

#4

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

September 27, 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: President D. Bradley, Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: C. Barton, L. Eberman, B. Eversole

1) Administrative Reports:

- a) President D. Bradley: We have Homecoming this week. We have a Foundation Board and Board of Trustees meeting this week as well as all of the Homecoming events.
 - i) R. Guell: I would like to acknowledge that the President made a wise decision in regards to The Walk when he first came here.
 - ii) D. Bradley: Christmas Break dates are changing by one day. We are officially going on break December 23rd and will come back on Wednesday after the New Year. This affects this year and next year. It doesn't affect the academic calendar.
 - (1) R. Guell: That makes sense given how late grades are due. There is no way to have the Registrar get everything done before that.
 - iii) D. Bradley: I also want to note that the wife of John Hines, a development officer in the Foundation, passed away.
 - (1) S. Lamb: He is greatly appreciated in the Scott College of Business.
- b) Provost M. Licari: My student success seminar to the Board of Trustees is at 2:45 on Thursday. The Trustees' meeting is Friday afternoon. Prior to the BOT meeting on Friday is the ribbon cutting and reception for the renovation of the African American Cultural Center. It is beautiful. Stop over if you can.

2) Chair Report:

- a) T. Hawkins: We are now fully one month into the Fall Semester. I hope you are enjoying the nip in the air as much as I am.

- b) Following our 15-minute Open Discussion we will welcome C. Barton to the table to provide us with an update on Staff Benefits for the new year.
 - c) As the Standing Committees begin to work through their charges, we await major action items. With this in mind, I want to use the next couple of meetings to address a few important issues that have either been left on the table or require careful discussion:
 - i) Next week we will have Katie Butwin here. While she will address more than one topic, I have asked her to be present as we put back on the Agenda the Student Grievance Procedures that were tabled at the final Senate meeting of the spring. I would like the Senate to reconsider this in October with the intention of preempting any hypothetical executive action.
 - ii) Also on the 4th, S. Powers will join us to provide a briefing on the Positive Academic Leadership Workshop that she is holding at the end of October. This will allow us to continue our discussion on departmental leadership.
 - iii) The provost will be briefing the Trustees on Student Success this Thursday. I would like to suggest that he summarize this report to us on the 11th.
 - iv) D. Hantzis presented the Officers with some concerns about the Title IX procedures. We took them to the provost yesterday. I want to let you know that L. Reynolds will be here with us on the 18th to answer questions and concerns directly.
 - d) Our primary discussion today will concern plans to revise Promotion and Tenure guidelines. I have invited the chair of FAC, L. Eberman, and the chair of PTOC, B. Eversole, here to participate in this initial discussion.
 - e) Regarding Item #7, I hope we can provide Graduate Council with some direction today concerning their inquiries about Program Review Procedures and Online Checkout.
 - f) In other news, Susan Eley has informed me that she will not be able to serve on PTOC this year. We will need to find a replacement from HHS.
 - g) You learned from the Musings that M. Muyumba has been appointed Temporary Faculty Advocate. She will do a great job.
 - h) Finally, AAUP will be holding a campus forum on Academic Freedom on 19 October. I have been asked to participate, and I will send a notice to the Senate.
 - i) R. Guell: Will we be able to discuss the University Calendar and definitions for day, closing day, opening day, etc. with K. Butwin when she comes?
 - ii) T. Hawkins: She said she will talk to us about anything that is on the table. That particular matter is now at FAC, and I don't want us to bypass FAC. If they have something for us before Tuesday, we will consider it.
- 3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes
- a) Motion to approve as amended (D. Hantzis, L. Phillips) Vote: 9-0-0.
- 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
- a) S. Lamb: Was there any decision on the parking lot issue that I brought up last meeting? I have faculty with a night class.
 - i) M. Licari: Event parking in the garage affecting instructors who have the evening classes even if you are not going to the game.
 - ii) D. Bradley: I wouldn't be surprised if it states that in the fine print. I would guess from a practical point of view, the lot at the corner of 6th and Cherry should have

parking at that time. It is just a little further than the garage from the building. In the short term we will look into it. It may take a while to fix that.

5) Staff Benefits Update

- a) C. Barton: The wellness screenings are done. If you haven't done the tobacco form, you need to get that in. If you are using your family physician, you have until September 30. If you bring it to us, please send it in a sealed envelope.
 - i) R. Guell: Is this the year we don't take them at their word? That you don't have to just say, "I'm trying to quit?"
 - ii) C. Barton: We allow that for two years and we do call them to check up. We have had a quite a few people who have quit. We pay for 4 different prescription drugs to help people quit who have signed a cessation form.
- b) C. Barton: Wellness screenings are great – it enhances how you know what your health is. We have telephone wellness coaches available through Cigna at no charge. People can do that if they need it. Our wellness coordinator L. Clifford works out with people and assists with diet needs. We have made changes based on legislation. It caused us to change the incentive which will alleviate some of the issues we've had. There are three things you need to do: fill out the online questionnaire, take the screening, and complete tobacco form. For the first two, you will get an incentive off of the insurance premium for 2017. For an employee or employee plus children, they will get \$30 off their premium per month. If it is an employee and spouse or employee, spouse and family and both the employee and the spouse do it, they get \$50 off. We separated the employee and spouse; the change is that if the spouse does not do it, then you lose the \$20 off, but the employee will still get the \$30 off the premium if the employee does it.
- c) C. Barton: There is a change in the tobacco surcharge: in 2016 the surcharge was \$50 whether the employee or the spouse, or both, was the user. In 2017, if the employee is user, that's \$50 and if the spouse is, it's an extra \$50. If both employee and spouse are tobacco users, the surcharge is \$100. I presented this in Staff Council and haven't heard much since.
- d) C. Barton: There have been some data entry issues regarding the numbers in the One Community. The scores may be off so you should check those.
 - i) B. Kilp: Mine was way off and they haven't changed it.
 - ii) C. Barton: Please email me and I will handle it.
- e) R. Guell: The letter for the timing of the wellness check came after I had made appointments with my doctor. For next year, could we get more advance notice so we can schedule with our doctor?
 - i) C. Barton: We can try, but our problem is vendor availability and room availability and we don't always know that far in advance.
- f) L. Phillips: Do we have control over who does this work? I have heard reports that there was a lack of professionalism with some of the screeners. For example, there was a mistake made, there was some laughing behind the screen and the affected individual was sitting right there.
 - i) C. Barton: Please email me with any issues. We have people all over the Midwest come in. Union Health Services came in this year. There is one individual screener who we don't want to have come back. If a screener is not doing what was expected, let me know the details and I will follow up with it.

- ii) L. Phillips: The follow-up individuals may not be qualified. One person who had high cholesterol was told to stop eating donuts. The person does not eat donuts.
- iii) C. Barton: We've talked about better privacy. If you have any ideas, please let me know and if anything went wrong, I would like to know.
- g) C. MacDonald: I had a doctor's appointment before my screening, so it felt silly to have this less qualified person tell me stuff that I already know.
- i) C. Barton: You don't have to go to the counseling after. The target is those who have not been to the doctor in 20 years.

6) P&T Discussion

- a) T. Hawkins: For a successful outcome, we need to ensure that those who will be investing significant time and energy in the process have a clear understanding of our primary goals. As I understand it, the provost would like us to begin with a small ad hoc group. They will be charged with producing a first draft which will then go to FAC for review/revisions. This is intended to help concentrate FAC's debate. FAC will then provide Exec with a second iteration, and we will go from there.

C. MacDonald and I were to have been part of the initial group. However, we agreed with the provost that it would be best to include the chair of FAC from the beginning to facilitate the shift from the first to the second round of discussions. We also agreed that it would be best for the process if the Senate chair were not so closely invested in a particular document. Therefore, I will be stepping back.

What are the primary goals? That is what I would like to get on the table now. The Administration argues that the university guidelines are too generic and that they should provide more clarity about what ISU considers important: high quality teaching, alternative approaches to scholarship, meaningful service. College guidelines would not disappear, but they would be more closely informed by the University expectations.

- b) D. Hantzis: I hope we might also use this opportunity to address gaps in our standards. This became more obvious with the P&T document from CAS. The major change in that document was the guidelines for annual review of pre-tenure professors. It is an improvement, but the CAS has no guidelines at the college level for the annual review of lecturers or instructors. There were no notes about lecturers or instructors whatsoever. I agree with D. Bradley, that we need to have actual guidelines in the Handbook for each category and type of review. We have now, for 5 years, evaluated instructors with no guidelines. I find this unconscionable. If we can, we should at least ask FAC to consider this. Many universities have RPT guidelines: Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, so annual reviews are addressed specifically.
- c) R. Guell: In my experience, having my foot in both a 3-3 College and a 4-4 College that there is quite a bit of apprehension in the 3-3 College that it will soon become a 4-4 College. And in the 4-4 College, there is anger. There is a difference in workload, at least in terms of the number of sections. Having an identical expectation at the university level for the same rank of the professoriate is a problem. We either have to align the expectations with the work, or we need to make equitable the expectations.
- i) S. Lamb: The vector I thought we had agreed upon was the student-faculty ratio.

- ii) D. Bradley: That's for departments.
- iii) S. Lamb: It's not for individuals. The individual does not have a great deal of control over it, and there are rewards and the student success plans talk of these goals. We take every opportunity there is to ensure a student's progress is not stopped by not having a seat. We do not turn away students. If there is inadequate spacing in a room, we move rooms. I've heard 100 times that it is up to the deans. If the deans can achieve this goal of satisfying the student's demand with 3 classes rather than 4, then do so.
- iv) R. Guell: That message may not be communicated to deans. Deans are communicating to chairpersons that they do not have the flexibility.
- v) C. MacDonald: My chair feels like she does not have flexibility.
- vi) D. Bradley: This discussion can be sent to the task force. We are not going to solve this in this meeting.
- vii) T. Hawkins: I want to make sure the task force has a sense of what the common issues/concerns are.
- viii) D. Bradley: Clearly, the faculty often has some role to play in how many courses have to be taught. They determine things like complexity of the curriculum.
- ix) C. MacDonald: Sometimes that is true and sometimes that is not.
- x) M. Licari: I communicated with the deans that teaching load need to satisfy student demand. But, you have curriculum decisions that departments make that can be adjusted, you have pedagogical decisions that departments or individual faculty make which will tilt you to smaller classes, or more complicated curriculum. If you can satisfy student demand and go from a 4-4 to 3-3 load, it is fine.
- xi) R. Guell: In my experience, if my numbers of BSW or MSW students were low that semester, I would not be allowed the flexibility to combine the courses. They would tell me I have to split it.
- xii) L. Eberman: I feel confident the ad hoc group can embrace quality teaching and promote a change in culture. The evaluation process is part of the error here. We know that the system is rigged to congratulate the scholar. We know that we are to participate in community engagement. Do we think that belongs in the Handbook?
- xiii) R. Guell: What is the coin of the realm? Whatever it is, part of the discussion has to give some flexibility to departments to broaden what is in the counted stuff.
- xiv) M. Licari: D. Hantzis' comments were important to serve as establishing faculty in an ongoing process. That will begin to address the cultural issues. You can't legislate culture unless it becomes a routine thing the university does.
- xv) R. Guell: And how difficult is it going to be to change the culture?
- xvi) S. Lamb: I appreciate you saying there will be flexibility in the department, but one size does not fit all. In SCOB, how are we to achieve the 3 courses? We do it by having a common core; everyone has to take a set of courses. In Arts and Sciences it is not the same. You have to look at the specifics of each college. I'm hesitant on jumping on board on changing the research bent. I agree we must broaden it, but I do not feel we should deemphasize it.
- xvii) L. Phillips: We have the ad hoc committee drafting something for FAC: C. MacDonald, S. Powers, B. Smith, L. Eberman. So it will start the process.
- xviii) D. Bradley: Our P&T documents need to be aligned with the mission, vision, and values of the institution. There is very little doubt when you look at teaching and

- service, the importance of each varies depending on the level you are at—department, college, university. I would say in general, the university level should have a lot to say about teaching and how it's evaluated. Probably only a little bit to say about research and how it's evaluated. Service is somewhere in the middle. I would suggest structuring it that way.
- xix) D. Bradley: The culture piece: I agree with L. Eberman. I don't know how to do that other than to say that we go to a quantitative process. In a simplistic world, you say there's 15 total points and you get points in each of the 3 areas. I think that is one of the big things the committee has to deal with. How can we be sure that teaching is given its fair share in the process?
- xx) D. Hantzis: The commitment of faculty to research and service does not appear except 305, which defines hiring and review processes. I asked last year, that we do as D. Bradley said and make sure there is an alignment between the work we are expected to do (section 310) and what we are being evaluated on. The first phrase in 310, Faculty Duties and Responsibilities, defines teaching load. We all know it's not the standard teaching load, but I hope that we are able to look at section 310 and something is there about my job duties involving research and service if I'm being evaluated on it.
- xxi) R. Guell: In terms of teaching with a university level measure, I am concerned that what is done in Social Work is different from what is done in Economics, which is even more different than what is done in Music. There needs to be some kind of flexibility.
- xxii) D. Bradley: I didn't mean to that level. The value between the two is what I meant. The instruments by which you evaluate should be consistent.
- xxiii) R. Guell: If there is a point system, we need to decide if there are mandatory contributions.
- xxiv) D. Bradley: That is particularly true in the interim. The deans, provost, and this body need to ensure that the collective will is being taken into consideration.
- d) L. Eberman: Do you see community engagement tied between the 3 sections or do you see it as a 4th section?
- i) D. Bradley: I don't think it matters.
- ii) L. Eberman: It matters to how people provide their evidence.
- iii) D. Bradley: Teaching, research, and service are not the only three. If we want to further break into categories, it allows for more opportunity.
- iv) M. Licari: We know a lot of faculty are blending teaching and research—they might not have two entirely separate categories.
- v) R. Guell: Community engagement should be embedded in the three. Are we comfortable with a notion that when we have the three and you embed your community service, then you can say that this person is a great person even though they don't do a lot of service? They should be embedded in the three.
- vi) S. Lamb: What amuses me is how similar this is becoming to performance based pay under the Moore years. We had scores in each of the three areas, and the only thing you haven't mentioned is that individuals could choose what categories they wanted to weight.

- vii) D. Bradley: This has more to do with retention and promotion. That we need to do something with those promotions to make failure less of a catastrophe. There should be less effort for the application.
- viii) L. Eberman: Chairs and deans should be encouraging their faculty to go up to full if they are eligible. Most of the faculty, particularly women, are waiting for someone to tell them.
- ix) C. MacDonald: I had thirteen years worth of materials to summarize before I went up for full.
- x) D. Bradley: From my perspective, I am not particularly interested in what someone was doing thirteen years ago.

7) Graduate Council Discussion

- a) T. Hawkins: Regarding the inquiries here, what should L. Phillips tell Grad Council?
- b) L. Phillips. Let me recap. There are two issues: revisions to grad program review and who should bear the onus of graduation check-out. Can they proceed with their revisions to the procedures for grad program review? I didn't see anything as problematic. I think it's more of a clean-up and clarification.
- c) T. Hawkins: I don't think we need to send their procedures to Senate.
- d) D. Hantzis: I disagree with the logic used to underwrite the notion-I don't think graduate faculty have three deans. The Graduate College houses programs, not faculty. Deans certify degrees. Faculty do not certify degrees. I believe deans can establish a process. I am uncertain why there has to be a complex check-out. Are they not on MySAM?
 - i) L. Phillips: They are not.
 - ii) D. Hantzis: The way it works now is I submit a petition and then it goes into the record and then it is there.
 - iii) C. MacDonald: We cannot do that yet with grad programs. What will happen is the grad dean has had to check out everyone individually. It is better for this to be decentralized back to the department.
 - iv) L. Phillips: Can the dean issue directives about who in departments should do the checkout?
 - v) R. Guell: I went to the training. Someone in the department must do it. It might be that someone else might be charged with doing it in the department other than the chair or the program director.
 - vi) D. Hantzis: The department should decide how the workload is distributed.
 - vii) L. Phillips: Could an admin do it under the direction of the program director?
 - viii) R. Guell: An admin cannot make decisions about exceptions to programs, they do not have the credentials. An admin could help you gather data, but the faculty needs to make any decisions.

8) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:

- a) AAC (C. MacDonald): Has not met since the last meeting.
- b) AEC (S. Lamb): I have not received any memos from them.
- c) CAAC (B. Kilp): Will meet next Tuesday.
- d) FAC (D. Hantzis): We meet tomorrow at 8:15 and will be handling the suggested revisions.
- e) FEBC (J. Conant): Meets tomorrow.

- f) GC (L. Phillips): We haven't met and we will meet October 5th.
 - g) SAC (R. Guell): We met and surveyed the charges and started to get information on last year's SAC review on the Advising Task Force report and if there is anything for SAC/FAC to do in a positive way for advising.
 - h) URC (L. Brown): We are meeting on Friday to learn about the rubrics for evaluating the grant applications.
- 9) Adjournment: 4:52 p.m.