

#1

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

August 23, 2016

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Final Minutes

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

Members Absent: J. Conant

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley

Guests: D. Selman, E. Seung

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley: None.

b) Provost M. Licari:

i) Welcome back. It is nice to see campus alive with people again. The move-in weekend was for the most part smooth. In fact, we received some rave reviews from parents who had previously moved other teens into other dorms at different universities. The rest of the weekend was good; students seemed to have fun and Convocation was a success.

ii) Donaghy Day was a success. We had more students participate than ever before; just shy of 2,000 students participated. That is a testament to the organizational skills in the Community Engagement division and the dispositions that students are bringing.

iii) In terms of Academic Affairs, I had a couple of retreats over the summer: 1) direct reports and 2) larger leadership in Academic Affairs. I have three themes for the year which will relate to the strategic plan: student success, employee success, and the efficient use of personnel resources. They also link to the goals that D. Bradley gave me for the year: improving graduation rates; revising promotion and tenure documents to achieve a better alignment of faculty expectations and university values, which was something we had been talking about last spring; simplify our curricula, which the SCOB and COT have underway; incorporate career readiness

- outcomes into the curriculum; and, hire great people. I have a variety of leadership posts that need to be filled and an RFP is out for a search firm for the BCOE dean.
- iv) I look forward to my second year. I will be visiting every department again this year, and I look forward to that.
 - c) T. Hawkins: It would be nice to have some comments for the Faculty Senate since you won't be there on Thursday.
 - d) L. Brown: I had someone approach me and ask about the Wellness check and whether it's really voluntary?
 - i) M. Licari: Yes, it is unless you want to be charged \$50 per month.
 - e) S. Lamb: This idea of broadening faculty routes to promotion—I worry about a de-emphasis of research. Might you expand on this?
 - i) M. Licari: It's not a de-emphasis, it's more of an expansion. One of the things we pride ourselves in is experiential learning. Your experiences should count for something; that's what the University wants us to do. We can't have a situation saying the University says this is what is to be valued and on the other side this is what you need to be promoted. I don't think that's healthy.

2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins:

- a) I wish to thank all of you for serving. I am happy to be sitting here, with people like you who devote a lot of time to university service. I am expecting to lean on your abilities a great deal throughout the year and hopefully we get off to a great start.
- b) First, a couple of issues pending from the April Senate meeting. The attendance at Faculty Senate meetings was a charge to FAC. A proposal was brought to EC, where some changes were made. Between then and the final Senate meeting, an alternate version was provided by another senator. Since this was a constitutional change, it was unclear how the proposals should go forward. One proposal came out from FAC to EC to FS via normal routes, while the other went straight to the floor, outside of the procedures. My intention is to bring them back in a more completed form to FAC and go through the normal procedures. We can hopefully then agree on one and send it for a constitutional vote. I also intend to send the report on Senate elections to FAC for consideration.
- c) Regarding the Student Grievance Policy: Senate voted in April to approve the Policy, however there was a substantial debate regarding the procedures. This was tabled, and we will need to talk to K. Butwin about that. We will need to make sure we are comfortable before going forward.
- d) One issue that came up over the summer has to do with a growing concern about the need for professional development workshops. I won't pick on any particular one, but as we begin to add more professional development workshops and seminars, they will crowd the Academic Calendar. We need to consider alternatives. One may be a change to the calendar for a "professional development" date.

- e) I agree with the Provost there are certain issues that will top our agenda. It will please me if we can come to an agreement on revisions to promotion and tenure, the grievance process, and what it means to be an “instructor”. These issues blend in two important ways: there needs to be more continuity between colleges, and, in order to tackle them, we will need to touch the “third rail” of faculty workload.
- f) As far as Standing Committees are concerned, I think six out of the eight have made plans or have had their first meeting. That’s a great start for the year.

3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes

- a) Approved as amended: (D. Hantzis, C. MacDonald) Vote: 5-0-3.

4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) R. Guell: I want to mention a couple of things that were on last year’s agenda that percolated to here but didn’t result in a resolution: definition of day, working day, opening day of the year, closing day of the year or semester. I think K. Butwin agreed to have a glossary of those definitions, but I don’t think there were any results from that meeting.
 - i) T. Hawkins: I don’t believe there’s been progress, but I do believe the issue of “working day” is a charge.
 - ii) R. Guell: We are really close to having no institutional memory of when we went from 9 to 10 months, and then historically making the first day of school Tuesday. We need to know whether Tuesday or Thursday is the first day back for faculty.
 - iii) M. Licari: True. I would also say the discussions of a Faculty Development day are linked to defining a start day.
 - iv) S. Lamb: I was there, and in all the arguments we were assured this would not make a difference to the Academic Calendar.
 - v) R. Guell: Yes, but that was two Provosts and one President ago. We are not that far away from having a department chair calling a meeting August 1.
 - vi) S. Lamb: There is not continuity as you move Provost to Provost or President to President. Just for historical sake, the rationale that was given was an accounting problem.
 - vii) R. Guell: Accounting said that pay would not be made in September if someone was not working in August.
 - viii) B. Kilp: I did teach a summer class, and a lot of work is being done then. I work seven days a week throughout the summer. Now should I tell students “no” I don’t have any way to respond to you? Would I then be counted as absent? How do we fit in that so much work is being done online, off campus and at home versus sitting at an office?

- ix) C. MacDonald: Part of it is that faculty are sometimes out of the country in the summer. Currently there are no working days throughout the summer. We have some faculty that will not work any days outside of their 10 month contract.
 - x) S. Lamb: It seems to me it could be a healthy compromise, that there are duties in the summer.
 - xi) D. Hantzis: But what's the compensation for that? This is a concern that I have: we are so far out of agreement of what the first day is. That is clearly a day when classes are not in session. I develop the calendar for evaluation for the department, but the Provost's office should ensure equity across the campus.
 - xii) R. Guell: The College that I entered added its own dates to it. Is that not a common practice?
 - xiii) L. Brown: We do that. We get a schedule from Arts and Sciences and then we figure out the department due dates from that.
 - xiv) D. Hantzis: Three years ago we mandated that a master calendar was to be distributed August 1 by Academic Affairs. So, we are still having faculty having 48 hour notice.
- b) C. MacDonald: Regarding required statements on syllabi. The release is only a few days before class. I have six required statements, and it takes about a page and a half. It would be helpful if Academic Affairs could compile them into a list about a week or more before school starts.
- i) D. Hantzis: I've had three people in one day ask about this. One asked if there was a place available for all of the required statements. They are not collected in one place. One person had already sent his syllabi to Foundational Studies and had to retrieve it.
- c) R. Guell: I would ask for a Senate-level reminder of 915.2 on the use of ISU property for political uses. A faculty member in my home department made the mistake of sending a political letter on ISU campus letterhead to the State House and was reprimanded for doing so. This is generally a bad idea, and faculty should be reminded of it.
- d) D. Hantzis: I would like to ask that we address parking, again. Once again parking spaces designated for handicapped drivers were inaccessible on streets and in lots near any residential building during a work week day (Friday, August 19). Given the distribution of residences, many spaces on the south, north, and west sides were blocked. When I arrived at 6th and Cherry at 8:15, 6th Street was blocked. I asked the residential staff at the entrance to Lot 5 (also blocked) what accommodations had been made for handicapped drivers, and they said no one told them about any accommodations and directed me to a police officer standing on 5th street. The officer said that there had been no statement about accommodations. She let me know that the nearest parking with handicapped accessibility would be in the Rec Center lot and someone could always call for a shuttle ride.

As we've noted before, accommodations for handicapped drivers need to be made every time designated parking spaces are made inaccessible. The accommodations need to be announced and disseminated, routinely. I re-read the public announcement of lot and street restrictions during move-in and nothing was said about handicapped parking spaces. Accommodations should be posted on/near the barricade signs—perhaps along with a note about closest available parking for any driver who arrived expecting to park where s/he always does for work. Also, if the plan is to direct drivers to park away and call for a ride, the drivers need to be alerted so that rides are ready and available. It is not unusual for staff who are blocked out of handicapped parking places to wait 20 minutes or longer. We've suggested in the past that posting a driver at several different "away" lots and the garage at strategic times could improve working conditions for staff and faculty, making it easier for them to park further away from their offices without being late to work.

Given that we've raised questions in the past about the status of parking, particularly as it impacts handicapped drivers, perhaps Executive Committee could review an audit of the parking space allocation. Have we made adjustments in allocations in line with changes in occupation of buildings? For example, staff and faculty housed in Gillum Hall are concerned that adding three offices of programs not previously housed in the vicinity to the second floor changes the need for near-parking, pressuring Lot 5 and the adjacent lot. Several part-time and full time staff and faculty, who purchased the \$130 permit, told me they routinely feed meters in Lot 5 all day rather than parking at a distance that adds uncompensated time to their work (and for some a physically challenging walk). While we welcome students and create a highly efficient method of moving them into campus, we need to demonstrate thoughtful respect for employees as well. We need also to review our parking plan with an eye toward ensuring that staff and faculty have reasonable near-building access to their workplaces routinely.

- e) L. Phillips: A colleague of mine was prevented from doing research overseas. I thought we might consider a way to ensure that risk management could be involved sooner. This person had made his plans but then was told by our risk management office that this trip could not be taken.
 - i) S. Lamb: Was it that the trip could not be taken or insured?
 - ii) L. Phillips: Insured. I would hope that we can figure out an alternative. I wouldn't make the argument that risk management should have the final say.
 - iii) R. Guell: What was the risk other than the \$100,000 life insurance policy?
 - iv) L. Phillips: I'm not sure of the details.
 - v) S. Lamb: Should it be the risk management or a recommendation to Academic Affairs.
 - vi) M. Licari: That's exactly what happened in this case and one other. One of the issues that seemed to be the most troubling was that the timing of the final decision was

poor. There was in both cases a lot of planning that had been done. In one of the cases, the faculty did not secure credentials to travel. Nevertheless, the decision still needs to be made whether the university is going to fund, sponsor, and insure travel to known dangerous places. One potential solution is to put some of that information out to trigger an earlier conversation where you are planning to travel. It would give more time for a decision. There also might be opportunity for discussion that if the university is funding your trip, you need to recognize these things and have a clear itinerary. My hope would be somehow to front-end those decisions so we do not have a faculty member or group of students in a big mess. Having had some horrible experiences in my previous job, it becomes challenging to get students/faculty out of places that are collapsing or we don't have diplomatic relationships with. At the end of the day, I don't foresee ever approving the use of university money to travel to particular places in the world. Nobody's going to North Korea for example. They can go there on their own dime. We can have reasonable and professional discussions about this.

- vii) L. Phillips: It seems to be different if you are visiting North Korea as a tourist and whether your studies are dependent on the travel.
- viii) R. Guell: If you hire an assistant professor and say go forth and do scholarship but then cut them off, and you discover they want to go to Syria, Iran, etc. we should never have hired them if we can't guarantee their scholarship. If we hire someone and tell it to them before, and they still come to the university, then that's their choice.
- ix) M. Licari: Travel and this kind of support is not guaranteed.
- x) L. Phillips: It's not guaranteed but it is an incentive.
- e) T. Hawkins: I have had an inquiry regarding the review of instructors in their 3rd year: they go with the 3rd year tenure-track faculty, which means they don't learn the results until April. If they are not reappointed, they may be stuck with no options. Is it possible to allow them to submit their materials in September so that they could have more time to look? Might language be written to provide for this option, assuming it's the correct procedure to allow instructors to bring in their documents early?
 - i) R. Guell: I think it's an awful idea to have instructors going through the path at two different time periods.
 - ii) L. Brown: They are already being reviewed at different times based on what year they are in their contract. Would it be possible to give them the option of submitting earlier?
 - iii) D. Hantzis: The third year is a new contract, not simply a renewal. We did discuss providing a relief of one year. There was some pushback. If you found someone unsatisfactory in their third year, why let them teach another year? Starting in their third year they are guaranteed another year because results are in March. There are lots of reasons why that contract would not be renewed. You can't ask the Provost to

approve in October if they don't know if they can approve in March. FAC did address this when we revised the section.

- iv) T. Hawkins: Is there consensus to raise this in Senate?
- v) D. Hantzis: The policy actually reads: "Instructors who receive recommendations of non-reappointment (in the third or subsequent year of an appointment) may be offered an appointment as a part-time temporary faculty for the subsequent term when continuing need is demonstrated and resources remain available." We created the option (University Handbook section 305.11.1.3).
- vi) T. Hawkins: It appears we have no consensus. We will leave this issue for now, then.

5) Selection of Parliamentarian

- a) Motion to approve R. Guell for Parliamentarian (T. Hawkins, S. Lamb) Vote: 8-0-0
- b) B. Kilp: Would you consider possibly having R. Guell mentor a new person so they can get a handle on how to do a good job? If you've never done it and don't have experience it is hard to volunteer. We should have understudies for things.
- c) R. Guell: I've actually never been Parliamentarian, but I've been at this table about six times.

6) Update to University Policies

- a) Policy 922.4 Title IX Coordinator
 - i) Motion to approve (S. Lamb, L. Phillips) Vote: 8-0-0.
 - ii) T. Hawkins: I wasn't sure whether we could consider this as a minor change: "office number and address".
 - iii) D. Hantzis: I was confused by the absence of the name, because K. Butwin told us that the federal law requires the name of the person and this erases them. We were told explicitly several times that we can't remove the name. It's always bad to put information in documents that will change.
 - iv) B. Kilp: People are recalling, maybe we should ask her directly.
 - v) T. Hawkins: If this language wasn't approved by K. Butwin that would be surprising. She was at the meeting. It's our decision to determine if this is either fine or not fine.
- b) Policy 923 Non-Discrimination Policy
 - i) Motion to approve (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips) Vote: 8-0-0.
- c) Policy 920.3
 - i) Motion to approve (B. Kilp, C. MacDonald) Vote: 8-0-0.

7) Curriculum

- a) Approval of Music Industry Studies Minor
 - i) Motion to approve (B. Kilp, D. Hantzis) Vote: 8-0-0

- ii) D. Selman: This was brought to the Department of Multidisciplinary Studies as a minor for current music majors who find that they are not going to successfully go on with a music program, to have a minor. It's also intended to provide a minor to COT and SCOB students and others who have an interest in this type of minor. Music faculty have agreed to serve as affiliate faculty. It's really about providing career opportunities to those who are not music majors.
 - iii) D. Hantzis: How many students do you anticipate?
 - iv) D. Selman: We have the interest of five students without any promotion. We anticipate to promote in the COT and SCOB.
 - v) S. Lamb: Have the courses been created?
 - vi) D. Selman: We've done this utilizing existing courses and resources at ISU.
 - vii) B. Kilp: It's our understanding that if we have at least 20 students, the minor will go to the School of Music.
 - viii) D. Selman: That's the hope. We hope to get it up and going, in hopes that as we incubate the departments that the home locations will be ready.
 - ix) B. Kilp: We were really happy to work with you and had good outcomes.
 - x) D. Selman: Thank you.
 - xi) D. Hantzis: It's good to have one that allows students the option of a minor that doesn't require music theory.
- b) Elimination of Science Ed. For Licensed Teachers M.S.
- i) Motion to approve (B. Kilp, C. MacDonald) Vote: 8-0-0.
 - ii) E. Seung: We don't offer this program anymore. We want to delete it from the graduate catalog.
 - iii) R. Guell: How is it that we are meeting the dual-credit needs of the instructors in Vigo County and surrounding areas? This seems odd to eliminate a master's degree in science education.
 - iv) L. Brown: The issue is that they need any master's degree and then 18 hours of graduate credit in their content area.
 - v) M. Licari: Except that concept is not quite ready yet from the Higher Commission.
 - vi) R. Guell: There are a lot of K-12 teachers in a lot of disciplines and we are running from those groups.
 - vii) L. Brown: This happened with the elimination of the "Slash Ed" degrees and moving them all to CIMT. For example, in the Math Ed. degree, they were taking more than 18 credits of graduate level mathematics, and now there is not a degree.
 - viii) M. Licari: You don't have to have a master's degree in Education. It requires a master's degree in anything and now the Higher Education Commission is leaning towards education in anything and if the degree is not in what you are teaching, the individual needs 18 hours in the content area. We are in the process of creating 18 hours of work for those teachers to stay qualified. It's a logistical challenge for both

the school district and us for something to meet the needs. It hasn't been offered for so long I don't believe it will create a dent in enrollment.

8) Confirmation of Standing Committee Liaisons: AAC, AEC, CAAC, FEC, FEBC, GC, SAC, URC

- a) T. Hawkins: I have included this on the agenda to make sure we are all on board with our liaison assignments. As I mentioned, the process has gotten off well this year. In two weeks at our next meeting, we can begin liaison reports.

9) Proposed Charges for Standing Committees

- a) R. Guell: FAC #11: One of the issues you get to note in the grievance to talk about in the Executive Session is the CHHS does not have any timely filing. I think it's important to include a charge for timely filings of grievances to be considered at the college level.
 - i) T. Hawkins: When I requested suggestions for charges, this is one that in general terms came up.
 - ii) R. Guell: That is one specific thing I'd like to be taken to FAC. Also, in 305.7.6.1 it doesn't imagine a tie that could in fact occur. We should make sure that does not haunt the EC and administrators in the future.
 - iii) D. Hantzis: On college P &T, a tie is a negative vote.
 - iv) R. Guell: The result can't be ambiguous. Also, are student grievance procedures in the FAC list or not?
 - v) T. Hawkins: They are not. I want to talk to K. Butwin before I make that charge.
 - vi) R. Guell: That needs to be on our list of carry-over items. Also, the role of instructors versus what is in the Handbook. Lastly, if there is a question if instructors are required to do intra-departmental services. There are differences of opinions across campus.
 - vii) D. Hantzis: We talked about this in April. I think R. Guell is right. We have to clarify what instructors are to do. It was approved and it shouldn't have been or we need to honor it. There are all kinds of issues, and I don't know if FAC or EC should draft something. Does EC have something to say about it first? We've been talking about it since last year.
 - viii) T. Hawkins: I would prefer to have FAC bring us something. I don't like the idea of directing a committee in a particular way.
 - ix) S. Lamb: I'm pleased that it would be reviewed by a committee.
- b) L. Phillips: Can we place my concern about risk management on a list for one of the committees?
 - i) T. Hawkins: Perhaps under FAC.
- c) T. Hawkins: If there are any questions, we can discuss them at the next meeting.
- d) S. Lamb: I appreciate the SAC charge #2.

- e) T. Hawkins: These charges are not prioritized, so if that's something you would like to do with your committee that would be a good place to start.

10) PTOC terms

- a) T. Hawkins: The issue here is to figure out how to stagger the terms.
 - i) R. Guell: We have to repopulate this committee entirely.
 - ii) D. Hantzis: If that's an EC function we need to do that.
 - iii) R. Guell: Over the next couple of weeks, we need to think about candidates, and the officers should come up with a good slate. The point of doing what we did last year was to wipe the slate clean to make sure that group did its job.
- b) T. Hawkins: Please send us names.

11) Nominations

- a) University Standing Committees
 - i) Motion to approve (C. MacDonald, D. Hantzis) Vote: 8-0-0.
- b) FDHC replacement (R. Guell left the meeting).
 - i) Motion to approve (C. MacDonald, D. Hantzis). Vote: 7-0-0.
 - ii) T. Hawkins: K. Yousif has agreed to be nominated, so I am asking for your approval.
- c) Senate resignation
 - i) T. Hawkins: A COT Senator resigned from the university right before the beginning of the term. They do not have an alternate.
 - ii) R. Guell: There is not a mechanism for a special election.
 - iii) S. Lamb: In times past, we have allowed their governance body to fill the seat.
 - iv) R. Guell: In the past they've ignored what is in the Handbook.
 - v) T. Hawkins: We will not fill the seat outside the process. COT will have one fewer representative on Senate this year.

12) Executive Session

- a) Motion to enter executive session (B. Kilp, S. Lamb) 7-0-0
- b) Motion to exit executive session (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips) 7-0-0
- c) Motion: The executive committee finds that this grievance is inappropriately filed as an appeal. Should the faculty member wish to pursue a primary grievance of this matter, the executive committee will take it under consideration in accordance with the Handbook. (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips) 7-0-0

13) Adjournment 5:42 p.m.