

Indiana State University
Faculty Senate Student Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes, October 20, 2014
8:15 a.m., Federal Hall, Room 222, Scott School of Business

PRESENT: Committee: Azizi Arrington-Bey, Cheryl Blevens, Lisa Decker, John Lui,
Chris Olsen, Lisa Phillips, Jeanne Sowers, Alina Waite;
Ex-Officios: Jennifer Lawson, Linda Maule, Joel McMullen, Josh Powers,
Susan Powers, Rich Toomey
Student: Olivia Finley

I. Call to Order

C. Blevens called the meeting to order at 8:20a.m.

II. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was accepted as presented. (Phillips/Maule) **Motion passes 7-0-0**

III. Minutes of the October 6, 2014 meeting

C. Blevens called for additions and/or corrections to the meeting minutes. There were no corrections and/or additions. The minutes were accepted as presented. (Maule/Enyeart).

Motion passed 7-0-0.

IV. "Whistleblowers Policy" (*see attached to bottom of these minutes*)

The committee request more information prior to making a decision on this charge. Blevens will contact Melony Sacopulos and invite her to the next SAC meeting to provide additional information.

V. Charges for 2014-2015

1. Review HB section 310 changes suggested by the Departmental Success Taskforce. Blevens. **Charge Completed.**
2. Identify a faculty member to serve as representative to SGA Senate meetings. Decker.
No report.
3. Monitor international student enrollment. Blevens, Toomey.
Blevens provided the following report: International undergraduate students increased 17.81 percent, 112 students – from 629 in 2013 to 741 in 2014. International graduate students increased 19.87 percent, 59 students – from 297 in 2013 to 356 in 2014. Total international students increased 18.47 percent, 171 students – from 926 in 2013 to 1,097 in 2014.
4. Evaluate (from a student's perspective) the Taskforce recommendation that student evaluation of courses be made universal. Phillips.
See the recommendation at the bottom of these minutes.
5. Work with the Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Coalition to review policy and proposals (A. Janssen-Robinson). Decker.
Tabled.
6. Conduct analysis and make recommendations regarding Academic Coaching. Phillips.
Tabled.
7. Continue to monitor student quality measures that go beyond HSGPA, consider making recommendations regarding adjustments to admission and/or retention standards. Blevens, Olsen, Toomey.
Tabled.

8. Administer the Faculty Scholarship. Investigate “fast-tracking” of scholarship winners to the Executive Committee. Arrington-Bey, Liu, Phillips, Waite.

Tabled.

9. Produce an annual report by 8/1/15. Blevens.

Tabled.

VI. Administrative reports

A. Chair

- a. No report.

B. Ex-Officios

- a. J. Powers thanked everyone for their participation in the Success-X and Student Success conferences last week, both were successful.

C. SGA

- a. Finley expressed the success of homecoming, the 1st annual music festival, and the Success-X conference. SGA is helping Dr. Maule promote priority registration. Org funding has been completed, they will be going toward an online model in the future. There is a student sub-committee looking into and discussing concealed carry rights.

VII. Adjournment 9:52a.m.

IV.

905 WHISTLEBLOWERS POLICY

Policy passed by Board of Trustees on February 22, 2013.

905.1 General. Individuals are expected to abide by state and federal laws and regulations, as well as University Handbook policies. An Indiana State University employee cannot be compelled by a supervisor or other University official to violate a law or University Handbook policy.

905.2 Reporting. Individuals who have knowledge of specific acts that are reasonably believed to violate the law or University Handbook policy (“Wrongdoing”) may disclose those acts to any appropriate University official, and any employment supervisor is obligated to report specific acts that are reasonably believed to be Wrongdoing.

905.3 No Retaliation. This Policy prohibits retaliatory academic or employment action because an individual makes a good faith report of Wrongdoing.

905.4 Supplementation of Law and Policy. This policy supplements the existing Indiana state statute, IC 21-39-3 applicable to State Educational Institutions, and also supplements other University policies under which reporting may also be required, like the Policy on Minors.

905.5 Development of Procedures. There shall be reporting procedures devised to handle a report of Wrongdoing and to respond to any reports of retaliation for making such a report.

V.4

From the Student Affairs Committee:

Given the concern expressed by Faculty regarding the hasty implementation of the Fall, 2014 course evaluation questions, the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) recommends three key changes in how the course evaluations are implemented.

First: By way of introduction, all course evaluations should include a statement indicating that the six across-the-board questions were not approved by the Faculty Senate and will not be used for evaluation purposes, e.g. “Students should be aware that these questions will be used by faculty members to inform their teaching.”

Second: SAC recommends the evaluation be sent to students during the fall and spring semesters approximately after 85% of the course has been presented and prior to the start of finals. Summer courses will vary from this time frame but should occur approximately twice throughout the summer courses, in addition to the introductory statement, the evaluation questions be separated into distinct sections, e.g. “Common Questions Applicable to all ISU courses,” “Department-specific Questions,” “Instructor-generated Questions,” and that they be sent to instructors at least one week prior to its dissemination to students.

Third: Members of SAC discussed the six proposed common questions at length. None of the questions were acceptable as written. Among the many concerns, SAC members felt the questions were so vague as to render any answer invalid. At worst, the questions would only prove a faculty member’s relative “popularity” rather than provide commentary on the quality of the course. Rather than use the questions proposed, SAC recommends those listed below. It is important to note that careful attention was paid to ensuring all six were applicable to in-class, on-line, lab courses, and all others and that the questions were tied to the teaching criteria outlined in the University Handbook.

Recommended Six Questions:

1. Course Organization Instead of “This course is well organized,” we suggest:
“The instructor provided a syllabus at the beginning of the course that accurately represented how the course was conducted” (Maule/Sowers) **Motion passed 7-0-0.**
2. Communication Instead of “My instructor communicates effectively,” we suggest (from the databank):
“My instructor seems enthusiastic about the course material” (Decker/Olsen) **Motion passed 6-1-0.**
3. Instructor/Student Interaction Instead of “The quality of interaction with the instructor is good,” we suggest:
“The instructor treated students with fairly”
“My instructor creates an environment in which a reasonably motivated student can learn” (Olsen/Phillips) **Motion passed 7-0-0.**
4. Grades and Grading Instead of “Feedback from my instructor on papers, exams and other performance measures is helpful,” we suggest:
“The instructor evaluated work and provided feedback within two weeks (or other time-frame specified on the syllabus)” (Phillips/Olsen) **Motion passed 7-0-0.**
5. Student Learning Outcomes Instead of “The instructor is a very effective teacher,” we suggest (from the databank):
“The course challenges me to extend my capabilities” (Maule/Phillips) **Motion passed 7-0-0.**
6. Workload and Course Difficulty Instead of “Overall, the quality of this course is good,” we suggest (from the databank):
“I put a lot of effort into this course” (Decker/Sowers) **Motion passed 7-0-0.**