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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

October 13, 2015

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Draft Minutes

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

Members Absent: None

Ex-Officio Present: D. Bradley, Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: R. Guell

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Bradley:
      1. I missed the meeting last week to go to a presentation for the Regional Cities Initiative. We are part of a proposal for a $42 million project put together by Vigo, Knox and Sullivan counties. It asks for about $8 million from the state. $2 million of that would go towards the restoration or remodeling of the ICON building to become a shared work/living space. We will have an answer from the state by the middle of December. One advantage we have is that our proposal is so small compared to the other regional proposals. I don’t know what, if any, official role ISU would play with the building. We would just as soon hand the deed over. It would be best for everyone if the building became something like The Deming.
      2. This is Homecoming week. I hope that you all are able to participate in some of the activities—the parade, tent city, and the game.
      3. We have a Foundation Board meeting at the same time as the Senate meeting this week. There is a lot of overlap this year.
   2. Provost M. Licari:
      1. I just have a reminder for those who weren’t here last week. We are moving forward with the Strategic Planning process. If you would like to be involved, let me know. In the spring, make sure to get your colleagues and yourselves to attend all of the campus-wide meetings that we will be having as we work through the goals and benchmarks. We are looking for maximum participation. The Strategic Plan 2016 website has the dates and times for the major meetings. In particular, the last week in January there will be a campus meeting, a steering-committee meeting, and key-question subcommittee meetings.
      2. C. MacDonald: We will put this information in the Musings this week as well.
2. Chair Report:
   1. C. MacDonald: Thank you V. Sheets for your feedback about the faculty survey. Part of this data will be useful to us as feedback. It will also be helpful to me as research data. It will likely take a while to get the survey up.
      1. M. Licari: I have had some discussions about the IRB and will do what I can to speed things up. They are putting a lot of work on themselves. Hopefully we will make some progress.
      2. C. MacDonald: Terrific, thank you.
3. Approval of Minutes
   1. Motion to approve as amended. (S. Lamb, T. Hawkins) Vote: 8-0-1
4. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. S. Lamb: What is the final day that individuals can complete the *It’s on Blue* report?
      1. D. Bradley: There is no final date. It depends when you want your pay raise. There are only a handful of faculty who have yet to do it. We are very close to full participation. Most of the rest are adjuncts and instructors. The system keeps names for people who are active one semester and not the next. We haven’t gotten to the point where we discuss people who refuse to participate.
         1. C. Paterson: And for students?
         2. D. Bradley: It’s very close. There are many more of them, of course. The real test will be when pre-registration begins. It’s high among freshmen. Some who have not done it do not plan to be here next year because they are graduating. In general, it has gone pretty well.
   2. T. Hawkins: The news about the searches this year has been going around campus. Dan, could you give us your thoughts?
      1. D. Bradley: We ended up with twenty-four more FTEs than we expected to have.
         1. C. MacDonald: We hired forty last year. We got more students this year.
      2. D. Bradley: What I approved was twenty-four fewer F-T positions than we have. We need to figure this out before we move ahead. We can’t add more than a million dollars to the instructional budget without a plan. The positions just appeared without a plan for where those positions go.
         1. J. Conant: How did that happen?
         2. R. Guell: J. Maynard approved positions in June that were needed to fill classes for freshmen in the fall.
      3. D. Bradley: I think it’s more complicated than that. There is more than one explanation. I would guess we are going to be hiring people this year, but we’ve got to figure out what we’re going to do. In my view, deans have never taken seriously their responsibility to prioritize within their colleges. We end up with a lot of proposals from deans. They have got to take responsibility for allocating faculty positions.
         1. J. Conant: They have an FTE budget. Are they ignoring it?
         2. D. Bradley: They think they have found a chink in it.
      4. C. MacDonald: At the same time, we know there are departments that will be in real trouble if they don’t get their lines. Will failed searches rise to the top, or will we be in this position again and again? This is why have we hired bad people in the past -- People are afraid to have a failed search for fear that the line won’t be prioritized the next year, and sometimes it is better to have a warm body than no-one. It hasn’t always been a dean’s decision.
      5. D. Bradley: It has been the dean’s decision for the last seven years. You need to take it up with them.
      6. V. Sheets: The deans decide, but then there is a failed search. Whose responsibility is it?
      7. D. Bradley. If the deans put forward one search, you are probably going to get it. If the deans put up fifteen, Mike will tell them to prioritize. When we try and describe positions, everyone tries to talk from their own point of view. People with cooperative mindsets can approve what is appropriate. M. Licari will be working to improve the process.
      8. S. Lamb: Is one of the primary criteria still the SCH count?
      9. M. Licari: Right now I have been challenged to revamp this. It is about paying attention to workloads. SCH is a factor but not necessarily the only factor. There are a lot of other factors, including external ones, that go into whether a department needs to hire more faculty. These might differ from the FTE numbers. Accreditation pressures might be one factor.
      10. D. Bradley: I don’t support any move that would count faculty productivity other than collectively. There would not be an SCH for individual faculty members. We are not going there. Are you teaching three, four, or five courses? That’s crazy.
      11. M. Licari: Departments have different needs. We have foundational-studies, graduate, and other upper-level courses. To boil it down to one faculty member is ridiculous.
      12. D. Bradley: When we have multidisciplinary degrees, we can’t integrate that way. That model right now is done on a department basis not a program basis. In Economics it might be less complex.
      13. S. Lamb: It’s interesting. We tried very hard to maximize the number of students in our statistics classes. Given that we played that card for such a long period of time, finally the number of students in the major increased from six or seven to about forty.
      14. D. Hantzis: I think it’s great that we are again talking about this and being strategic. We are not just replacing losses. I came in 1990, and we talked about it then. I know that late in the spring my department was told that we needed to offer forty-four additional sections of COMM 101 this fall. We were told D. Bradley made this decision. We were excited because it might mean we could hire new faculty; however, many ended up being hired late with little faculty involvement. So the Comm department might account for four or five FTEs faculty positions that were not approved in the normal process. That was pretty crazy from our point of view. It doesn’t make sense overall, though. I have heard that some faculty members with grants hire instructors to cover their courses. Are those faculty counted in the additional FTE?
      15. D. Bradley: They may be in the twenty-four, but they are not the problem. Can I talk about the larger issue? I have done a couple of testing scenarios of what happens if our enrollment tops out and tuition is kept at inflation over the next decade. The results say we would have to reduce our budget by $3 million a year. 65-70 percent of the budget is payroll. Our health as an institution is tied to being strategic about hiring. Our target student-to-faculty ration is 23-1. If we say we want that to stay constant once we reach our target of 14,000 students, we are still in multimillion dollar cuts. What are we going to do in ten years if the state is no more generous than they are now?
      16. S. Lamb: It’s interesting if it’s forecastable. It’s hard for me to conceive a situation where an institution would keep non tenure-track regular faculty.
      17. D. Bradley: There are no silver bullets. That would be, perhaps, only 5% of the solution. We need to have multiple solutions. We may need to cut $20 million out of general fund budget within the next decade. We can do small things that add up. But, if we are not very systematic, at best no one will get a pay raise for a long time. The number of positions we have must be really closely looked at. It means that probably no one’s going to have as many lines as they want. I don’t want to change our 15-15-70 model for our staffing levels.
      18. R. Guell: You disowned D. Hantzis’s comment about the hiring in Communications. I want to go back to that. She said that it was the “President’s decision.”
      19. D. Bradley: I don’t recall making that decision.
      20. R. Guell: L. Maule will probably tell you differently. She will reference a report that addressed late-enrollments into big sections that students could pass. The recommendation was made to put freshmen into COMM 101. J. Maynard saw that draft report in June and told L. Maule to go ahead and act on it. This was a student-success-based policy.
      21. D. Bradley: I wonder how many more freshmen sections we have this year. My guess is that you can’t multiply twenty-four by four. Do we have 96 unexpected sections?
      22. V. Sheets: I added one in August in Sociology.
      23. D. Hantzis: I think it would be good to look at it. This wasn’t a strategic decision. We didn’t end up with many under-enrolled classes.
      24. E. Hampton: I don’t have the data, but it’s a close-held perception among faculty that when cuts come around faculty are at the top of the list. We are not replacing lost individuals. Is there a strategic plan for looking at other areas on the payroll?
      25. D. Bradley: Over the last few years, we have not reduced faculty. We have dramatically reduced non-faculty areas.
      26. E. Hampton: I don’t know if that’s a common assumption.
          1. C. MacDonald: It is not a common assumption.
      27. R. Guell: The trend you started in 2012 has been reversed.
      28. D. Hantzis: The staffing report we reviewed at the beginning of this year came from AAC. It showed a decrease in both support-staff and full-time faculty; the only increase was in EAP hiring—and mostly EA. All of the increases were small. We had talked about going back to the report to discuss and respond more fully.
      29. D. Bradley: The student-staff ratio and the student-faculty ratio are both up. Without putting parameters on it, those numbers are going to have to go up over time to make our funding mechanisms work. The idea that faculty have been cut relative to the rest of the campus can’t be proven.
      30. S. Lamb: This speaks to the pressures that we’ve found ourselves under to create greater enrollment possibilities in Finance 108. To Linda’s credit, she never did say it was the President’s decision. She came to us to take the Course Transformation Academy. She would have enrollments of 900 if we could help with the huge increase in demand. We did help, and I believe the quality of Finance 108 was not damaged. It is a difficult course to teach. We are trying to give students tools to use for the rest of their lives. The math involved in 108 is rigorous and challenging. The instructors assigned to the courses were regular faculty. They are truly dedicated individuals, and I am very proud of what they have accomplished. We have nine faculty involved in teaching that course. They have to come to an agreement and document that we are capable of improving the pass/fail rate. We are having success with that. The professor in Math 115 spoke well in regards to the challenges. I am of the opinion that if you have an instructor with a course load of 100+ the pay should be more than $3,000. For a 60-120 course load I was able to get them another $3,000.
      31. D. Bradley: One final thing. I think we have forty-seven more freshmen than last year. I hope this expenditure gives us 5% more retention. Then we can say that maybe we stumbled into a good thing. But if we have the same retention and graduation rate….
      32. J. Conant: I am not sure that retention should be the only metric to move people, for example, from Econ to sculpting. The only reason I reduced seats in ECON 100 was because of Bob. He was a part of the report. Otherwise, I would have had no idea of the change. The communication lagged. I’m all for a strategic plan, but you have to let people know there is a plan.
      33. D. Bradley: Those kinds of decisions really need to be made in December or January.
      34. D. Hantzis: I agree with J. Conant. All of the people didn’t know.
   3. D. Hantzis: I am very glad to have an improved web version of the University Handbook. However, I’ve noticed repeatedly that the Handbook takes longer to load than other documents on the ISU website. Also, there is (as yet) no searchable version of the Handbook. We have asked for a link to a downloadable version that can be searched. Please create one.
   4. D. Hantzis: A faculty member asked me a question about Study Week and I reviewed the policy, as published. I found two versions of the policy published in official university documents—University Handbook, ORR Final Exam schedule, and GR and UG catalogs. The difference matters. I am hoping we will ask FAC—or maybe this body—to determine which one is the legitimate version of the policy. I remember several years ago, when B. English was in the Provost’s office, I found three versions of the policy in official documents. Finally, the direct-hire policy on the HR site is wrong. We need to find the correct guidelines.
      1. University Handbook version:
         1. 310.1.4 Final Examinations
         2. 310.1.4.3 Study Week. Through mutual agreement of the University Faculty Senate and Student Government Association, study week is intended to encourage student preparation for final examinations during the final examination week; however, class attendance during study week is expected. No examinations of any kind, including substantial quizzes, shall be given during study week preceding final examination week. Students who feel that these policies have been violated should register their complaints with the Office of the Student Government Association.
      2. UG and GR Catalog and ORR Final Exam Schedule version:
         1. Study Week Policy
            1. Study Week is intended to encourage student preparation for final examinations given during the final examination week. Class attendance, however, is still expected. No examination of any kind, including quizzes that count over four percent of the grade, can be given during Study Week. Papers due during Study Week must be specified in the class syllabus handed out to students at the beginning of each semester. Examinations for laboratory; intensive, mini-courses; or summer sessions are permitted.
            2. The student is responsible for notifying the Student Government Association of a violation of any of the above terms. The Student Government Association will take the correct procedures for informing the faculty member and the academic department chairperson of the failure to comply with the terms of the Study Week policy. The student's name will be confidential to the Student Government Association.
5. FAC item:
   1. Motion to approve as amended. (D. Hantzis, L. Brown) Vote: 9-0-0
   2. R. Guell: We have never had a process that is remotely democratic for the selection temporary faculty advocate. It has always been the Faculty Senate Chair’s recommendation to Provost. For years it was S. Hoffman. It always struck me and several others as problematic that the represented faculty didn’t get to select their representative. We can’t have a direct vote of the temporary faculty because the Handbook defines the voting faculty as only those who are regular faculty. We would have to redefine several things to allow for that. To avoid that particular issue, this process was created where within the first week of classes, a nomination call would go out with a request for statements of interest. We would have to attach those statements of interest to a *Qualtrics* survey to get an indication of how much support any particular nominee had. Officers would then use the statements of interest and the survey results to conduct interviews. If there were no more than three applicants, that’s where the “where appropriate” clause would come it. The Executive Committee would hear from the officers regarding their impressions from the interviews, and get the results of the survey of support. Exec would then vote on three nominees to send forward to the Provost who would choose the TFA within five days.
      1. T. Hawkins: I have some suggested language revisions: In 246.15.1 Selection, change “a list of three (3) nominees” to “a list of nominees”. Down at 246.15.1.4 replace “select a…” with “conduct interviews with some or all of the candidates. We could then eliminate the interviews section to reduce language and incorporate it in the section above. And, in 246.15.1.6 insert “up to” between choose…three”
      2. R. Guell: I don’t think members of FAC would oppose those changes.
      3. D. Hantzis: T. Hawkins, could we use “no more than three”?
         1. T. Hawkins: Sure.
      4. D. Hantzis: Do we want this to be time driven?
         1. R. Guell: There needs to be a short time that nominees can specify.
      5. C. Paterson: Did the committee look at moving this process to the spring?
      6. R. Guell: You don’t have the optimal candidate you will have every year, a full time both fall and spring lecturer. If you had that type of person, it would be great to have in the spring, but the problem is that we have defined that person as an “instructor” now. People don’t necessarily know that they have a spring assignment.
      7. D. Hantzis: Who do we disenfranchise? Who have we hired in the fall? If you exclude those hired in the fall, we have disenfranchised a significant number of the faculty.
6. Liaison Reports:
   1. E. Hampton (AAC): The committee recently met and asked for clarification for their charges. Regarding the charge to look into deans’ activities and assess the amount of revenue brought in vs. time expended, what does the Senate want to see? A specific timeline? Do they look retrospectively or do they begin tracking right now? Also, what’s the purpose? The context?
      1. C. MacDonald: the person who wanted this charge is not in the room. Not much was specified. The point was to understand how much time deans spend away from colleges. Is it worth it?
      2. D. Bradley: I think you’re going to find that will be very hard to quantify. It is more appropriate to ask the provost to make sure that the analysis is part of the review process. Then over a period of three years you can look to see how much money has come in and estimate whether things are getting better.
      3. M. Licari: That’s true, you do need a longer review. Sorting all of that out is almost impossible. Gifts come in fits and starts.
      4. D. Hantzis: My sense was that this change was motivated by the absences of deans from campus without delegation of decision making authority to associate deans. It would be nice to figure out what executive leadership expectations are and if there is a plan that would allow decisions to be made in the event of the absence of a dean. Then perhaps, we could see if the absenteeism is justified.
      5. M. Licari: Fair enough. I’m less interested in bean counting. If there are managerial problems being created because of the traveling, that is something else. How was the college managed during the dean’s absence, was the dean communicative while they were gone, that’s fine.
      6. S. Lamb: I hate to call for one additional round of evaluations. Generally the deans are answerable to the Provost and to the President. They know that if they’re spending their time unproductively, it’s not going to be received well. I think this is something each dean is going to have to sense. You will have to seize the opportunity when it’s there. Colleagues, remember if we ask for one more evaluation of administration, they will ask for three from us.
      7. J. Conant: On a different note, there is fuzziness regarding the Foundation. There is continuing concern about its effectiveness. Certainly deans and chairs have a developmental responsibility. There could be some increased clarity about the developmental processes and actions. Perhaps there is some perception that deans need to do the work of the Foundation because the Foundation is incompetent.
      8. D. Bradley: The Foundation is independent by Board action. In terms of how much time should deans be away? One second less than the time necessary to run the college. Development is not that important. One thing I was told when I got here is that the Foundation is not my responsibility.
      9. J. Conant: My concern is about associate deans who have a hard time making calls in the absence of deans.
      10. D. Bradley: We have a high turnover rate of associate deans.
      11. E. Hampton: What should I bring back to AAC?
      12. C. MacDonald: Now you have some background. Standing committees can do with their charges as they see fit.
      13. D. Hantzis: I think it’s okay to be authentic. One of the senators asked if there was a policy requiring faculty evaluation of associate deans. There is a lot of concern from faculty who feel like they are talking to the wind. It might be possible for the Senate to suggest that deans conduct regular evaluations of associate deans with faculty input.
          1. C. MacDonald: I have just charged FAC with that.
      14. E. Hampton: What was the Senate’s desire in having AAC look at the staffing report? Should a new report be fashioned? Should more meaningful variables be identified? What are the parameters?
          1. C. MacDonald: We would like meaningful variables.
          2. D. Hantzis: They should talk with FAC.
          3. S. Lamb: Some misleading conclusions were drawn from the last report because of the definitions used. The definition of regular faculty was not used.
          4. D. Bradley: The last time the staffing report that HR prepares changed was when we agreed that a FTE lecturer taught five courses. That was five years ago. Unless they are looking at data more than 5 years old, I don’t know of any substantive….
          5. D. Hantzis: What we talked about on Exec is that the report was not robust enough, that AAC has to do too much, that IR should do more and disaggregate more of the data.
          6. D. Bradley: I’d be happy to sit and talk with D. McKee about the changes you all would like.
          7. C. Paterson: Last year’s report was not that way. L. Spence helped get the data and worked with D. Richards.
          8. D. Hantzis: It missed gender patterns and other data.
          9. D. Bradley: That is different. I suggest that AAC or FAC ask M. Snyder and P. McClintock to come to a meeting and ask them what they want.
          10. D. Hantzis: E. Hampton, I would suggest you touch base with R. Guell.
          11. C. MacDonald: FEBC should also be included in this.
   2. C. Paterson (AEC): Nothing to report.
   3. L. Brown (CAAC): Nothing to report.
   4. V. Sheets (FAC): Updates were made earlier in the meeting.
   5. S. Lamb (FEBC): Meets Wednesday (10-21-15).
   6. T. Hawkins (GC): The Council meets tomorrow. It will be taking up the new charge to look at the Advising Taskforce report and discuss how to implement its recommendations without new funding.
   7. D. Hantzis (SAC): SAC met today. We noted the revised charge to review the Advising Taskforce report. SAC works by subcommittee, but there were no subcommittee reports updating work on charges this month. Our next meeting is November 5th during which time we will discuss the Advising Taskforce report. I was also asked to seek clarification of three, similar, charges:
      1. Monitor international admissions.
         1. D. Bradley: The Blue report probably shows this.
      2. Monitor quality measures beyond HSGPA and consider recommending revisions to admission and/or retention guidelines; SAC also wants to look at GR student profile at admission data.
         1. D. Bradley: The only way we can change significantly is looking at the details within the high school transcripts. That may be possible within the very near future. It’s going to take some degree of effort to identify which courses within the transcript make the difference.
      3. Monitor the policy granting 125% tuition to some Illinois students; it seems to be a concern that the rules governing the continuation of the grant injure Illinois students.
      4. Based on clarification, I’ll prepare a report for SAC that reports international admission data for 3-5 years and a review of the pre-entry variables for UG and GR alongside the published admission requirements and of the current retention standards. I will also prepare a report that indicates ISU now continues the tuition benefit to Illinois students after the fourth year if the student is persisting successfully.
         1. D. Bradley: They were taking it away from people after four years. After the start of this year, they have it as long as they are in good standing.
         2. C. MacDonald: Let’s close that.
   8. J. Conant (URC): Fall applications are available.
7. Adjournment: 4:55pm