

#22

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

April 26, 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: D. Scism, N. Rogers, K. Butwin, L. O'Laughlin

1) Administrative Reports:

- a) President D. Bradley: The semester ends in ten more days, and everybody is happy. Everything is set for commencement. We have the governor here next Thursday, and it would be great for people to come out. He's making an important announcement about 21<sup>st</sup> Century scholarships.
- b) All of the construction projects are moving forward. There will be a discussion of Rhodes Hall on the BOT agenda.
- c) Provost M. Licari: We have our last town hall for the Strategic Plan tomorrow in Dede I at 3pm. I will give a run-through of what I will be sharing with the BOT. The goal statements are drafts right now. We want to spend some time thinking about the initiatives we would like to have under these benchmarks. It should be an interactive session. The Board presentation is on the 6<sup>th</sup> at 10am. We would appreciate a strong faculty presence.

2) Chair Report: C. MacDonald

- a) I want to congratulate our incoming Executive Committee and its officers. T. Hawkins will be our new Chair. L. Brown will serve as Secretary, and I will be Vice-Chair. D. Hantzis and S. Lamb will continue on Exec, while R. Guell, B. Kilp, C. Olsen, and L. Phillips will also come aboard. The alternates in order are J. Conant, J. Kinne and J. Kuhlman.

- b) If we get to agenda item #11, we can discuss the issue of representation.
- 3) Approval of Minutes of April 19, 2016
- a) Approved as amended: (V. Sheets, C. Paterson) Vote: 9-0-0.
- 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
- a) L. Brown: I've had a couple of people approach me about deans not being evaluated—in particular the A&S dean. This is the end of the three-year cycle, and he has not been evaluated. The language in the Handbook states it will occur, not shall occur.
    - i) M. Licari: I think it's clear that J. Murray's evaluation has been suspended pending the outcome of his job search. I have a meeting with him in a couple of days. We will know soon.
  - b) E. Hampton: In terms of the workload issue, a compelling argument has been made that it is time to look into this. We are doing a disservice to pre-tenure faculty members with a heavy workload. I am wondering if we have had any thoughts on how the Faculty Senate will approach this.
    - i) C. MacDonald: We did discuss this with the Provost.
    - ii) D. Bradley: I think my job is to set the student-faculty ratio for the institution. The provost sets it for the colleges.
    - iii) S. Lamb: That's what M. Green said last week.
    - iv) M. Licari: I told the officers yesterday that my job is to allocate resources to the deans so that they can manage the set of priorities they have: they need to cover classes, get students through the curriculum, and graduate students. It is their job to figure out how to make that work. I'm content to let them manage their college in the way that they think works best.
    - v) C. MacDonald: We have not made a decision about what to do in Senate.
    - vi) S. Lamb: I agree with the position of the President and Provost, but I do think that Faculty Senate can take a strong position on this. I do think that it's perfectly legitimate that the President set the overall ratio. It's a necessity to set the ratio for colleges. But we can argue for equity. We can encourage but not mandate. Whether it is possible to satisfy demand with a three-course load, that's another story. Certainly, I believe the Faculty Senate has a role to play. I encourage T. Hawkins to find ways to bring this issue forward next year.
    - vii) D. Bradley: I don't disagree, but faculty have to be on both sides of the equation. You can't add to one side and not take away from another. If you do an analysis and see that COE is understaffed, what that's going to mean is you are going to have to look at the other colleges to see what to take away.
    - viii) S. Lamb: I'm not arguing that anyone is understaffed. I'm arguing that we have not carefully investigated satisfying demand with a three-course load. We have come close to reaching our loads in SCOB, but we have done it via 3 course load. We have

- the benefit a set of core courses. It's a huge benefit to the SCOB. I don't know if that exists in COE. I'm not arguing for different standards, I'm arguing for more investigation.
- ix) C. MacDonald: I am not saying that nothing will happen. The officers have been dealing with a number of issues lately. This issue has not been put on top. This does not mean I'm hands off of this issue but with our Agenda today we can't spend a lot of time on it.
  - x) D. Bradley: M. Licari and I are happy to be part of a helpful discussion. We all need to understand that there are limited resources.
  - xi) C. MacDonald: Part of my frustration is that we don't have access to sufficient data.
  - xii) D. Bradley: It is often difficult to get the data in the form you want. I would encourage you to work with M. Licari and to think about the kind of reports we want to have. Unfortunately, not all of the deans did a rigorous job assigning S-F ratios by department. COE may be the most agitated right now, but there is a broader problem with establishing reasonable SCH ratios by department. There's plenty of work to be done.
  - xiii) D. Hantzis: I want to say I think we have a lot of wonderful conversations ahead about faculty workload. I do believe that we could help ourselves if we try to gather the necessary information this summer and we keep Section 310 in mind as we do it. We have sections in the Handbook where the language is archaic. We need to be much more able to differentiate between workload and teaching load.

5) AAC items:

- a) 351 (Academic Departments) regarding Failed Departments
  - i) Motion to approve the proposed language with V. Sheets' changes. (T. Hawkins, C. MacDonald) Vote: 9-0-0.
  - ii) C. MacDonald: I sent this charge to AAC in February asking for it to be prioritized. I finally learned that they tabled everything. I am extremely disappointed in that, since they did not even bother to edit it. I have expressed my disappointment.
  - iii) E. Hampton: They were unclear about intent, so they tabled it.
  - iv) D. Hantzis: They are empowered to make changes.
  - v) E. Hampton: I believe they would have agreed to this language.
  - vi) C. MacDonald: No departments are currently in this position. This makes it explicit about what will happen in such an event.
  - vii) D. Hantzis: I appreciate that the first reference is to the failure of the department to meet its obligations.
  - viii) S. Lamb: R. Guell and I were on CAAC together, and we wrote a similar document that, I believe, passed through Faculty Senate.
  - ix) C. MacDonald: There is nothing currently in the Handbook.
  - x) C. Paterson: I think this is essential.

- b) 350.5 (Acting/Interim Chairperson) including the addition of emergency replacement
  - i) Move to approve (T. Hawkins, D. Hantzis)
  - ii) Motion to table (E. Hampton, L. Brown) Vote: 6-3-0
  - iii) C. MacDonald: Some of the failed departments prompted this. 350.5.2 deals with emergency replacement.
  - iv) V. Sheets: I didn't see a real need for this. It seems obvious to me that you can replace interim with Handbook language.
  - v) C. MacDonald: I think I had been misreading this.
  - vi) M. Licari: I think it's in that section because an acting or interim chairperson will be put in place.
  - vii) E. Hampton: But it's not an emergency replacement.
  - viii) M. Licari: It's putting in place in an emergency way.
  - ix) C. MacDonald: Acting/interim may not need to be there.
  - x) L. Brown: Because you can remove the chair person.
  - xi) C. MacDonald: I think it was meant to read "a chair person".
  - xii) D. Hantzis: The emergency removal clause, the change there is the Provost. I have had a conversation with D. Bradley about this. The Handbook states that removing a chair requires the president's approval. He did not realize it states that.
  - xiii) T. Hawkins: The point of the language was to address the removal and replacement of a chair on an emergency basis. If it is determined by the Provost, instead of going to the department to get a poll, and ask for a nomination, then effectively this allows the Provost to move faster.
  - xiv) D. Hantzis: But then why?
  - xv) T. Hawkins: We're removing a chair.
  - xvi) D. Hantzis: Removing an acting or interim chair?
  - xvii) V. Sheets: It's not likely to be used this summer. Could we table this and send it back to the committee next fall?

6) CAAC items:

- a) University-wide BA/BS proposal
  - i) L. Brown: Only the COT reported a problem with the CAS guidelines.
  - ii) D. Hantzis: The colleges determine the criteria.
  - iii) C. MacDonald: You can keep both.
  - iv) V. Sheets: You only need to make a distinction between the degrees.
  - v) Motion to table: (V. Sheets, T. Hawkins) Vote: 9-0-0.
- b) Career Readiness Proposal
  - i) Motion to endorse the development and strategic implementation of the integration of the Student Sycamore Career Readiness Certificate following a successful period of pilot efforts (D. Hantzis, C. Paterson) Vote: 4-5-0

- ii) N. Rogers: The document that you have is a proposal to incorporate the objectives of the Certificate into programs. Career Readiness is a goal of the strategic plan. The state is interested in this. We also have a \$3 million grant from the Lilly Endowment. It is time to address this. We initiated the Career Readiness Certificate a couple of years ago. Right now it's an upper-division elective. And, two programs, Elementary Education and Human Development Studies, integrated it into their programs. This proposal outlines a recommendation that each program fit the Certificate into their majors.
- iii) V. Sheets: Is this a recommendation or requirement?
- iv) D. Hantzis: As I read it there are two requirements: major programs must be revised to show how they are meeting the objectives; and, students have to show how they have met the requirements.
- v) N. Rogers: The intention is to have outcomes integrated into majors so that students would meet the requirements.
- vi) D. Hantzis: So the first line is no longer valid?
- vii) N. Rogers: That's right.
- viii) D. Hantzis: So it should not be articulated as a graduation requirement?
- ix) E. Hampton: One option is that programs simply require the Certificate.
- x) N. Rogers: I suppose a program could do that. But it becomes more difficult in terms of tracking. After we talked at CAAC about this it seemed pretty clear that incorporating it into existing courses would be the best option.
- xi) E. Hampton: I'm assuming this applies to all undergraduate programs?
- xii) C. MacDonald: Not all of our students and programs are undergraduate.
- xiii) T. Hawkins: I think CAAC did a good job summarizing the issues with implementing this in fall 2016. We can talk about whether its worthwhile, but I think we need more than a few months to put it in place.
- xiv) M. Licari: That was the understanding in the CAAC meeting. To phase in would be appropriate.
- xv) N. Rogers: We were thinking ten programs next year would start with this. There are certainly ten programs that can do this with no problems.
- xvi) T. Hawkins: I would be more than happy to support a trial or phase in. However, I would not necessarily support this and help pass it based on the expectation that it works in our programs. If students want to prove it works, that's fine. But we need to make sure to be careful about approving something this big.
- xvii) D. Hantzis: A couple of times the word "approval" shows up. I'm not sure by whom. I would not be comfortable if they were approved outside of the faculty. I would like that any time there's a requirement there should be a clear statement who is authorized to approve.

- xviii) M. Licari: I don't want to speak for N. Rogers, but my thought would be that the objectives of the Certificate can be built into the assessment plans of major programs. We have a clear understanding what it's going to achieve.
- xix) D. Hantzis: Another place is "approved experiential learning". Again, if that's how it's supposed to be, that's okay...but it's not quite how it reads.
- xx) C. MacDonald: I would hope that departments are approving it.
- xxi) N. Rogers: That is how we approve internships.
- xxii) D. Hantzis: And I would ordinarily think that, but this did not come up through the ordinary path.
- xxiii) N. Rogers: It's not something that the Career Center or I am controlling. You can manage through the departments.
- xxiv) S. Lamb: Much of this looks like it's appropriate for the SCOB, but I have a lot of empathy for T. Hawkins' concern. When you say "programs", could it be that the entire college has approved the process?
- xxv) M. Licari: If that is the appropriate place for assessment, then yes. But if not, no.
- xxvi) S. Lamb: I would expect that the approval process vote go through the normal approval process. This needs to remain under faculty purview.
- xxvii) V. Sheets: Right now, having a student complete the certificate counts as a second UDIE. Would the second be waived?
- xxviii) D. Hantzis: If this is approved, then we will vote to waive that. You can't finish a Foundations requirement simply by finishing your major.
- xxix) V. Sheets: I understand there are some allowances for those students not seeking a job, but what about online students who are already employed?
- xxx) N. Rogers: We do have resources that are available to online students. We can ramp that up. But, the non-traditional issue needs to be managed by the programs.
- xxxi) V. Sheets: Will you let us? We're having an issue having students find internships, because they're already employed full time.
- xxxii) N. Rogers: That needs to be managed by the department.
- xxxiii) M. Licari: You will structure the program accordingly. As N. Rogers said, these things would be managed locally.
- xxxiv) L. Brown: I think in theory this is a great idea. In math, we have a clear career path—they are going to be teachers. It would be very easy. It wouldn't add more to our existing program. But, I am concerned about other programs. Some would have to add things to the curriculum. So, we're asked to create additional learning outcomes that have to be met. In some cases they are not going to slide easily into the courses. Such a mandated requirement creates an additional burden on students. We're not going to pull out our content to implement this. This is adding to our majors. We have a lot of non-traditional working students. This adds time.
- xxxv) N. Rogers: I think it's reasonable to expect that anyone who graduates from here can write cover letters, etc. This is a reasonable expectation for students. I appreciate

- that it doesn't go well with your courses now, but over the course of the major these needs can be met.
- xxxvi) L. Brown: Then why do we allow credit for a UDIE for students who complete this? It's either worth the credits or it's not.
- xxxvii) D. Scism: They are not given three credits. They have to take a three-credit hour course in addition.
- xxxviii) M. Licari: I will reiterate N. Rogers's statement that it is important that our graduates are able to do certain things. It will be hard to work the Certificate into some majors. We won't push this on everyone in the fall.
- xxxix) C. Paterson: I have implemented part of the Certificate into my course already. I certainly have anecdotal evidence from students suggesting it's worth their time. But, is there evidence or data that you have collected from people who have completed it that shows positive outcomes?
- xl) D. Scism: We have few students who have completed it. It was only implemented this year.
- xli) C. Paterson: I don't know if this is going to be resolved today, but it is absolutely essential to know what the outcomes are.
- xlii) N. Rogers: We do have evidence that students are underprepared for a job search.
- xliii) C. MacDonald: Regardless of what we do in here today, there is nothing that prohibits programs from volunteering for this. I think that this a good idea, and we need to move towards it, but programs do need time to consider how to integrate it before they are forced to have their students do this.
- xliv) D. Hantzis: I agree with N. Rogers for the most part about the knowledge areas. I think that the skills are easily mapped onto most majors. But I'm worried that this is stated in a dramatic way, as a graduation requirement, etc. I am concerned that we are rushing into this. Indiana just became a LEAP state. We are part of a state collaborative to do this. It is only just moving forward. Also, I'm concerned about the clear indication that resources be provided in the Career Center at a time when there's no up-staffing of faculty or other staff. Even CAAC addressed that. I know the Career Center cannot handle 2,000 mock interviews. If we are going to fund this, that's going to be very difficult to manage.
- xlv) N. Rogers: A charge that has been cleared to D. Scism and the new executive director is that we can't continue to deliver our programs the way we have done. The model is not sustainable. We're going to have to look at other kinds of programing. I don't think we are getting more staff.
- xlvi) S. Lamb: I'm torn. I think this works extremely well in the SOCB, and it has been very helpful to students in their employment opportunities. I think the model fits beautifully for professional colleges. There's where the trial should be. It must go

- through the curricular process, and the units must be allowed to format their activities appropriately. We have a certain mission.
- xlvi) J. Conant: I completely agree that our graduates need to be able to do these things and that right now a lot of them can't. I know the state is concerned about this. We also keep getting reports from employers that we in higher education are not preparing our graduates. At the same time, it is true that faculty feel like they have been 'salamied' enough. This is yet another thing we have to take on without any additional resources. There's a perception that when something is added to administrative work resources follow. This is not true for faculty. We need to work through this proposal in more detail. At some point, you cannot continue to add without reaching a breaking point.
- xlvii) M. Licari: I don't think we are asking to have this rammed through. We are asking to do it where we can and then take time to plan out what kinds of resources are needed. All we're looking for here is a thumbs-up to move forward.
- xlvi) C. MacDonald: The strong resistance here suggests that it doesn't say that.
- l) J. Conant: I'm quite happy to go to my department to say let's get started, but I'd like to have a list of things that can be done outside of the department.
- li) M. Licari: But those are things you decide on yourself.
- lii) T. Hawkins: I don't support that. To say we are going to put this in to place without having worked out the details is unacceptable. I'm happy, for example, to support a pilot, and then come back next March. I don't want to endorse anything that suggests this will go full force now.
- liii) D. Hantzis: So would it be appropriate to have pilot in 2016-2017?
- liv) J. Conant: My problem is that those in the pilot may believe they don't have to do anything. Everyone needs to begin to think about how to incorporate it into the curriculum.
- lv) M. Licari: The entire campus either has to be part of pilot or actively considering integration.
- lvi) J. Conant: A process of integration into our programs.
- lvii) T. Hawkins: If it comes down to that, I want to be able to say I voted against this. There are things that I don't like about this as a history professor. Unless I see our faculty engaged, I want to be able to come back in March 2017 and see how well the pilot has gone.
- lviii) C. MacDonald: Can we agree with what will go along with this? This is something we talk about.
- lix) E. Hampton: Can we talk about starting a pilot we don't endorse?
- lx) J. Conant: I would like to make a motion, one that provides recognition but no time frame. It's a statement that we recognize that our students need this, but we're not sure when it should be in place.

lxi) Motion that Faculty Senate endorse the proposal to create means by which all undergraduate students will meet the objectives of the Student Sycamore Career Readiness Certificate. Vote: 5-3-1.

7) GC item: Graduate Council Bylaws

- a) Motion to approve (E. Hampton, D. Hantzis) Vote: 9-0-0.
- b) L. O’Laughlin: we started this process last year when we realized we didn’t have any bylaws. We have made revisions this year to the subcommittees.

8) General Counsel Item: Student Grievance Procedures

- a) Motion to endorse (S. Lamb, C. Paterson) Vote: 9-0-0.
- b) K. Butwin: These are updated procedures for investigation. They are in the same format as the procedures that we established for the interim policy. We’ve worked with student and staff council members to update these. I do want to comment that the students will have two-year rolling terms instead of three. One issue that required discussion is found in Section G. This addresses the standard of evidence and how the committee will make the decision. We have a lot of lawyers on the Board of Trustees. They wanted a reference to “reasonableness” in the language. For now, I added a sentence in Section G.
- c) V. Sheets: More likely than not that a reasonable person would consider it...
- d) K. Butwin: And that it affected a person. Those are related. A student could feel a personal response to a situation that would not be considered reasonable more broadly.
- e) D. Hantzis: I’m assuming that the ‘reasonable’ standard only applies to number one.
- f) K. Butwin: As the lawyer for the University I was told to stress ‘reasonable’ in all circumstances.
- g) E. Hampton: I think determination is spelled out in two places, and that’s where it should be.
- h) C. MacDonald: One point that R. Guell asked me to address is under Section M. FAC is adamant that students don’t get to vote if it’s an academic freedom issue.
- i) K. Butwin: I think the position of the administration is the exclusion of determination is earlier. The Faculty Senate chair will be contacted much earlier in the process. It is in the Policy.
- j) C. MacDonald: That’s the first review level.
- k) V. Sheets: That’s before the faculty member has had time to respond.
- l) C. MacDonald: That is in Section C.
- m) K. Butwin: We could add something to address that issue. A student makes a general complaint through the website. There’s not much information at this point. We have a conversation with the student to find out more details. It may be that at this point the complaint gets moved in a different direction. It could be once you get a written statement that this belongs somewhere else. There’s another complete review for the formal submission.

- n) C. MacDonald: But it's at the point where the faculty member responds and argues academic freedom. R. Guell is concerned at this point about students voting on that.
- o) V. Sheets: Yes, to me it makes sense why I have the lecture, but the student may not understand.
- p) C. MacDonald: Let's say a complaint goes through, but V. Sheets still argues academic freedom. That's the point R. Guell is concerned about it.
- q) D. Hantzis: If we look at D, that's after the first review. So if we provide in D.2, can we put it here?
- r) C. MacDonald: You could but it doesn't resolve the issue.
- s) D. Hantzis: That will be reviewed at the committee.
- t) C. MacDonald: Exclusion has to happen at the committee determination level. In terms of making the determination, R. Guell would prefer that no students make a determination.
- u) K. Butwin: R. Guell's language states that students should leave the room.
- v) C. MacDonald: Can the issue not be determined by a majority of the faculty on the committee?
- w) D. Hantzis: What if all the students disagree?
- x) K. Butwin: It's a majority of all the members. There are six. If three students agree with the student and three agree with the faculty member, there's no violation. I will be happy to talk to the President again about this. I will say in D. Bradley's defense and mine that we did specifically exclude content and pedagogy in the Policy itself.
- y) M. Licari: We can't draft policy according to whether you are a well-liked faculty member or not.
- z) V. Sheets: I'm concerned that students can see the relevance of what I'm teaching. I'm not convinced that the triage level will recognize that.
- aa) K. Butwin: I think it is okay to put something in so that they can make a decision.
- bb) M. Licari: I am okay with that at the triage level.
- cc) K. Butwin: We have not had any issue that has resulted in a formal grievance. One of the great things about the procedures is that if they are not working, we can make quick changes.

#### 9) Standing Committee Slates

- a) Motion to approve (S. Lamb, V. Sheets): Vote 9-0-0
- b) C. MacDonald: The Dismissal Hearing Committee requires discussion. When we began looking into this, we discovered that the committee was not appropriately staffed. I used an old list of volunteers to see if they were interested in volunteering. We need to make a choice in a couple of places.
- c) C. Paterson: I'm happy to serve, but I don't know if I need to leave for you to discuss.
- d) C. MacDonald: We are in agreement on J. Harper and C. Paterson.
- e) D. Hantzis: I wasn't sure about the Senator status of some of these folks.

#### 10) Mission, Vision, Values

- a) Motion to endorse (T. Hawkins, L. Brown) Vote: 9-0-0.
- b) C. MacDonald: M. Licari has asked us to endorse this.
- c) M. Licari: The mission statement is broken down in to two statements. The Values are much shorter than they used to be.
- d) D. Hantzis: I don't like the phrase 'career readiness'.
- e) K. Butwin: This will be in the Handbook, Section 210.

#### 11) Nomination/Election Proposal

- a) Motion to receive the proposal (D. Hantzis, L. Brown) Vote: 9-0-0.
- b) D. Hantzis: I appreciate the speed with which B. Bunnett responded. There are a couple of errors. He refers to a Ballot which we don't explicitly have. We have time. The idea is good. I'm less persuaded on some issues than others.
- c) T. Hawkins: When he says that you must be on Exec to run for chair, that's not true. It needs to be clear that those positions are open to all senators. I appreciate the work and I support of a lot of these things. As far as giving candidates the opportunity to make a statement, I think we can return to this tradition and post them on the Faculty Senate website. I think it's going too far, however, to say that we are not seeing turn over on the Exec. In the period since 2010-11, ten out of the twenty-one people who have served on Exec have been new to the committee. Effectively, that counters the presumption that we are a stagnant body.
- d) C. MacDonald: T. Hawkins will be our third first-time chair in the last three years. We've also had a new officer this year. We have ten new people alone on Senate this year. Some of these things we can adopt as practice.
- e) D. Hantzis: I also think it may be time to ask about putting limits on departments. I love that we have this conversation and I really am in support of a Senate nomination form having a statement from the one running.
- f) V. Sheets: I was going to suggest that I think a lot of progress has been made in governance. I think we can accept this report and send it to FAC for next year or have next year's Exec see if there are charges to come out of it.
- g) S. Lamb: I think the most important part of B. Bunnett's suggestion is the nominating committee. To help ensure there are more candidates running, it is and has been problematic when the officers are nominated right at the meeting and there's no fore-knowledge.
- h) C. MacDonald: We did do the New Senate Social to alleviate some of that.
- i) M. Licari: From what I've been hearing, I believe you should vote to "receive" the document.
- j) D. Hantzis: I would prefer that that number report not go to Senate. We're not going to ask them to act on it. I think we've let who serves on Senate be overstated as an issue.

12) Information Item: PTOC Report

a) C. MacDonald: You are being given this because they are required to provide a report.

13) Adjournment: 5:40pm