

#16

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

February 7, 2017

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Final Minutes

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

Members Absent: none

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Bradley

Ex-Officio Absent: Provost M. Licari

Guests: A. Anderson, S. Barton, D. Israel, S. Kopaczewski, C. Olsen, S. Powers, D. Woods

1) Administrative Reports:

- a) President D. Bradley: M. Licari is in Indianapolis today interviewing VP candidates. Yesterday, we went to the Statehouse with about 45 students. There were lots of legislators there. It is not hard to be successful when you bring wonderful young people and have food. We were told the legislature was further behind than they had thought they'd be in regards to state budgeting. And, with a new governor, that is not surprising. The governor just got his cabinet settled last week.
- b) Provost M. Licari: none.

2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) We have a busy curricular agenda today, so I will keep my comments short. Next week FAC issues should dominate our Agenda—Community Engagement and Experiential Learning language for Section 210 will be considered; and, more motions will likely result from the FAC meeting tomorrow. We may also have one or two more CAAC items as well, depending on what happens with Physics/Chemistry. And, C. MacDonald will present us with the newly revised BR training.
- b) This means that the 2-16 Senate Agenda will be full. In addition to what we move forward today and next week, we will have the re-engineered Traffic Engineering Technology Minor. J. Powers and L. Reynolds are also scheduled to provide a brief update on the Inclusive Excellence report that the Trustees received in December.

- c) An early reminder: We will be using the 30 March special set-aside date for Senate to roll out the BR training. The 13 April date is in play, as well. Assuming that FAC can address the Taskforce work on proposed P&T revisions this month and forward it to us by March, I intend to notify the campus of the language that will come here. This will allow senators time to consider the language and receive feedback. Senate will then take up the proposal in March and vote at the dedicated session in April.
- 3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of January 31, 2017
- a) Motion to approve minutes as amended (B. Kilp, D. Hantzis). Vote: 9-0-0.
- 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
- a) R. Guell: I had a visit from an instructor who sought promotion to senior promotion and showed me his/her letter from M. Licari. It was kind of ambiguous. Let me read the sentences: “Additionally, instructors who met the University Handbook criteria could elect to pursue a promotion to Senior Instructor. Your evaluations merit promotion to Senior Instructor. I recommend that your appointment be renewed based upon departmental need.” Nowhere in the document does it say “I am the Provost and I recommend you to be promoted”. The language is stilted and out of character with other promotion letters that simply say “I am recommending to the President that you be promoted.” The stilted language is confusing.
    - i) S. Powers: This was our first time having promotion letters for senior instructor and there were lots of variations. We will note that for future versions.
    - ii) S. Lamb: To confirm, there were four in my area and they all used the very same language. I was pleased they all made it to senior instructor. But it did have the ambiguous language.
  - b) D. Bradley: We need to have more conversations around Senior Instructors. For example, do we view this as more like promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or Associate to Full?
    - i) R. Guell: It is akin to Assistant to Associate because you don’t have annual reviews anymore. However, it is also akin to Associate to Full because you don’t lose your job if you are not promoted.
    - ii) D. Bradley: It should not be viewed as an entitlement.
    - iii) R. Guell: Correct. If it is not in the Handbook yet, we have legislative records that suggest our intent, and it can be put in.
    - iv) T. Hawkins: That is my understanding as well.
    - v) D. Hantzis: Perhaps we could suggest that PTOC look at how colleges defined promotion to Senior Instructor. It would be good to do a comparative review.
    - vi) T. Hawkins: I can talk to B. Eversole about that.
    - vii) S. Lamb: I felt the criteria for promotion were rigorous. I felt that the motivations behind it were the 10% raise and also that faculty would not have to go through the annual review. I think part of the selling point was that this was recognition that these people have served us honorably and were entitled to 10%, which is a significant raise.
- 5) Exec Item: Overview of Faculty Governance revisions
- a) Motion to endorse revised version (S. Lamb, D. Hantzis). Vote: 9-0-0.

- b) C. MacDonald: The attendance policy now reflects the changes we made. I have added sections for how the Senators are elected into Exec and the name for the “New Senate Gathering” along with more detail about that process.
  - i) S. Lamb: I would like us to have some discussion about removing a sentence on page four. I think the last sentence is too prescriptive. I would like the body of the senators to exercise their will. It should be noted that service as secretary is excellent preparation to be chair, but we’ve been hammered on this 586 times. I do not want to be so prescriptive to our election process.
  - ii) C. MacDonald: That language is there because in the past we have had people who had never been on Exec run for Officer positions.
  - iii) D. Hantzis: We have a section immediately prior to that that describes the duties of the officers. We could note under the duties of the Secretary that it helps prepare someone who is interested in serving as Chair. I think the addition of the language there makes it clear and the intent is not to be prescriptive.
  - iv) S. Lamb: It is excellent preparation to becoming Chair, but it may very well be appropriate to have someone other than the Secretary as Chair.
  - v) C. MacDonald: I’m happy to make that modification.

6) CAAC Items

- a) Motion to approve the Criminology and Criminal Justice minors (Corrections, Forensic Investigation, Law and Administration, and Law Enforcement and Evidence) as a group (C. MacDonald, J. Conant). Vote: 9-0-0.
- b) S. Barton: Last year we made a major modification to our curriculum. We noticed that our students have a weakness in writing. We wanted to insert writing to our major curriculum (9 hours), but we were informed by the administration that adding 9 hours would not be approved. We decided to take our concentrations and turn them into minors.
  - i) C. MacDonald: Can a student major in Criminology and Criminal Justice and do one of these minors?
  - ii) S. Barton: Yes. They could even do more than one.
  - iii) L. Brown: Could non-Crim majors do one of these minors?
  - iv) S. Barton: Yes.
  - v) D. Hantzis: It’s elegant and I like it.

7) Department of Communication Appeal

- a) Motion to approve the COMM BA proposal (J. Conant, L. Phillips). Vote: 9-0-0.
- b) T. Hawkins: Because we are considering this as an appeal from the Department of Communication, I am going to ask that the representatives of the department speak first. I will then ask the representative from CAAC to speak before we turn to questions from Exec. To ensure a smooth discussion, each member is entitled to a question and a follow-up before we come back around.
- c) S. Kopaczewski: I would like to start by saying I appreciate the opportunity to present my department’s proposal for a Health Communication Concentration to the Senate Executive Committee, and hope the proposal will be included for consideration by the Senate. As the department’s curriculum committee chair and one of two current faculty members who have studied health communication at the doctoral level, I have been excited by the support our Health Communication Concentration has received at various

levels of the curricular process and am glad to know a majority abstention vote in CAAC will not be the end of the proposal which the department has been working on since the fall of 2010. Our commitment to offering communication students a concentration in health communication is bolstered by research showing that health communication is a growth area for both student interest and opportunity. The department has worked diligently to maintain disciplinary recommendations and standards for delivering a **communication degree** with a 15 credit **concentration** in health communication. Departments which follow our structure for a degree in communication based on a core set of classes with smaller more contextually specific concentrations and elective options are common, and many of those programs which also offer health communication as a concentration provide similar course offerings to ours, and do not require courses from outside the major.

- d) S. Kopaczewski: The department strongly believes we are well situated to train students as experts in communication with a health communication concentration designed to provide students the courses that best prepare them to apply their expertise in communication to various health communication contexts. The proposed concentration is comprised of 3 health communication courses that have already been approved and regularly offered, in addition to the organizational communication and campaigns courses. These courses when combined with the core and guided electives prepare students in key knowledge and skill areas identified as important skills for working in health communication by a 2014 state of the field report. We ask that our proposal be given due consideration for these reasons.
- e) D. Israel: I serve as the external chair for Department of Communication. I have been very impressed with the department's ability to be able to move forward for this. They should be commended for this for their enthusiasm for finding better ways to benefit their students and being willing to persisting even when they are told "no" at different levels in different years. We know the health industry is a growing economy in the U.S., Indiana, and Terre Haute. This will attract new students to ISU as we talk to perspective students who are interested in communication and health fields. I won't go into details, but I think S. Kopaczewski went into good detail. With advising, their new program, which started 14-15, students are moving into their senior years. You get to see their progress and you can see how the new program can be switched to. The department has control of having their students graduate, planning when to take courses. Student success is a reason why this design works well.
- f) D. Israel: At the December 6 CAAC meeting, we were asked to accept an amendment which would allow Communication majors to take a course from outside of the department as part of the 12 credits of electives required for Communication majors. The Communication Department accepted that request and forwarded the proposed language to CAAC. However, as you know, the proposal was not supported by CAAC in January, with two of the committee members voting against the proposed changes to the bachelor's degree in Communication.
- g) D. Israel: As you see from Curriculog and the department statement, the Department of Communication proposal adds a 5th concentration in Health Communication as a possible choice for Communication majors. It is designed to be parallel in construction with the other four existing concentrations in the major – it requires 5 courses (15 credits) of course work, three of which are specifically health communication courses. This

structure of the major is designed to contribute to student success and graduation, allowing students to pursue one or more concentrations within the major, and to switch to a different concentration, if their interests change.

- h) D. Israel: Those of us who listened to the CAAC discussion, the only opposition we heard was based on requiring a student to take an outside course. I am also glad you are willing to have the university consider this further, and we were excited the proposal was approved through the various offices it went through and would be excited to have this opportunity for Communication majors.
  - i) C. Olsen: I don't know the procedure about sending it to CAAC for consideration, but I think it would benefit if CAAC approved the proposal rather than sending it to the Senate. The supporting arguments are strong and it's a growing field. I am in favor of it, but CAAC is the body who reviews curriculum - that's the ideal solution.
  - ii) T. Hawkins: We are considering it here at this time, because the Department of Communication formally appealed the CAAC decision to us. In effect, with a 2-2-3 vote, CAAC did not approve the proposal.
- i) A. Anderson: Stated that CAAC does not disagree with the idea of sending this forward. This proposal was discussed over three meetings. We are fine with having Exec take it now. If you send it back to CAAC, we will take it up again, but we iterate that we did spend a lot of time on it already. The dominant issue was that we wanted there to be a required or at least identified elective(s) in a health-related course. Also, although it's not the practice to have separate learning objectives for each concentration in the department, we thought that having outcomes specific to this program would make it clearer. These fed into the negative votes. We fully expected this could and would go forward and have understand if Exec overrides our vote. If you send it back to CAAC, we will take it up again, but we did spend a lot of time on it already.
  - i) T. Hawkins: Thank you.
- j) S. Lamb: There are very strong feelings about this. I would like to ask the professionals. I see that "health" appears in many of the titles of the courses. Was there a concern the language associated with the health profession was not sufficiently covered in this set of courses? Do you feel it is sufficiently covered to say this is a concentration?
  - i) S. Kopaczewski: Yes. We are not a "health communication" program. We are a communication program wanting to offer a health communication concentration.
  - ii) S. Lamb: Can you further explain?
  - iii) S. Kopaczewski: Let me reference a 2014 publication where the authors talked to professionals and academics. They asked: What are important skills to working in health communication jobs? The highest skills were interpersonal communication and evaluation. The highest public health rated category was health behavior and communication. Having studied communication, I think giving our students communication degree with concentration in health communication will be helpful to them.
  - iv) C. MacDonald: I know that this is in the appeal from Communication, but I also did my own research to see what other health communication concentrations in communication majors looked like. And, in a number of schools I looked at, including ones you may have heard of, such as Harvard and Johns Hopkins, the curriculum looked much like this proposed one.

- v) R. Guell: I lose real patience with people who claim ownership of words and phrases. Especially when their claim is weak. I unambiguously support this proposal.
- vi) J. Conant: With the exception of Harvard, none of the other programs had a science course in them. They were strictly health communication.
- k) D. Bradley: I am supportive of the process we go through in terms of curriculum development. The debate is really good. We are really here because a number of people in CAAC need to vote. What really should happen is it is sent back to CAAC for a vote. It's probably not fair to Communication, but sometimes you will have to vote what is not necessarily in the best interest of your own department.
  - i) L. Phillips: Can it be sent back to CAAC?
  - ii) T. Hawkins: If we wish to do that.
  - iii) D. Bradley: I suggest you send it from Exec to CAAC and include a memo that tells them they need to vote.
  - iv) S. Lamb: We have heard from the chair of CAAC that they were agreeable for us to take it up. I do not want to have ill-feeling over this. I think we should send it forward. It certainly has merit. Let's get on it.
  - v) D. Hantzis: Thank you President Bradley for your comments about governance. I want to acknowledge that this proposal was changed during the deliberation by CAAC, which is how the process should work. We made the change to allow any of our majors, regardless of concentration, to substitute a course outside the department as one of the electives.
  - vi) T. Hawkins: I agree with the President regarding the importance of process. I also don't want this to be precedent-setting. Personally, if the vote in CAAC had been more definitive, I would have a much more difficult time entertaining this appeal. But the proposal was brought to us via a legitimate route. We should act on it. And, I believe that A. Anderson understands—and can take back to CAAC—that one of the messages we are sending from this discussion is that standing committees should work to send a clear message one way or another through their votes.
  - vii) D. Bradley: Or encourage people to live up to their professional responsibilities.
  - viii) R. Guell: I would not have a problem taking it up if CAAC had voted it down. We should not let a group of 9 have the final say in negating a decision that is the entire faculty's decision to make.

8) Adjournment: 4:24 p.m.