

Faculty Affairs Committee, Meeting #6

November 12, 2009

DRAFT Minutes

Present: Arthur Halpern, Susan Hoffman, Mark Lewandowski, Nan McEntire, Nancy Rogers, Linda Sperry, Virgil Sheets

Absent: Linda Behrendt, Karen Evans, Barbara Skinner

Meeting called to order at 4:12 by Linda Sperry

Minutes of the November 5, 2009 meeting were approved (Halpern, McEntyre)

Report from Liaison to Executive Committee (Sheets) – President Bradley received compensation plan from FEBC for long-term model. A portion of the salary-increment fund to be used for equity (ca. 0.5% of raise pool), a portion to address gaps between ISU and peer-institution salaries, and the remainder based on performance review. President indicated desire to have annual performance reviews for faculty. President Bradley and V.P. McKee to present new retirement incentive plan. President Bradley mentioned possible midyear budget reduction by state in the event of revenue shortfall – this would interfere with salary compensation plans.

Report from the chair (none)

Review of the NCA Document (Mark Lewandowski)

Campus-wide Self Study Draft—Suggestions and comments for FAC

1. The document should have a detailed table of contents so that ISU faculty members can more easily locate particular points of interest.
2. The document places a lot of emphasis on technology in the classroom (page 71), referring to electronic work stations, a/v equipment, etc., as well as the laptop initiative. It should be pointed out, however, that most classrooms lack appropriate desks for the use of laptops, as well as sufficient power outlets. (In a side note, ISU classrooms do not have basic necessities like synchronized clocks and left handed desks. In light of these deficiencies, the “upgrading” of classrooms rings hollow.)
3. Much emphasis is placed on the benefits of CIRT. On page 76, it is mentioned that CIRT is made up of 16 individuals. One committee member expressed surprise that the “department” was that large. No where is it mentioned what percentage of the faculty actually takes advantage of CIRT. Is this intentional? The absence of the data suggests that it is not widely used. This is disturbing, because immediately following this paragraph on CIRT, we find out that, on average, faculty members only receive 25-33% of monies needed to attend just one national conference per year. Outside readers might wonder why ISU plows all this money into CIRT while failing to sufficiently fund faculty travel. (The same paragraph mentions that professors use other sources to supplement their travel. It would be helpful to know what percentage is typically funded by such sources.) All this emphasis on technology suggests that the key way ISU supports faculty development is by providing professors lots of electronic devices. Many outside readers would not consider, for example, a machine that allows a professor to take roll electronically as meaningful support.
4. Chapter Five of the document deals with the “acquisition, discovery and the application of knowledge.” Table 4.1 (page 83) graphs out faculty “scholarship” from 2006-2008. The language for the table seems to come right out of Digital Measures, a program many faculty members have had problems with. Note the heading “Book Chapters, Journal Articles, etc,” which, next to Conference Presentations,” is the most common expression of professional development. Where do the creative and performing arts fit into the heading? The heading suggests that it does not

include music performance, art exhibitions, publication of poetry, etc. This needs to be clarified, perhaps in the paragraph right before the table. It must be understood that "Scholarship" includes creative endeavors.

5. The arts receive another unintentional snub when the Theodore Dreiser Award for Distinguished Research and Creativity Award is referred to as the "Theodore Dreiser Award for Scholarship."
6. No where in Chapter Five (that I can find, at least) is there mention of the many other ways in which faculty members engage in the "acquisition, discovery and the application of knowledge." What about our professional journals? The English Department alone has five of them. Every year the university hosts conferences, some drawing scholars from all over the world. It is important, of course, when professors publish in journals and participate in conferences. But why is there no mention of the conferences we host and the journals we edit?? I suggest the writers of the document send a survey to the chair of each department to find out about these professional activities.
7. ISU is home to a large number of lecture series and film series. In Arts and Sciences, we see these series as one of the key ways in which we engage the university community, as well as the public at large. The English Department, for example, hosts the Joseph S. Schick Lecture series. This series has brought to campus some of the most well respected literary scholars in the world. It is one of the best lecture series in the country. Many other departments in Arts and Sciences bring in professionals from all walks of life every year. Why aren't these mentioned in the document? There's also no significant mention of the University Speaker Series, Summer Theater, the Contemporary Music Festival, etc. These events draw thousands of people a year. Is there no place for a mention of this considering ISU's commitment to "Community Engagement," or for the students participating, "Experiential Learning?" ("Global Nights," a series of events sponsored by international students to promote cultural awareness, is detailed twice...) These omissions, as well as the definition of "Scholarship," might suggest to outside readers that ISU pays little attention the arts.

#### Charge #9 – Grievance Procedures

A.Halpern and L. Sperry presented recommendations concerning changes to the University Handbook in response to Charge #9.

A motion was introduced (and seconded) to recommend approval of the proposed changes in the U.H. to the Executive Committee. Copies of the relevant sections of the U.H. containing the proposed changes were distributed. Each of the changes was described, the rational presented, and discussed. In view of the need for further discussion, a motion to table was made, and seconded, and approved.

The meeting adjourned at 5:23

A.M. Halpern