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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

October 6, 2015

3:30 pm, HMSU 227

Final Minutes

Members Present: C. MacDonald, T. Hawkins, L. Brown, E. Hampton, D. Hantzis, S. Lamb, J. Conant, C. Paterson

Members Absent: V. Sheets

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley

Guests: B. Yousif, C. Hanson, R. Fitch, R. McGivern

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Bradley: None.
	2. Provost M. Licari: The strategic plan development process has begun. We had a Steering committee meeting a couple of weeks ago. Last week, I met with the chairs of the Key Questions subcommittees. The Strategic Plan webpage is taking shape. Technically, it is set up, but there’s not much in it yet. What you will find right now is the rosters of membership for all of the committees, templates for the progress reports due in November and final reports due in January, along with instructions. The Strategic Plan timeline is also on the website. On the timeline are dates and times for town hall meetings, key constituency meetings, and other steps in the process that will occur in the spring once the Key Questions subcommittees are done. Their work will be used to craft the language for the goals and benchmarks. We will need a lot of help in the spring. I encourage you to look at these documents and encourage your colleagues to look at the website as well. I would like to maximize participation. If you know someone who wishes to be involved in some way, please let me know. There are opportunities. That where we are in terms of that process. As progress reports come in from the Key Questions subcommittees, they will be put up on the website. Everything will be there.
		1. C. Paterson: Regarding the implementation, I see it will be October of next year. What period of time is it slated to cover?
	3. M. Licari: We haven’t specifically discussed that yet. There is some mixed thinking about that. If you say it’s a “five-year plan” then you get a five-year plan. It puts boundaries on goals and benchmarks that you might not want. Our current Strategic Plan was built to have some flexibility. We don’t want set periods.

1. Chair Report:
	1. C. MacDonald: I have some positive news. As of yesterday, we have an e-mail address for the Office of the Faculty Senate so that as people rotate out of the Chair and Administrative Assistant seats, communication won’t be lost. Tied to that, per V. Sheets’ request, we have established a Faculty Senate *Qualtrics* account. This will also be helpful as people rotate in and out of positions.
	2. We have a new Temporary Faculty Advocate: Malissa Muyumba. Hopefully she will be able to join us at the Faculty Senate meeting next Thursday.
	3. You may remember at one of the Senate meetings this year a senator asked that we consider surveying our faculty about issues that the Senate should address. I have been thinking about that a lot. I would like to create a survey that would request feedback about process changes, what works, and the level of faculty engagement with governance. I want to know what faculty would like their involvement to be and what types of barriers there might be to their participation. I am looking for your blessing on this. Because of my interest in leadership issues, I think there might also be potential for scholarship as well.
		1. S. Lamb: It is interesting how many people who serve on the Senate have little acquaintance with the Handbook. There’s almost a complete void.
			1. C. MacDonald: I can certainly put in a question about “when was the last time you referenced the Handbook?”
		2. S. Lamb: Our newer deans have become more acquainted with the Handbook than those in years past.
		3. C. Paterson: I had reason to turn to it recently. I think it has a lot to do with how it was revised last year.
			1. C. MacDonald: I hope so.
		4. S. Lamb: And with the President’s attitude toward the Handbook. It is different from the attitude held by the former president. While D. Bradley has seen fit to change some things, he has also worked with it.
2. Approval of Minutes of September 29, 2015
	1. Motion to approve as amended (D. Hantzis, L. Brown ) Vote: 8-0-0
3. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. L. Brown: I appreciate Dr. Hammen’s remarks to the Executive Committee last week, and I understand that the IRB has an increased administrative workload.  However, I am concerned about her comments regarding treating our students as a protected population although this is not required under federal guidelines.  Who made this decision?  Is it an IRB decision?  I don’t believe we have ever had this discussion as an institution.  I have talked with several faculty from more than one department who have experienced push back from the IRB because they use their students in educational research even though they have included safeguards for their students; e.g., ensuring that their grade in the class is not affected by their participation or non-participation in the study. The very high level of scrutiny for exempt studies should be examined.  Since the vast majority of studies making their way to the IRB are exempt, policy changes regarding exempt studies could significantly reduce the workload of the IRB.
		1. i) D. Hantzis: It is still a thorough approval of exempt proposals. I wonder where the money goes from Vincennes and Rose-Hulman. They pay us to review some of their proposals for their reviews.
		2. C. Paterson: I have served on two IRB boards – ISU’s IRB, as a faculty member, and IU’s Biomedical IRB, as a community member. My experience on each was very different and probably reflects the culture of each institution. With IU’s board we focused on medical treatment interventions and their associated risks – there was emphasis on whether or not a cancer medication was reasonably safe to use. My experience with ISU was one that seemed to focus on psychological ramifications of surveys. In both cases we complied with the same federal guidelines for IRB. In the CITI training, which all researchers must complete prior to being approved to conduct a study, that there is a part devoted to dual relationships and specifically deals with students enrolled in a faculty member’s course. I recall that while these situations are not prohibited, they are scrutinized for the possibility of coercion.
		3. L. Brown: Sure, so that grades are not affected. I have heard from several different departments. They are putting those safeguards in place yet still getting pushback from IRB.
		4. E. Hampton: This merits close conversations. IRB has no right to designate any group as protected. They have the right to look at them more carefully. By researching your own students, you are putting yourself in an ethical dilemma.
			1. D. Hantzis: If that’s what they are doing.
			2. J. Conant: It should not take six months to get results. There needs to be more discretion exercised.
	2. D. Hantzis: I was looking at current catalog copy and, by way of clean up, some of the catalog text displayed on department web pages still uses “General Education program” instead of Foundational Studies program, which is very out of date. Can a search/replace be accomplished?
	3. D. Hantzis: Also, the online 2015-2016 UG Catalog front material includes "ISU has six academic divisions, each headed by a dean who reports to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The divisions include the Colleges of Arts and Sciences; Business; Education; Health and Human Services; Technology; and the College of Graduate and Professional Studies."  The University College is missing, although this is its third year.
	4. D. Hantzis: I looked again for the Direct Hire procedure document. I mentioned in August that it was not on the AA website any longer (since it was revised by Senate). I looked at the University Procedures list at the Handbook site and at faculty resources and personnel procedures sections on the AA website. Noncompetitive hire (i.e. direct hire) is mentioned in the Handbook now and we need to be able to point to the procedures, as revised.
	5. D. Hantzis: Finally, I am working in Normal Hall this semester and I am wondering why there is only one entrance to the building. The ground floor entrance and 2nd floor entrance, both newly restored and facing the quad, are locked against entry. The ground floor doors are labeled "exit only" even though the reception desk on that floor has a line of sight to the south (quad) and east entrance. The back door is emergency exit only (though it used to be open). Students are frustrated after walking up the beautifully rebuilt staircase. I am concerned about a building as busy as Normal Hall offering only one entrance for no obvious reason. I'm wondering about security issues in a building with only one entrance to block.
	6. C. MacDonald: Are we going to have a strict curtailment of the amount of e-mail that can be retained and/or archived?
		1. M. Licari: No, nothing is finalized yet. The President’s Cabinet has been discussing this, but we can’t agree.
		2. C. MacDonald: Please don’t do that to us. We need to keep a lot of our email as long as we can
		3. M. Licari: A lot of the potential solutions are something along the lines of tagging a folder if you want to keep e-mails. Anything not tagged would be flushed after a short period of time. We all have e-mail we need to keep. I get volumes of e-mail in short periods of time, but I need to preserve some of them, because they reflect a decision I made. There will be a method for preserving this material. We will need to manage our own e-mail.
	7. C. MacDonald: A faculty member came to me regarding a grievance filed against her in May by a student. Our policy states that faculty be notified within ten days if it goes forward. This student hired a lawyer, but to date the faculty has not been notified about this complaint. She has e-mailed K. Butwin without response. It is now October.
		1. M. Licari: Who else has she e-mailed?
		2. C. MacDonald: A. Robinson and C. Brown.
		3. M. Licari: Where is the complaint?
		4. C. MacDonald: I can give you details after the meeting. I’m concerned that we have a policy that is not being followed. Respondents should at least know if the complaint is going to be pursued.
			1. S. Lamb: Have you seen how explicit the policy is?
			2. C. MacDonald: I have reviewed the policy within the month and it is pretty clear. I understand that once lawyers come in the policy stops and another begins. If the policy is in play, that needs to be acknowledged. If not, the individual needs to know.
			3. S. Lamb: I don’t recall any situation where the court process changed things.
	8. J. Conant: A faculty member came to me with concerns with Brother Jed in regards to Title IX. The faculty member felt it was odd that Jed could say things to students that would get a member of the ISU community into trouble. What do our policies say in regard to speech? It doesn’t seem right to allow people to come onto campus to say things to our students that we don’t allow our students to say.
		1. M. Licari: The president has sent an e-mail about this. Visitors should be held to the same standard of decorum that ISU members are held to. It is strange. But, we need to be very careful when we start considering restricting speech. That said, there is useful speech and useless speech. When Brother Jed is standing there and calling them out, that crosses the line. That’s where it needs to stop.
		2. D. Hantzis: Many of my 70 freshmen check their schedules to see if they can go listen to him. They have asked in my class why he is allowed to do this. What I was told is that Jed’s language is not directed at “you” personally but at the “group”. There is a crowd, and the people are there voluntarily.
			1. L. Brown: I am not there voluntarily when I walk past them. I think it is distressing for young women to be walking past them. To have that happen on the campus is not acceptable.
			2. C. Paterson: I know very few people who pay a fee to be part of a community and who then find themselves subjected to such ridiculous statements. At the end of the day, I would much rather have my students be thinking about biomedical ethics. They should be engaged in academic efforts and not this.
			3. S. Lamb: I think the greatest damage is done when too much attention is brought to it. We need to “walk on by” as the song says. It lends credence, the more attention you bring to this show. I wouldn’t give it any more attention.
			4. J. Conant: I’m a big freedom of speech supporter. We have embraced the responsibility of teaching our students to express themselves with civility. I am NOT so much concerned with what’s being said as I am with the incivility of how it's being said.  We are trying to teach our students to conduct political discourse with civility.
			5. S. Lamb: When you show them the opposite, doesn’t the gentleman make a fool of himself?
			6. T. Hawkins: It is important to know that this group went to DePauw University for the first time last week. There was a major campus disturbance. A couple of students and faculty members had to be restrained. The police had to be called in. It has been a relatively benign experience at ISU, but this doesn’t mean it won’t change in the future.
			7. E. Hampton: Can we put him somewhere else?
4. CAAC Item: Change to CAPS Manual
	1. Motion to approve CAAC proposal, as amended (T. Hawkins, L. Brown): Vote: 8-0-0
	2. C. MacDonald: This comes from last year. I believe it was approved by CAAC last September.
		1. R. McGivern: We discussed it when S. Lamb was chair, so I think it’s older than that.
	3. R. McGivern: I served on CAAC about three-years ago. At that time H. Hudson introduced a document with similar language to the committee and it had evolved since then. It is a revision. It allows the Executive Committee to expedite lesser changes to move things faster through the pipeline. It still needs revisions, because it talks about Foundational Studies and eight semesters rather than seven. We need to compare it to Curriculog. Since the university is a living entity, the document is going to have to be updated.
		1. C. MacDonald: We can send CAAC that charge.
		2. E. Hampton: I am trying to understand the new language. Is this an exception to the boundaries or an exception from full review from the governance bodies?
			1. R. McGivern: We do have cases where we vote immediately. This would then give EXEC the opportunity to vote immediately for minor changes. The chair would announce it. A member could recall an item if necessary.
		3. D. Hantzis: What is the change? Is it in policy or procedure? I didn’t understand the effort to exclude six hours of Foundational Studies. What is the rationale?
			1. R. McGivern: I don’t know it that well.
			2. L. Brown: I think we are talking about change with credits.
			3. D. Hantzis: I see that but, they are changing credit hours.
			4. S. Lamb: This was discussed and championed by R. Guell. My memory tells me that the upper level UDIEs were excluded from being counted in the major because no one has ever taken the UDIEs when transferring. When students take the UDIEs, they are seniors. The lower-level courses should be counted. Even the president bowed to that way of thinking.
			5. D. Hantzis: The proposal excludes the upper level UDIE and also English 305. It basically eliminates the upper-level courses, even if they are required towards your major.
			6. C. MacDonald: It benefits students who change majors. By the time they take the upper-level UDIEs they hopefully will be graduating in that major.
		4. C. Paterson: How many programs currently require 80 credits? Do we have any programs in excess of 80?
			* 1. D. Hantzis: Yes. We reviewed that issue in Senate in the spring.
				2. C. MacDonald: It is fewer than it used to be.
				3. R. McGivern: Fewer are exempt in part, because some are moving to a BFA degree. Yes, there are some because of the nature of the program and accreditation. It is beyond our control.
		5. D. Hantzis: I would like to recommend some revisions to the language. Can we replace “deciding on” in line three with “choosing”? Can we replace “whether” in line eight with “that”?
5. Proposal for Guidelines for Awarding BA and BS degrees in CAS
	1. Motion to approve the proposed guidelines (L. Brown, S. Lamb): Vote: 8-0-0
	2. C. Hanson: This is a proposal that has been discussed within the College of Arts and Sciences for a long time. Most of the degrees awarded are Bachelor of Science, unless you are a Language major. We are proposing different guidelines. Every department will submit a proposal regarding the degree they intend to award based on the set of guidelines we have established. The process will follow normal curricular channels. October 21, 2016 is the effective date.
		1. C. Paterson: I was reading about the deadline. We have passed the deadline in the proposal.
		2. C. MacDonald: The attached letter from the dean addresses that. It would go into effect in 2016.
	3. D. Hantzis: I think there were three of these efforts while I was Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences. My concern was that the university had a definition of degrees that was different from the college. The other colleges only say that they issue baccalaureate degrees. However, I checked, and we have no university definition of degrees. So, I see no obstacle in approving this. The College of Arts and Sciences can do this. It makes a lot of sense. Previous efforts foundered, because our definitions were too specific.
	4. C. Hanson: One of our challenges was at the department level. They have primary expertise on how their degree should be defined.
	5. D. Hantzis: That’s where I disagree. I’m a little troubled that the University has not taken this responsibility.
	6. B. Yousif: We asked S. Powers if the university should be included in this discussion. She did not want to go there. She said proceed.
	7. E. Hampton: What happens to the twelve credits in the existing degree?
	8. R. Fitch: Every program will be analyzed and go through a review process. The only department that will be significantly impacted is Criminology.
	9. B. Yousif: The controversy was over what are you—science, social studies, or humanities. Different curricula have different designations. We just want them to make a choice.
	10. J. Conant: You have established no criteria or standards on how they will be judged. What do our peer institutions do?
	11. E. Hampton: Is it one or the other?
	12. C. MacDonald: Departments will have to make their case.
	13. J. Conant: There will have to be guidelines. We don’t make promotions this way.
	14. R. Fitch: The difficulty with that analogy is that it makes sense to have specific guidelines for the promotion and tenure process. But the College of Arts and Sciences is so large, it’s hard to make a blanket determination.
	15. J. Conant: You’re wanting us to make a decision.
	16. R. Fitch: They will have to provide a rationale whether it’s a BA or BS.
	17. B. Yousif: That’s what we do with promotions.
	18. J. Conant: The way it’s written I support it, but you’re going to have a problem when departments put forward their rationales. Will you say, “It’s not enough?”
	19. C. Paterson: Regarding fine arts, music and music education, are they effected in any way by this policy?
	20. R. Fitch: No.
	21. C. Paterson: They won’t be responsible for turning in documents?
	22. J. Conant: No.
	23. L. Brown: In all of the discussions I’ve been in on, it seems like most departments have a category they will select. Really, the only time a controversy would appear is if the department wants to allow for both in the program. That will really be the only time there will be an issue.
	24. T. Hawkins: It’s what the department decides.
	25. J. Conant: And the oversight body?
	26. T. Hawkins: This proposal is a legitimate response to a real problem we have distinguishing between the BS and BA. It’s fair to ask why history majors graduate with a BS. The standard across the nation is the BA, and that should be fine.
	27. J. Conant: That’s an example that is simple and I understand. It would be perfectly rational to say we offer both the BA and BS. Somebody’s going to look at that and say there is not enough distinction drawn.
	28. D. Hantzis: I am in a department that might seriously consider offering both degrees. The department does have the final say. I think this will be a very important process. I appreciate J. Conant’s observations.
6. Liaison Reports:
	1. E. Hampton (AAC): There is a meeting tomorrow (10-7-15).
	2. C. Paterson (AEC): During the last meeting we elected officers and are planning on having one meeting in November.
	3. L. Brown (CAAC): They approved the BA and BS proposal. CAAC did not meet today but will convene next week.
	4. V. Sheets (FAC): None.
	5. S. Lamb (FEBC): The committee recently met and discussed changes to our health plan, including the increases in our health insurance costs. To me these do not seem to be substantial but rather contained within our parameters.
	6. T. Hawkins (GC): The Graduate Council did not meet last week. There is another scheduled meeting next Wednesday.
	7. D. Hantzis (SAC): The committee established regular meeting times from 11:30-1pm on Tuesdays. The first substantive meeting will be next week.
	8. J. Conant (URC): Met on 1 October and went through the review process.
7. Adjournment: 4:41PM