

#11

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

December 1, 2015

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Final Minutes

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

Members Absent: S. Lamb

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

Ex-Officio Absent:

Guests: K. Butwin, N. Corey, R. Guell

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley:

- i) Cheri and I are having everyone over for an open house reception at 3:00 on December 2<sup>nd</sup>.
- ii) Commencement is next Saturday, I hope everyone will be there for that. Cheryl Roberson is the alumni speaker. She is an engineering manager for Rolls-Royce. Martha Reed will be our student speaker.
- iii) We have been involved with the degree guarantee for four years. We now have our first student suggesting that bad advising has not allowed him to graduate on time. S. Powers has confirmed this to be true. M. Licari and I are looking into it. It's not your average case of "bad advising". It's really bad advising. The student was advised to take four Foundational Studies courses that he did not need to take because he was in the Honors Program. If this faculty member had not already retired, we would have considered taking some kind of action. Having C. Cantrell investigating all of these students is giving us insight into some horror stories that we are going to have to systematically eliminate. The student did everything he needed to do. The faculty member was at fault. And, it appears that MySam was not used.

(1) D. Hantzis: One of the good things about MySam is how it determines the need for courses for honor students. This has to be part of our conversation. Advisors are not being trained properly.

- (2) D. Bradley: Based on what S. Powers has told me, you can provide people with a lot of training, but that doesn't necessarily mean they will accept it. I met with some of the African-American faculty this afternoon, and some have mentioned academic advising and not feeling confident. If we as an institution decide to move in the direction of professional advisors, we will have fewer faculty. This can be a college, not a university-level discussion.
  - (3) V. Sheets: Regarding advising, what about students who can't get into the classes they need because they are full?
  - (4) D. Bradley: It's our responsibility to have enough seats open. We also need to think about less-complicated degree programs. Some are so complicated that they are difficult to map. If a student gets out of sync, it is hard to get them back on track. The Provost is working on that as well.
  - (5) D. Hantzis: Some students also have an attitude that their faculty advisors will get them into the seats.
- iv) We also have an informal meeting next Thursday at Condit House.
- b) Provost M. Licari:
- i) We will have a Strategic Plan steering committee meeting this Friday. All of the progress reports are in. They are up on the Strategic Plan 2016 website as PDFs. I encourage you and all of your colleagues to take a look and see what the committees are up to.
  - ii) I want to remind you that the Strategic Plan timeline is on the website as well. In early spring semester, we will have campus town-hall meetings. We need those to be well attended so we can hear from as many individuals as possible or at least make as many people as possible aware of the work that has been done. Please help promote attendance.
- 2) Chair Report:
- a) C. MacDonald: We will first invite K. Butwin to provide an update on the Handbook webpage.
  - i) K. Butwin: I am going to show you the Handbook demo page. If you have feedback, you can give it now or share it later. Most of the updates will happen in December so that the site will be ready to go in January. It can be found at [www.indstate.edu/handbook](http://www.indstate.edu/handbook) and not on the General Counsel website. We start with the main policy index. There is a section on proposed policy modifications. This is where the links will be. We have a tab for Recently Updated Policies—this lists policies that have been modified in last year. We have a place for College Documents, e.g., a location for links to college constitutions. There is a place for a Policy Development section, though nothing is up yet. We imagine this as a place for information on how we approve procedures and how they go through the process. We

- need to make sure that all procedures are associated with policies. Many now are associated with Human Resources; we are in the process of reviewing them. The Policy Index is searchable. Policies will appear with an initial date of approval and a revised date. It is good to have a historical record of how changes came about. There is no PDF version of the Handbook, but you can print out the policies. You can also email sections. Our plan is to move the search bar to the top of the page. We are currently testing it. The search bar is a Google search function and will begin to self-populate as more people use it. The Handbook has to be correct and user-friendly so that people use it. S. Gambill will be managing these tabs for the most part. One of the things she is doing is going through what the Board has and what we have. We will also be going through the Glossary in the spring. Many definitions are incorrect.
- (1) D. Bradley: Something to think about in the future is to have a search for the modifications.
  - (2) K. Butwin: We do need to establish an ad hoc group to help us coordinate those.
  - (3) D. Bradley: It would be a good idea to run 385.1 by S. Powers.
  - (4) L. Brown: Is there any way to make these PDF?
  - (5) K. Butwin: No.
  - (6) D. Bradley: We could set it up so you can print it as a PDF. Drupal has the ability to identify who changes what.
  - (7) K. Butwin: It does not tell exactly what has changed. I have to identify what was changed. Marketing is working on that.
  - (8) E. Hampton: It would be helpful if you had a link on the current page from the previous page to the new.
  - (9) D. Hantzis: It would be good if we could somehow delete older policies once they have been replaced. I would like to see the related procedure placed at the end of the policy document. On larger policies, there could be a link to the page.
  - (10) D. Bradley: It may be worthwhile to indicate whether or not there was a procedure.
- b) C. MacDonald: I was approached by J. Powers and B. Whitaker about the notion of having a session on inclusive teaching. The University of Iowa did something similar that was sponsored by their Faculty Senate. There were two panels, one led by students and the other by faculty, which discussed dealing with sensitive topics in the classroom. We would like to bring this to Senate as something we could do in the spring. I would like suggestions from you for the names of faculty members and students whom we can invite to participate. What do we want to call this?
- i) D. Bradley: We need to be very mindful of who is considered. You don't want political correctness to run away with the show. You want a good, broad section of people to attend. You don't want to get to the point where you can't talk about difficult subjects because some students can't deal with them.

- ii) D. Hantzis: I think it fits very neatly with the FTE pedagogical developments. I would prefer not to call it inclusive teaching. It's about how do we teach sensitive topics. The issue of inclusion is a bit different.
- iii) D. Bradley: We can't get to the point where students can't talk about certain topics.
- iv) C. Paterson: I do think there is a place for reasonable accommodations.
- v) D. Bradley: We talk about the "real world" here. If you can't avoid the topic in the "real world" then...?
- vi) D. Hantzis: I give cautions in my classes, and I don't think that's inappropriate.
- vii) T. Hawkins: I've had a hard time making my mind up about these issues, because they have been debated on the news and on campus for months. Since this is the first time I've heard about this particular idea and since it does not seem like we have a clear picture of what kind of session we want, I don't think it would be a good idea to take it to Senate right now because I don't think we will get very far with the debate. I wouldn't take the idea to Senate until you know what you want to do. Then you can debate and seek approval for a specific plan.
- viii) D. Bradley: I agree with T. Hawkins. This may need a second draft.
- ix) C. MacDonald: So, I will proceed with a tentative endorsement of the idea from Exec.

3) Approval of Minutes as amended.

- a) Motion to approve (L. Brown, V. Sheets). Vote: 8-0-0

4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) T. Hawkins: I had some initial concerns about the proposed interim student grievance policy. In particular, I am worried about the vagueness of the language. When we debated the anti-bullying policy, I know that D. Bradley worried that it might produce a lot of litigation. To me, this policy as it is written has the potential to create a tsunami of grievances. There doesn't seem to be any defined boundaries.
  - i) D. Bradley: We will be happy to consider changes. The policy will be more successful if we can review proposed changes and apply them while still keeping things simple. We are going to have to have some kind of process for that. Otherwise, you will end up with a policy that is way too long and cumbersome. Do you have specific changes you would like to see?
  - ii) T. Hawkins: It doesn't make sense to me to start out by recognizing the right to grieve in a very general sense but then list multiple areas that are off-limits.
    - (1) D. Bradley: All of those are in areas we don't have control over like Title IX.
  - iii) T. Hawkins: I would suggest that instead of starting out with an all-inclusive statement, you narrow the process down by listing the exceptions to the policy. What remains in the end is what the new policy will cover.

- (1) D. Bradley: If you could put that into a paragraph, I could have K. Butwin take a look at it. That is very valuable. We clearly don't want to have a large number of grievances.
  - (2) B. Guell: FAC also has several suggestions and concerns. I can put that in an email to K. Butwin, on the website, or share it here.
  - b) C. MacDonald: We have had three senators for whom the attendance policy has come into play. I have had to give them a warning. One immediately resigned, one got very upset, and the third was quiet. This has not been a fun process. We do not have an alternate for the one who resigned.
    - i) V. Sheets: At least with a formal resignation this does not affect the quorum.
  - c) V. Sheets: Have the people who are having searches been notified yet?
    - i) M. Licari: The deans know. So far yes. There could be more to come.
    - ii) V. Sheets: When did the deans find out?
    - iii) M. Licari: Within the past few weeks.
- 5) FEBC Item – Dependent Child Fee Award
- a) Motion to approve: (T. Hawkins, E. Hampton)
  - b) Motion to table: (V. Sheets, E. Hampton). Vote: 8-0-0.
    - i) N. Corey: We revised this policy by adding the word “graduate”. We wonder how many people are actually affected by this. I don't know where the cut-off age is—somewhere around twenty-four, I thought—to be able to be included in this issue. That's where it was left after being approved.
    - ii) V. Sheets: Was there anyone from University Benefits who could assist with this?
    - iii) N. Corey: C. Barton can speak to it. I'm not sure we can easily confirm that number.
    - iv) R. Guell: It's done all the time with spouses. There is paper work that travels up to my wife and she adds income that they don't ever see. The paperwork side is trivial.
    - v) D. Bradley: When we spoke with D. McKee, she thought it would be relatively expensive in terms of lost tuition. My understanding is that for tax purposes you are no longer considered a dependent after twenty-one or twenty-two. But, federal financial aid rules are not the same. We need to try to quantify the maximum benefit.
    - vi) R. Guell: It has to be the undergraduate equivalent.
    - vii) D. Bradley: Do we give an 80% discount for eight years or eight semesters?
    - viii) C. Paterson: One thing would help me: what does “qualified tuition” mean?
    - ix) D. Bradley: Mandatory tuition and fees is my guess.
    - x) C. Paterson: There are several programs that have fees of more than \$500 per semester.
    - xi) J. Conant: There is a big different between adding a person to a program that is nowhere near capacity and adding one, for example, to the physician's assistant program. With the latter you would be giving up a lot of money. A few programs are really expensive.

- xii) N. Corey: A Ph.D. in education would be costly.
- xiii) D. Bradley: Revenue is revenue. When we are looking around for places to cut, we don't want to appear to give ourselves benefits that other students have to pay for. I understand the desire, but I will talk with D. McKee to see how much it could cost.
- xiv) N. Corey: Do you want me to revisit this?

6) FAC items:

a) Study Week Policy

- i) Motion to approve as amended: (V. Sheets, D. Hantzis) Vote: 8-0-0.
- ii) R. Guell: S. McConnaughey and L. Eberman pulled this from a policy that was passed by Senate in what I believe to be 2003. The Board never acted on it. This language now aligns the Handbook with the *de facto* policy.
- iii) E. Hampton: Could we change "papers" due during study week to "assignments"?
- iv) V. Sheets: Has there been any discussion on adding information about online classes? Because there are no assigned times, instructors may have different expectations.
- v) R. Guell: We understood that the calendar is the calendar and you are not to violate the policy.
- vi) L. Brown: What is the first day of the week? Sunday?
- vii) R. Guell: You can open tests any time, but you cannot close them until you are within the confines of the exam period.
- viii) L. Brown: Students can take the test earlier if they wish.
- ix) R. Guell: That is where faculty members have the ability to assign a take home test.
- x) D. Hantzis: I know for sure that significant numbers of faculty give exams online; many open them during study week and do not close them until the end of finals week. I am concerned about the difference between practice and policy.
- xi) T. Hawkins: I was curious where the 4% figure came from.
  - (1) R. Guell: It was a number chosen in 2003.
- xii) D. Hantzis: This issue came up this year in SAC. Health and Human Services was concerned about the language in the Handbook that said they couldn't do clinical evaluations during study week for their graduate students. Was there any discussion at FAC concerning the specific needs of graduate students?
- xiii) R. Guell: None. We were charged with bringing the language into alignment, and that's what we did. I don't believe FAC would have any problems with adding "clinical" to this.
- xiv) V. Sheets: I would like to suggest we include a statement that online programs are not excused from this policy.
- xv) C. Paterson: Can we agree to add "laboratory, practicum, and clinical"?
- xvi) D. Bradley: Do we need to add another sentence for summer courses?
- xvii) C. MacDonald: How about "This policy does not apply to summer courses."

xviii) C. MacDonald: This is our revised language, “Courses of 11 weeks’ duration or less are exempt from this policy. Examinations for laboratory, practicum, or clinical courses are permitted.” And, we change “papers” to “assignments”.

b) Grade Appeals

i) Motion to approve FAC recommendation to amend Section 323: (D. Hantzis, L. Brown)

ii) Motion to table: (V. Sheets, E. Hampton) Vote: 8-0-0.

iii) R. Guell: FAC got this charge after R. Lotspeich raised concerns in his AAUP presentation about faculty losing their right to be heard. We made several modifications.

iv) T. Hawkins: In 323.2.2, I wanted to suggest that rather than “encouraging” the instructor to meet with the student, we “require” this.

(1) D. Hantzis: I made that note as well, and the only person that has a timeline is the student. There should be a timeline provided throughout.

(2) R. Guell: In order to do that, we need to take it back to FAC.

(3) V. Sheets: I’m not uncomfortable with T. Hawkins’ suggestion, but I would like to remove the word “entirety”.

v) C. Paterson: In 323.7, what if it is determined that the actual appropriate grade is lower than what was originally submitted? This policy, by specifically limiting the outcome to either no grade change or a better grade, may induce students to employ the grade-appeal process in cases where there is no cause. Vetting complaints like these take time. I am concerned about the workload on the Grade Appeal committees.

(1) R. Guell: There are not many grade appeals that make it this far. This was drafted by L. Sperry and me about ten-years ago. It was explicit that the grade can only stay the same or go up.

(2) V. Sheets: It would also open up a faculty member to charges of retaliation.

vi) T. Hawkins: In 323.2.3, could we also require the chairperson to meet with the instructor? And, in 323.8.1, regarding transmission we should title this “To the Student and Instructor”.

vii) C. Paterson: In 323.7.3, is that in addition to their instruction load?

(1) R. Guell: That’s part of being chair.

viii) C. Paterson: In 323.10, as far as a “working day” is concerned for faculty and senior instructors at that time, I’m wondering if that’s going to be compensated work in the summer.

(1) M. Licari: No.

(2) D. Hantzis: You can decline to serve on the Grade Appeal Committee.

ix) D. Hantzis: In 323.2.3, “Should no resolution occur... following a meeting with the instructor...” In 323.3, “A formal appeal is made in writing by the student to the dean. When filing “the formal appeal”.

(1) R. Guell: The way this language looks is not the way it was written.

- x) D. Hantzis: In 323.5, “Verification of Appropriateness of Appeal”. When does the dean act?
    - (1) R. Guell: It made more sense without the numbering sentence.
  - xi) D. Hantzis: Do we want to ensure that there is never a panel only of senior instructors? The informal appeals should not be confused with a casual conversation. The chair will write that on this day, at this time, a meeting occurred. Would this be a sub-clause?
    - (1) L. Brown: I had a student do an appeal, and I was then notified by the dean. My guess is that the deans are consulting with the chairs when it’s moving forward.
  - xii) C. Paterson: In 323.9, let’s make sure that has been vetted by Office of Registration and Records.
- c) All University Committees
- i) Motion to approve as amended: (L. Brown, V. Sheets) Vote: 8-0-0.
  - ii) R. Guell: 270: Several things were done here. You will notice the absence of the Diversity Council. It is the President’s wish to reimagine that body. You will notice the absence of the Assessment Counsel. That is also being reevaluated. Last year we attempted to align all of the elements of 270. This is almost entirely the work of T. Exline in the President’s Office. There were two substantive additions: one, we are formalizing the University Health Benefits committee; two, we are recognizing the reality of the University Budget Committee and the way it has functioned since President Bradley took over in 2008. We also changed 270.9.3 to remove the required graduate faculty member from the University Athletic Committee as this status is almost universal now. I made sure to get approval from Dean Mauer, R. Prettyman, J. Sherman, and J. Sanders. They all agreed, but Dean Mauer asked to keep it everywhere else. She wanted faculty to be specifically concerned with graduate students on the other committees.
  - iii) L. Brown: Do we need to be worried about the language? Is “college” correct?
  - iv) M. Licari: Do we want to say “academic college”?
  - v) C. Paterson: It is implied but not explicit.
  - vi) R. Guell: Who are the members of the University College? Does the constitution specify?
  - vii) D. Hantzis: Yes, it does.
  - viii) C. Paterson: When you have a hearing, you have instructors, students, and staff.
  - ix) R. Guell: What probably needs to change in 270.2.1 is the insertion of “regular”.
  - x) L. Brown: Seven regular faculty members including one from each college.
  - xi) C. Paterson: By adding the term “regular”, whom do we exclude?
  - xii) C. MacDonald: We need to revise 270.11.1. Here the Graduate Council is excluded intentionally but the University College is not addressed. The University College does have a governing body.

- xiii) R. Guell: S. Johnson is the representative. Given that I was at the founding of this, the reason for this is how you can possibly have a Student Success Council without a dominant faculty voice. The first draft included a single faculty member as the faculty representative. Having a robust faculty voice was and should be viewed as important.
- xiv) L. Brown: Is the Dean of the University College on this council?
- xv) R. Guell: Yes.
- xvi) D. Hantzis: If the dean cannot designate someone to represent them, they don't need to be on the council. Can you say a "designee" of the dean of each college?
- xvii) V. Sheets: Just to be clear we added the FEBC member?
- xviii) R. Guell: We did that as a nod to the Bylaws change that was made four or five years ago that the President rejected. He was willing to take a member of FEBC but wasn't willing to change the language. We had a change we wanted to make. The President didn't want the change. He accepted whomever we wanted to bring to the meeting. That ended up being the FEBC chair. This formalizes it. It changes that "bring whomever you want to bring".
- xix) D. Hantzis: How does that ensure FEBC representation?
- xx) R. Guell: It doesn't. I think that this current form is much more robust than it had ever been when AAC had the charge. Last year I think the Senate officers had real influence on the budget projections.

7) Executive Session

- a) Motion to enter executive session (T. Hawkins, L. Brown) Vote: 8-0-0
- b) Motion to leave executive session (T. Hawkins, C. MacDonald) Vote: 8-0-0

8) Adjournment: 5:37