

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 13, 2016  
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: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley

Guests: S. Alexander, K. Bigler, S. Bocard, Y. Phillips, K. Smith, L. Spence

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President Bradley: none.

b) Provost M. Licari:

i) The President is traveling, but last week he did give our initial budget request to the Indiana Commission of Higher Education. He mapped the things we are doing onto the Commission's strategic plan to show that our efforts are in alignment with theirs. He shared the initial capital request to begin refurbishing the Fine Arts building and some specific requests for budget augmentation, especially after the steady decline in state appropriations per student FTE. Even as our costs are going up, we are receiving less in state appropriations. I thought his presentation was good and the Commission received it quite well. That was only the opening round.

ii) At the upcoming Board of Trustees Meeting, I will be giving another presentation on Student Success. This request came from questions I received from the Board from the past meeting about data on the efficacy of student success initiatives. I have been asked to show tangible results of the specific initiatives. This is challenging because only a few initiatives are set up as experiments.

(1) S. Lamb: We have the sense that the Board has developed a less than enthusiastic vision of the faculty, and maybe that perception is not correct. Anything that you, President Bradley, or T. Hawkins can do to bolster that is appreciated. My impression of the faculty is they are tied to the success of the institution. They are working so much harder and effectively and have fully endorsed the mission of the university. I do think the Board needs to understand that we are championing the mission.

(2) M. Licari: I think a better way to phrase the question here is: are the efforts that we are spending a tremendous amount of resources on worth it? That is an

appropriate question. For them to be probing on the efficacy of student success efforts is fine.

- (3) R. Guell: But do they question this across the board? In 2005 the combined SAT was 960 and now it is south of 910. We knew we needed to do this to increase enrollment from 10,000 to 13,000 students. All the decisions made for the VP for Student Success, the University College, and professional advising was a consequence of low enrollment.
- (4) M. Licari: It looks like we've been treading water, but in the face of these changes in student demographics, holding our own is something. We are outperforming given what would be expected of our students. It still remains true that it would be better if we could tick up the retention and graduation rates. It's the right thing to do by our students. We should always be working hard to make sure that they are as successful as they can be. I think that is the motivation for their question. That'll be the base of my presentation. It is always good I think if the Board sees the faculty leaders. I think it's good for as many members of the Senate Exec to be present at these meetings as possible, even if it is just to hear the questions they ask.
- (5) R. Guell: I would also say that when I was chair of Senate how rarely I or any other member of faculty was invited to the lunches or dinners. It was then that important conversations happened.
- (6) T. Hawkins: In the context of President Bradley's evaluation the Trustees met with Exec. I encouraged them then to make this a regular practice. I encouraged them during my Chair's Remarks to meet with Senate, and I hope they will do it.

## 2) Chair Report

- a) T. Hawkins: Following our general discussion, the agenda priority today will be the presentation on Blackboard/Canvas by L. Spence. We will then turn to liaison reports, which will give us a sense of where the Standing Committees are at this stage in the semester. I am pleased to report that the matter that required our attention during the planned Executive Session is no longer with us. The Grievance has been withdrawn.
  - i) S. Lamb: I would like to thank R. Guell for the time and effort he has put into this matter.
- b) T. Hawkins: A few issues resulted in extensive discussion at pre-Exec yesterday. First, the announcement of the internal search for chair of Multidisciplinary Studies raised the matter of "transfer of tenure." This is something that the department desires of its new chair. The Handbook does not recognize a mechanism for the transfer of tenure, though a department can vote to recommend tenure for an incoming faculty member. The Provost agreed that he would be willing to approve such a move, were it to be supported by the receiving department. However, faculty members in general will not be allowed to invoke a tenure-transfer mechanism to switch departments. At the same time, we do not think any faculty member should be required to give up tenure in their home department to take such an appointment. This will likely be a rare occurrence and, as such, is now not deserving of revisions to Handbook language—though we may reconsider that in the future.

- i) S. Lamb: There have been cases in the past where they did transfer tenure from one department to another. What I recall is that both the department she was exiting and entering had to approve.
- ii) R. Guell: On that topic, why is it that you need to move tenure? I can't claim any affiliation in Social Work. My service is at the pleasure of the Dean I am serving.
- iii) M. Licari: I wanted to make sure there was no requirement.
- iv) D. Hantzis: The department faculty want it, but I also think it limits the pool.
- v) R. Guell: They also don't have a guaranteed path back.
- c) T. Hawkins: The language addressing promotion to Senior Instructor has required some clarification. A reminder: for this academic year, Section 305.11.2.7, which creates a "window" for promotion, will be in force. This language will disappear at the conclusion of the 2018 academic year. Next academic year, the relevant language will be 305.11.2.2, which allows instructors who have completed five or more years to apply. The Officers and Provost agree this service does not have to be consecutive, but it does have to be at the instructor rank. As J. Conant noted we need to have a place for these clarifications; they shouldn't simply sit in the minutes.
- d) T. Hawkins: Regarding Senate on Thursday, we will have updates regarding the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence; we will have another opportunity to discuss university travel policies; and we will (hopefully) approve the PTOC slate. The "support" vote for the candidates for Temporary Faculty Advocate is occurring now and will end on Thursday. I aspire to having that position filled by next week.

### 3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes

- a) Motion to approve as amended (B. Kilp, D. Hantzis). Vote: 9-0-0.

### 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) C. MacDonald: I have a new State cup I purchased from the bookstore with the striped leaf. There is currently no clothing with the stripy leaf. L. Maule and I both want a scarf with the striped leaf. Still, I am pleased that I can now purchase items with this logo.
- b) R. Guell: I had the odd circumstance of seeing up close two colleges and their personnel processes. CAS is insisting that the five days for rebuttal come out of the unit from which the materials are arising, so that if a chairperson has until this date to submit the department stuff on a faculty member, the chairperson essentially has a week less than what it says. The College I chair in has it come out of the College. I believe the Provost's Office needs to determine where the five days sit and put it in the Handbook in an unambiguous statement.
- c) D. Hantzis: We need to honor the master calendar policy; it was not followed last year or this fall. There is as much as a three week difference between timelines from one college to another. We still have incredibly local decisions made late in the process. Faculty are not having the same period of time to prepare materials for their annual reviews.
- d) J. Conant: From ISU's budget request: for those of you who have been around for a long time, we were hit over the head with the fact that our state appropriation was the highest per student. It was the highest, but it is now the lowest. I think that's an amazing accomplishment, and I wanted to report on that.
  - i) S. Lamb: In my forty-four years we have always been persecuted for our cost per student.

- ii) J. Conant: ICHE recognizes that it is due to our efficiencies and our enrollment growth.
- iii) S. Lamb: M. Licari, I think something should be made of that. Press should be given for that.
- e) S. Lamb: Regarding those who are purchasing parking passes for the garage: they are also charged a \$5 fee for those who show up when there is an event. I have two instructors who teach night classes and they had to pay \$5 to park.
  - i) M. Licari: My first question to D. McKee: is it permissible?
  - ii) R. Guell: It's part of the fine print on the documents you get that if there are any events then they have to pay.
- f) D. Hantzis: I appreciate that we've talked a little bit about the numbers for first year students. I think it would be a good idea to invite L. Maule to walk us through some of the program data. We have implemented many programs for a period of years and it helps to identify differences in the impact of these programs to make choices about resources going forward. We heard that the advising experiment resulted in a positive increase (ftof) of 3.2. Other disaggregated data shows that some programs are not contributing to student success; one had a high negative impact. It appears we continue to have two different institutional offices working on separate, sometimes duplicative efforts; it would be helpful to discuss the current and intended relationship between the University College and the Academic Affairs' Student Success Office.
  - i) M. Licari: I know the program you are citing- the LEAP program. The program had not been increasing success for several years and then last year it recorded a high positive impact. This year the impact was right back down in line with previous years, which suggests last year was the anomaly.

5) Discussion regarding Blackboard and Canvas

- a) L. Spence: Periodically we examine our OIT plan. We have advisory committees to help us. In many cases we would have been having this conversation with an advisory committee first. But we are here today because we wanted to ask you the question first. Periodically it is appropriate to establish where you are going in the future. We are examining the technical and financial aspects of Blackboard and we wanted to open up the question of how to go forward with our learning management system. A number of campuses in the last few years have moved to Canvas. When we go to conferences we hear about that. Under what circumstances would we consider that it's time to look at the landscape? Either, as a campus, we are dissatisfied with Blackboard or we see enough to say we like Blackboard but Canvas appears to look better and we want to take a bigger look. We can either look further at Blackboard or go towards Canvas. We are not aware in OIT that there is rampant dissatisfaction with Blackboard by faculty. Our survey last year didn't indicate dissatisfaction. There appeared to be operator problems more than actual issues. We are looking at moving Blackboard into the Cloud. That move would not introduce any major changes in terms of functionality in the short term. If there is consensus that we want another learning management system and we don't need to be looking at Blackboard at all, then we don't need to spend more time on moving Blackboard to the Cloud.
- b) R. Guell: Most of us I think have an enormous investment in Blackboard. The payoff to change has to be significant in the immediate term, flexible in the transition process and

there has to be a sense of Blackboard being a dying entity before we would consider a move to another system.

- i) L. Spence: Similar to that, we just finished saying to faculty that we would put our grades into Blackboard. We wanted to have this conversation with you especially because this is a smaller group.
- c) S. Lamb: Some of the initiatives on Canvas are being investigated by Blackboard. Can you expand on that? Do you think those things that may be of critical value are coming down from on high in Blackboard?
  - i) L. Spence: That's what we want to give you a flavor of. From some of the materials we've seen, if you're not a consistent user or new user of learning management systems, Canvas has an ease of use for it. But if you need flexibility, Blackboard stands up better than Canvas.
  - ii) S. Lamb: I wanted to echo what R. Guell said.
- d) C. MacDonald: We have already been through this when we moved from WebCT. I'm not alone among the faculty in being wary of this. There are lingering feelings as you can tell. Faculty are extremely invested in Blackboard right now. When we are being asked to do more things here, this is a thousand more things.
- e) R. Guell: If you are not prepared to buy both platforms, for the period of time a course redo would be part of the pedagogical work, if I changed my courses every 4 years I would have to do both systems. Except I'd have to learn new software. I need a really big leap to move, and time.
- f) L. Spence: S. Lamb, to your point, there are some things out there, there are upgrades. In between we will have a little bit of each platform and where Blackboard is going from today into the future. If you guys saw a little bit of each one, would you want one over the other? Sitting here I think I know which one you want but we want to show you an alternative.
- g) D. Hantzis: I am a huge user of Blackboard. I think I write on the surveys quite a bit about things it can't do. There are things that seem to make sense as functions, but are not available. I call Kristie and she tells me if something can be done and if it might be able to be done in the future. I've been using Canvas on a statewide committee through IUPUI. I believe part of its appeal is that it comes from the open source community.
  - i) L. Spence: Canvas is not an open source, but it's interfaced.
- h) D. Hantzis: Blackboard is not designed for people who don't know how to use it. I don't know that we know how invested everyone is in Blackboard.
  - i) L. Spence: We don't have a large uprising with changing Blackboard.
  - j) T. Hawkins: How often do you survey faculty?
- k) L. Spence: We have instructional tools, advisory committees, and have been in rooms with all of you at some point in the spring. Our first customer satisfaction survey was in Spring 2015 and we are about to have a second one. People would have had a reason to talk about these things.
- l) K. Bigler: As you see with this demonstration of Canvas, there is a different look and feel to Blackboard, but it runs about the same.
  - i) R. Guell: Is there a way to import from Word to quiz questions?
  - ii) K. Bigler: I feel confident in saying yes, but I have not tried that.
  - iii) C. MacDonald: Can you grade within discussions?
  - iv) K. Bigler: I will show you the grades.

- v) T. Hawkins: Is there a course here we can look at?
- vi) K. Bigler: This is a very basic set up. Anyone can sign up for a look at how it works.
- vii) R. Guell: Grade columns you would make in Excel would transfer?
- viii) K. Bigler: I would have to try that.
- ix) D. Hantzis: What do they do for blogs? Do they have an interface?
- x) K. Bigler: The grader tool is the same.
- xi) R. Guell: Would you have to do magic like you did for Blackboard for portal grade entry?
- xii) K. Bigler: Yes. The student view of Canvas is similar to instructor view.
- xiii) R. Guell: Has someone fallen in love with Canvas on campus?
- xiv) K. Bigler: Not necessarily. This is the other leader which is why we chose to look at it.
- xv) L. Spence: There is a list of universities that use it.
- xvi) R. Guell: A professor who was used to Canvas at their previous institution and then came here and had to use Blackboard would be a better salesperson for Canvas.
- xvii) L. Spence: I've heard at New Faculty Orientation, don't change Blackboard because I've got it figured out, but if you do change it, change it to Canvas because I've used it before.
- xviii) T. Hawkins: I don't see the payoff within the short time we've discussed it.
- xix) S. Lamb: I've not heard a word from colleagues.
- xx) L. Spence: Purdue has done a yearlong study with a pilot of Canvas. Their question was whether or not to move to Canvas or Blackboard. They have done a full evaluation and have chosen to stay with Blackboard.
- xxi) B. Kilp: In my field there are two basic programs that are well used. One is like Blackboard and it's complicated, but if you've mastered it, you wouldn't want to change. The other is easier to use, but if you were going to use it on a big scale, you would want the other. Same thing here. Some colleagues just use it to post grades. This would be perfect for them. However, if I'm teaching two online classes and constantly going in deeper and deeper, if you say we're going to change, I would probably quit. I would have to completely rethink my course. I would say I agree with T. Hawkins.
- xxii) S. Lamb: I would say I am a medium user. The Blackboard functions that I need are not that hard to master. I don't see losing a system that is functional for these people. I certainly don't see investing the time.
- xxiii) L. Phillips: It is maddening to me if we see this from a student perspective. It cuts away too much by streamlining the student experience.
- m) D. Hantzis: What's the timeline? Blackboard has put us on hold for things that need to change.
  - i) K. Bigler: Until I actually see it in a release note, I'm hesitant. We are doing things here on campus that should improve your experience within a year or two.
  - ii) L. Spence: They are putting energy into really improving what's already there. They've got a new user interface that is not yet ready for use. That's where most of their energy is going.
- n) R. Guell: Is there a gigantic cost difference?
  - i) L. Spence: Not when you look at the Cloud cost. The initial numbers look about the same. We will be doing another survey this fall. We will ask questions about tools

and service. We are developing the questions now and if there are questions we need to look for that are shaped around what we have gone over today.

- o) S. Lamb: I think you have chosen a very appropriate approach to investigating this.
- 6) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:
- a) AAC (C. MacDonald): Chair: Cindy Crowder; Vice Chair: Brian Bunnett; Secretary: James Gustafson. They reviewed their charges and had questions about the staffing report and what format we want. And whether they need to continue from what they had last year or start over. The last staffing report we got was from last August.
    - i) T. Hawkins: How far are they on progress?
    - ii) C. MacDonald: I'm not sure. Brian seemed to have something in his hands.
    - iii) R. Guell: When I talked to K. Wilkinson last year, she seemed to have it completed. It might be in her hands.
  - b) AEC (S. Lamb): They have met, officers were elected. Chair: Brendan Corcoran; Vice Chair: Kira Enriquez; Secretary: Melissa Gustafson. The website needs to be updated and their report. They were concerned as to whether the application process was going online versus hard copy, but it says it is online on the website.
  - c) CAAC (B. Kilp): Chair: SAMy Anderson; Vice Chair: Larry Rosenhein; Secretary: David Malooley; Secretary-in-training: Michael Deem. They have met. They had Engineering Degree discussion and voted on Multidisciplinary Studies today.
  - d) FAC (D. Hantzis): We have our second meeting tomorrow. We meet every other Wednesday at 8:15 a.m. Chair: Lindsey Eberman; Vice Chair: Barbara Eversole; Secretary: Bridget Roberts-Pittman. B. Eversole will chair PTOC. We review charges tomorrow.
  - e) FEBC (J. Conant): Chair: Jin Park; Vice Chair: Andrea Arrington; Secretary: Kevin Bolinger. We will meet every other Wednesday.
  - f) GC (L. Phillips): Chair: Steve Aldrich; Vice Chair: Liz O'Laughlin; Secretary: Alvaro Gurovich. They have met twice. They have revised their program review document. COT is up for review this year and wanted us to give them the OK to use the new procedures. I just got this this morning. They want us to agree fairly quickly.
    - i) D. Hantzis: Are these part of the Bylaws of CGPS?
    - ii) T. Hawkins: Did we ever approve GC procedures? I'm comfortable giving them the go-ahead.
    - iii) L. Brown: But GC is a committee of the Faculty Senate. For example, the CAS Faculty Council is not a committee of the Senate. We do not have purview of the CAS Faculty Council, but we do the GC.
    - iv) C. MacDonald: The relationship is unique. There is nothing else on campus you can compare this to.
    - v) R. Guell: The only thing that is roughly parallel is approving the CAPS manual at the Senate level.
    - vi) S. Lamb: I know for years we thought the GC was acting independently of the Senate and there was a concern about that.
    - vii) L. Phillips: There has been a concern for the checkout process for graduate students—there's been some push back on campus and the GC is getting our feedback—if the Dean of CGPS can oversee or make the decision in the departments. They want to know how much authority the Dean of CGPS has.

- viii) D. Hantzis: The Dean of CGPS can't tell another college what to do.
- ix) T. Hawkins: It is best if we discuss it at our next Exec in two weeks and go from there.
- g) SAC (R. Guell): Chair: Jessica Nelson; Vice Chair: Nancy Nichols-Pethick; Secretary: Steve Hardin. They will meet one Monday a month unless they need to meet more often. SAC rarely has anything substantive that takes more than that, but they this body wants a real response to the advising report they will meet more often.
- h) URC (L. Brown): Chair: Anthony Walker; Vice Chair: Winnie Ko; Secretary: Cathy Thomas. Proposals are due the first Monday of October and they will start meeting to make decisions in late October.

7) Adjournment: 5:17 p.m.