b) Motion to leave (C. MacDonald, R. Guell). Vote: 7-0-0.
- 10) Adjournment 5:11 p.m.