

#20

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

April 12, 2016

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Final Minutes

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

Members Absent: none

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

Ex-Officio Absent: none

Guests: A. Viviani, R. Gonser, E. Seung, R. Guell, L. Maule, K. Butwin

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley: none.

b) Provost M. Licari:

- i) I would like to call attention to the upcoming campus stakeholders meeting for the Strategic Plan. It will take place on April 27 from 3-5 in Dede I. By that point, I will have what will essentially be a draft of the report I will give to the Board of Trustees the following week. I will introduce it on the 27th and use that meeting as a launching point to brainstorm the initiatives we should be developing for the benchmarks. That work will start in the summer, so we need to have good conversation to move us in the right direction.

2) Chair Report:

- a) C. MacDonald: I want to remind you that we have been invited to meet with the Board of Trustees on May 6th at 8:30am. I think it is very good that they are opening this

communication, and I hope they continue to seek our input. You are also invited to the Board seminar at 10:30 that day. Hopefully we can get a good presence there.

i) M. Licari: I do think it would be good to have faculty leadership there. It shows the Board of Trustees that we all care about this, and it gives you a chance to interact with them more.

3) Approval of Minutes of April 5, 2016

a) Motion to approve as amended: (V. Sheets, T. Hawkins). Vote 7-0-1.

4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

a) V. Sheets: What is the rationale for opening final grading a month prior to the end of the semester? We have had some problems in the past with faculty ending classes early. This seems to invite them to do so.

i) M. Licari: C. MacDonald asked about this at the pre-Exec meeting yesterday. We have some classes that end before the semester-long courses end. However, I think we might do a better job at targeting this information to the right faculty or, at least, word the communication differently. It doesn't mean that faculty should be filing grades right now if their classes have not yet ended.

ii) D. Bradley: I see how that made sense in the past, but now faculty members are expected to put grades in Blackboard. I think that's probably the rationale. It shouldn't have to happen anymore.

iii) M. Licari: We will revisit this.

b) D. Hantzis: I want to revisit the issue regarding the crosswalk between Federal Hall and the Technology building. My students have decided to debate this in one of my courses. Students are now walking through the bike racks and going over the bushes.

i) D. Bradley: You need to talk to the City Engineer.

ii) S. Lamb: I've been entertained by these efforts for quite a while now. Between the bushes, it is well trodden.

5) GC item: Guidance and Psychological Services: Specialization Counselor Education PhD

a) Motion to approve: (E. Hampton, D. Hantzis) Vote: 8-0-0.

b) C. MacDonald: This is a program that comes from my college. It used to exist in a slightly different form. We think it can come back.

i) D. Bradley: Is this still dropped?

ii) A. Viviani: You are thinking of the Counseling Psychology PhD program. They have accreditation through August 2017.

c) A. Viviani: One of the main differences between the previous version and the current program is that before it was part time and, as a consequence, not successful in graduating PhDs. Now it will be a full-time program that includes a mentoring process. We will prioritize graduation. A number of states will only license people who come out

of an accredited program. Our accrediting body is CACREP. They have taken the lead in promoting counselor portability. I shared with M. Licari that I was previously licensed in Illinois, but it took me nine months to get my accreditation from Indiana even though I met the criteria. Right now there are no such doctoral programs in the state of Indiana. Students would need to study out of state. As of 2013 you have to have a CACREP license. But Indiana doesn't have that.

- i) D. Bradley: Can you explain the difference between this and the other doctoral program in counseling?
- ii) A. Viviani: This is designed to train educators.
- iii) D. Bradley: How many students do you think you will have?
- iv) A. Viviani: Approximately eight per year once we start. The dean has encouraged me to take a full cohort from the start.
- v) D. Bradley: This will probably begin in fall 2017. It could be sooner if we don't need Commission approval.

6) CAAC item: Middle School Science minor

- a) Motion to approve the minor: (V. Sheets, D. Hantzis) Vote: 8-0-0.
- b) E. Seung: This is a minor program for all education majors. They can add this to their teaching licenses.

7) Foundational Studies: Health and Wellness

- a) Motion to approve: (V. Sheets, D. Hantzis) Vote: 8-0-0.
- b) L. Maule: This has actually been in the works for about a year. We've had discussions with the Council and the College. This makes some changes to the Health and Wellness category. The physical-activity component is not a requirement but an option. The learning objectives are broadened. It permits units across campus to participate.
 - i) S. Lamb: I was in basic training. I learned rifle thrusts and pushups...
 - ii) L. Maule: That issue is not up for discussion, though we did revisit it. We still believe that basic training as it is done today meets the learning objectives.
 - iii) D. Bradley: The activity course is optional, but the number of credits is six?
 - iv) L. Maule: Currently, both courses are three credits. PE just made changes to their curriculum. The activity component is embedded in the course. Everyone has to take a three-credit course that meets the Health and Wellness objectives.
 - v) D. Bradley: They are still doing physical activity, but it is not 100%.
 - vi) L. Maule: It never was. It is just not mandatory.
 - vii) V. Sheets: Why get rid of mandatory activity?
 - viii) L. Maule: From K-12 they've had an activity component. Our students don't necessarily view the activity component as transformative. More importantly, there is no evaluation and no way of evaluating this. We are the only public institution in Indiana with an activity component. I believe broadening the learning objectives is

good, because it connects to the things the university is doing. It connects to public health and sustainability in ways that allow our students to take what they learn into the community.

- ix) D. Hantzis: One change in the learning objectives that we felt important that our students experience was the last. We need to recognize the strength of the public health curriculum on our campus. Phys Ed maintains a roster of many one-hour credit courses. We give students many options. They are just not linked to the Foundational Studies curriculum.
 - c) D. Hantzis: We would like to see Curriculog recognize University College as a curriculum-generating body. The Senate voted that it is an academic college with the power to create and revise courses. But, we can't do it without being recognized as such in Curriculog.
 - i) D. Bradley: Who is in charge of Curriculog?
 - ii) M. Licari: S. Powers. I can talk to her.
- 8) FAC items:
- a) PTOC composition:
 - b) Motion to approve the FAC-suggested language as amended: (J. Conant, T. Hawkins)
Vote: 9-0-0.
 - i) C. MacDonald: PTOC has been a unique committee. It is vital to the functioning of the university. PTOC is not a standing committee, so we have few ways to ensure that it does its work. This was the rationale behind these recommendations. It's difficult to get individuals to serve on this committee. Colleges tend to nominate people who need university service. However, there is not much of a screening process. Last year we changed the Bylaws to give FAC an ex-officio seat. I think we need to do more.
 - ii) R. Guell: FAC sent L. Eberman to PTOC this year. She was vice chair of FAC. This gave us a witness to the dysfunction. We went as far as we went with our recommendations, because I and others have had to justify the indefensible non-action of this committee too many times to this president and this and the previous provost. A committee of this level of importance needs oversight. We have been patient long enough.
 - iii) D. Hantzis: I want to reiterate this expression of frustration. I experienced it when I was chair of FAC. I do have some suggested changes in language. I think our standing committees are extraordinarily important. If they can be populated by the Senate, then certainly this one can be as well. I looked to see how standing committees are constructed. I recommend we use parallel language here.
 - iv) D. Bradley: Are there any other committees like this on campus?
 - v) D. Hantzis: No.
 - vi) D. Bradley: Does that imply that members could be removed?

- vii) D. Hantzis: Individuals. Also, do you know why we are using “professional colleges” here? I think it should be “academic”.
- viii) C. MacDonald: This was old language.
- ix) R. Guell: The other substantive change would be to make this committee more reflective of the university by adding a member from HHS.
- x) C. MacDonald: I would like to recommend that the chair be the representative from FAC.
- xi) S. Lamb: Would we have to note that the FAC representative has voting rights?
- xii) C. MacDonald: Our parliamentarian is E. Hampton.
- xiii) E. Hampton: An ex officio member has voting rights unless it is explicitly forbidden.
- xiv) S. Lamb: Would it be objectionable to put “with the right to vote”?
- xv) C. MacDonald: “Shall have a voting seat”.
- xvi) D. Hantzis: I’m not sure whether or not the FAC member should be able to vote. FAC already plays a role in the appeals process. It seems to me that FAC members already play that role without voting rights. We just need to make sure. Could we simply identify the FAC representative as a committee member? Say, “An additional member of the committee shall be appointed from among the members of the Faculty Affairs Committee for a term of one year and that member will serve as chair of this committee.”
- xvii) E. Hampton: Can I ask about the logic of proportionality of membership rather than equality across campus?
- xviii) R. Guell: PTOC has been a 3-1-1-1-1 committee. We did not choose to eliminate proportionality but reformulate it.
- xix) D. Hantzis: Colleges cannot expect to have members on the standing committees. PTOC is an exception. You are a representative of your college here.
- xx) S. Lamb: Isn’t that same statement applicable to the senators?
- xxi) D. Hantzis: Yes. There is a contradiction.
- xxii) C. Paterson: I’m reflecting on a conversation I had once with a colleague who served on PTOC. I distinctly remember that if an issue came from her college she was excused. What does it state and what practices does it follow? I think that if there is not a clause that states that you should recuse yourself, regardless of what the handbook says...
- xxiii) R. Guell: You recuse on people not on principles.
- xxiv) D. Hantzis: The Handbook states you cannot have more than one vote. I think as it stands this is a good change.
- xxv) E. Hampton: Is there a need to specify how the FAC member is chosen?
- xxvi) C. MacDonald: I don’t think so.
- xxvii) D. Bradley: The only possibility is sometimes these committees are slow to organize. Exec would appoint a member of FAC?

xxviii) V. Sheets: I thought you were saying that appointment would be like other committees.

xxix) D. Hantzis: The language says that Exec appoints.

xxx) C. Paterson: There is no statement in 305 about recusal. It may be a practice.

xxxi) D. Bradley: Do we have a standard conflict of interest policy?

xxxii) D. Hantzis: The only reason for recusal is an appeal.

c) Electronic attendance at Senate meetings

i) Motion to approve recommended language: (J. Conant, C. MacDonald) Vote: 2-7-0

ii) C. MacDonald: There has been a call by some senators for this option.

iii) R. Guell: FAC was curious why phoning in wasn't an option.

iv) C. MacDonald: That was my decision. I think it would be difficult to install the phone device on the Senate floor. More substantively, we would not see the person's face. It would make it more difficult to ensure participation.

v) T. Hawkins: I oppose this recommendation. I don't want to encourage senators to miss meetings. The attendance policy in my opinion is very flexible. There should be and are accommodations. I don't want to see us at a time where several members of the Senate stay in their offices but still "participate". In the end this could leave us with a virtual Senate. How would it work if twenty senators were in the room and fourteen were attending electronically?

vi) S. Lamb: I strongly agree. I do think there ought to be room for an exception. Attendance should be case by case. Perhaps there should be room for exceptions on attendance if agreed by the officers...

vii) T. Hawkins: We could simply say that the attendance policy is this, but at the third absence your attendance can be excused if the officers agree that it is a legitimate absence.

viii) R. Guell: Why is it better for them to be absent than to participate via video?

ix) T. Hawkins: It's going to be rare for a senator to have more than three absences. If you have a senator blow off the meeting three times, then they should be off of Senate. If there is a legitimate excuse then it should be excused.

x) J. Conant: The Commission allows phone attendance. They vote but do not participate any other way. I would prefer that we would excuse absences.

xi) D. Hantzis: I also oppose this. I have wished that the Senate could record its meetings. I do not think that this is a good idea for the reasons T. Hawkins mentioned. We only meet once a month. I don't think senators should be able to attend virtually. I would be more likely to approve a proxy.

xii) E. Hampton: I would agree it wouldn't be a bad idea to take a look at the attendance policy. There are still opportunities to conference in. If Collaborate could be used, people can communicate, it would be a lot more interactive.

xiii) S. Lamb: Why don't we just vote on this one sentence?

- xiv) R. Guell: This is one of two items that we were sent late in to the year that we were to recommend to you. I'm curious why we got the charge to begin with.
- xv) C. MacDonald: They were charges to "consider". They did not require action in a certain direction. This one in particular, there were a certain number of people who were in favor of this. I decided it needed a hearing.
- xvi) D. Hantzis: We do have a number of faculty who do not set foot on campus and have voting rights but can't be part of the Senate. There are plenty of faculty who teach only by distance but want to serve.
- xvii) D. Bradley: I would endorse E. Hampton's idea assuming it would not cost \$100,000. If it's going to happen someone needs to get to Dede III.
- xviii) T. Hawkins: We do not always meet in Dede III.
- xix) S. Lamb: I would like to make a motion that officers may review the specific situation and may allow for the Senator to continue in his/her seat if there is unanimous agreement.
- xx) D. Hantzis: It might be easier to change the language from, "the Senator may lose his/her seat" to "if a Senator...may lose his/her seat following an officer review."
Motion to approve amended language (D. Hantzis, S. Lamb) Vote: 9-0-0

9) General Counsel items:

- a) Discipline and Dismissal 246.13: Motion to approve as amended (J. Conant, L. Brown) Vote: 9-0-0.
 - i) K. Butwin: You have seen this revision before, but this is newly modified. It now includes mechanisms for non-dismissal discipline. We are following the same basic path until we get to the determination phase. Now, discipline goes to the provost for determination. The decision of the provost could be appealed to the president. If the provost recommends dismissal of a tenured faculty member, the recommendation goes to the president who decides whether that is warranted. The Board would then have to approve it.
 - ii) D. Hantzis: In 246.13.21: Time for Hearing, this proposal uses the word "defense" and the next is "response". They should both be "response". I have concerns about the publicity section. I think that this is appropriate, but I think there's a better way to finesse the language. We can't govern the voice of the faculty member. All we can govern is who can speak for the university. Only the President can speak on behalf of the university. Could we use the word "institution" somewhere?
 - iii) R. Guell: I expressed an observation that of the different options for discipline there are two things that ought to go to the Board of Trustees. The Board confers rank and tenure. A reduction in rank should follow the language of dismissal.
 - iv) D. Bradley: I don't have a problem with that. I can't imagine a situation where reduction in rank would be appropriate.
 - v) V. Sheets: Perhaps that would require changes.

- vi) C. MacDonald: We need to change reduction in rank for any faculty member.
 - vii) K. Butwin: It needs to be inserted throughout.
 - viii) C. MacDonald: We need an end for the sentence in ...10.2. Should we keep the current language?
 - ix) D. Hantzis: I really would prefer if we included "institution" in 10.3, e.g. "by the institution to the public".
 - x) R. Guell: That almost gives me license as a committee member to say something. I should have my mouth closed.
 - xi) D. Hantzis: You should be bound by confidentiality.
 - xii) R. Guell: I agree. If the faculty member wants to talk about their own dismissal, okay. Everybody else should refer to the official voice. We have enough people here who have a history of manipulating the rules.
- b) 350.2 and 501.2:
- i) Motion to approve modifications to 350.2.9.1.3 as amended and to approve language of 501.2: (T. Hawkins, J. Conant) Vote: 9-0-0
 - ii) R. Guell: I want to raise an objection that this is part of FACs primary authority, but FAC was not consulted.
 - iii) S. Lamb: Given that, is there any reason we cannot have FAC consider this proposal before we take it up?
 - iv) C. MacDonald: we could, but let's complete our discussion.
 - v) R. Guell: Can I give some history to the sentence that K. Butwin wants to strike? This policy came about as a result of three circumstances when the previous Provost had to pull a faculty member out of the classroom. He did it with the full knowledge and tacit approval of the Senate officers. But, he did it without explicit authority. Last year, we agreed in good faith to provide that authority. We were in agreement last year that faculty needed due process rights and an appeals process. We agreed that it would follow the grievance process.
 - vi) C. MacDonald: In Pre-Exec we made some changes to bring due process back into the language.
 - vii) K. Butwin: Are you suggesting that faculty might grieve the removal? Also, that we are immediately moving toward discipline and dismissal?
 - viii) R. Guell: That was the case in circumstance #1. In the other two circumstances, that was not the case. Both were bound up in substantial controversy. The faculty could have raised a substantial defense. They were counseled to do what they were told. I give you that because this is not an "I'm pulling you out and setting you on the path to being fired". It's also "I am pulling you out, you are tenured, but you will be eligible to be returned to the classroom." It may be temporary. Dismissal is not the automatic consequence.
 - ix) K. Butwin: I don't want to limit us to one direction or another.

- x) D. Hantzis: I appreciate R. Guell’s framing of the matter. Our initial change was intended to hopefully ensure that we would not rely on bad actors among our chairpersons. I’m wondering if to take the language down a little bit we make sure that the instructor gets to respond. No charges have been brought. It is not necessarily an investigation—more a review. It’s only an investigation when charges are brought.
- xi) C. MacDonald: “...will initiate a more complete review, and in all cases, the employee/faculty member shall be afforded Due Process per appropriate grievance policies...”
- xii) R. Guell: I think that’s what FAC would come back with.
- xiii) D. Hantzis: In 350.2.9.1.3 I am not persuaded that “including violation...” needs to be included in the first paragraph. I think that one is already violating ISU policies and procedures when engaging in the specified language.
- xiv) R. Guell: All the things you are really concerned about are going to be raised elsewhere in the Handbook.
- xv) D. Hantzis: K. Butwin’s justification is that it would include anti-bullying. But that’s already there in my opinion.
- xvi) R. Guell: The responsibilities of employment include not bullying your peers.
- xvii) E. Hampton: I think the presence of this make it clear that we are talking about the anti-bullying policy. I know it is not precluded. It makes it clear.
- xviii) K. Butwin: We felt the need to put that in place because people don’t think about it.
- xix) S. Lamb: I can see both sides of this, but I think this opens the door too broadly. I bet I could find twenty policies we have all broken.
- xx) E. Hampton: I have to doubt that chairs would use non-pertinent policies to justify targeting an individual.
- xxi) S. Lamb: Half the time we’re talking about chairs who are acting poorly. I move to strike this clause from the document. (S. Lamb, V. Sheets): 7-1-1

10) Liaison Reports:

- a) E. Hampton (AAC): We meet on the 20th to wrap up the charges.
- b) C. Paterson (AEC): We’re done.
- c) L. Brown (CAAC): They will be sending recommendation about Career Readiness.
- d) V. Sheets (FAC): We are done
- e) S. Lamb (FEBC): I think they’re still dealing with the issue of adjunct faculty treatment.
- f) T. Hawkins (GC): Meeting on Monday.
- g) D. Hantzis (SAC): Met today.
- h) J. Conant (URC): Done.

11) Adjournment: 5:22pm