

#19

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

April 5, 2016

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Final Minutes

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

Members Absent: L. Brown

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

Ex-Officio Absent: none.

Guests: none.

1) Administrative Reports:

- a) President D. Bradley: none
- b) Provost M. Licari: none

2) Chair Report: C. MacDonald

- a) I know that many of you already know the outcome of our Senate elections. We were able to double the number of Senators of color. We also have ten new Senators. I think it's excellent that we have new faces. This Thursday the officer elections will take place in HMSU 321. Please come and encourage others to come.
- b) Our next Senate meeting will be April 14<sup>th</sup>. We do not have one scheduled on the 21<sup>st</sup> yet. If necessary, we can also consider a time during finals week. We are waiting for several items from Standing Committees.
- c) I hope you brought the revised topics list for the Biennial Review. I hope we can deal with the first thirteen issues quickly and as a group. The second group will require a little more discussion. The last two items will require more serious debate.

3) Approval of Minutes

a) Approve as amended (D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins) Vote: 7-0-1.

4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

a) T. Hawkins: I would like to pass along a concern from a colleague regarding the e-mail retention policy. She set aside a number of hours to tag individual emails and discovered in the evening that all of her e-mails had disappeared.

i) D. Bradley: I don't think that's a result of the tagging. Maybe she inadvertently did something. I don't think tagging has made any e-mails delete. Also, you don't have to tag individual emails; you can tag folders.

ii) C. Paterson: I deleted a mess of emails because I pressed delete inadvertently.

iii) T. Hawkins: I only bring it up because we need to expect technological glitches.

b) D. Hantzis: Three years ago we began a conversation about the need to evaluate EAPs on their teaching. That began when R. Williams was provost. The Handbook says that all teaching is to be peer evaluated. J. Maynard said that he would issue null contracts so that people in this category would be flagged as Lecturers. It happened exactly once. Why did it go away?

i) D. Bradley: Those who are doing it, though it is not required, should be treated no differently than any other lecturer. Last week someone said that all Lecturers are being evaluated. If this is not happening, chairs are not doing their job.

5) FAC item: Biennial Review

a) Motion to approve revisions listed as issues #2-13, exempting item #7 (S. Lamb, T. Hawkins) Vote: 7-1-0.

b) Motion to change "faculty" to "committee chair person" in Item #1 on line 90 (S. Lamb, T. Hawkins) Vote: 4-3-1.

c) Motion to insert sentence "Other faculty involved in the review process are also encouraged to attend." Into Evaluation System, #4 (V. Sheets, S. Lamb) Vote: 7-1-0

d) Motion to approve issue #7 (D. Hantzis, V. Sheets) Vote: 8-0-0.

i) C. MacDonald: I would like unanimous consent to take the first thirteen issues as a block. We can start with #1.

ii) D. Bradley: What does "faculty" consist of?

iii) C. MacDonald: Committee members.

iv) D. Bradley: The only way to do that is to say that if they do not do the training, they do not get a raise.

v) C. MacDonald: The text explains it better. All of these items have been talked by the Senate and in here.

vi) S. Lamb: In the SCOB we will have twenty-one people participate in training.

vii) E. Hampton: Do you want it to be pulled for further consideration?

- viii) S. Lamb: Yes.
- ix) D. Hantzis: The training burden has been there from the beginning. Now we need to give it teeth. 90% of the BR problems results from a lack of understanding. I'm not sure how it will work: a fact sheet or sign a form. But, something must be done.
- i) C. MacDonald: I will take responsibility for ensuring that training is created. Training is for reviewers.
- ii) D. Bradley: Make sure the burden is on reviewers, not on Susan Powers.
- iii) C. Paterson: We can't have system in place that is disregarded. We end up with a lack of due process because of it. Not having training, having people unsure of role, creates liability concerns.
- iv) M. Licari: That said. I sympathize with S. Lamb's concern about the volume of busy work. There needs to be some attention to that. I wonder also down the line whether the training will be meaningful. Later people will say I already did this.
- v) D. Bradley: Signing a piece of paper saying you have read it is all you need.
- vi) C. MacDonald: Absolutely not. We thought so many issues were self-evident. We might be able to use a Qualtrics survey.
- vii) D. Bradley: We could have something like a driving test.
- viii) E. Hampton: It could be as simple as what we do with human-subjects.
- ix) S. Lamb: I like the concept of a driver's test. In our unit we worked best having an expert on call.
- x) J. Conant: I am all for an easy way to test. Let me remind people that in general time spent making things done right is better than time spent fixing things.
- xi) D. Hantzis: The problem with the expert is if an expert is not available or unwilling to provide an answer. People who came to the training sessions in September learned something.
- xii) V. Sheets: The question is how many experts we would need. I would like to move that on line 90 we change faculty to review committee chairpersons.
  - (1) E. Hampton: I am concerned that you are requiring the chair to do training. It is cleaner to have all faculty do training.
  - (2) C. MacDonald: I lean that way, too.
  - (3) D. Bradley: I ask everyone to remember how much your colleagues detest mandatory anything. There would be consequences for not doing this. Don't create something where the provost won't want to take responsibility. We don't want to amend the document to the point where we have something that is not doable.
  - (4) V. Sheets: We can add a sentence encouraging other faculty to participate.
- e) C. MacDonald: Issue #6. Ineligibility for overall CE, and use of college criteria, if no department decision on criteria.

- i) D. Bradley: How do you enforce that?
- ii) C. MacDonald: If you don't, then you can't be above expectations.
- f) C. MacDonald: Issue #7: Insert into the document language clarifying what may be inserted into the process by the chairperson.
  - i) V. Sheets: I have a question about this. What constitutes university data? Is it what comes from S. Powers' office? My department has given me approval multiple times to survey advisees about our advising process. I then produce a report. Does that constitute official university data?
  - ii) D. Bradley: It would be official by any legal definition.
  - iii) D. Hantzis: If it were part of your department criteria.
  - iv) J. Conant: If it is the department criteria, yes.
  - v) M. Licari: Yes, I think so.
- g) C. MacDonald: Issue #9: Department committees must use the department criteria and evidence provided by the faculty member being evaluated as the basis for their evaluations.
  - i) D. Bradley: That doesn't exclude things in the personnel file?
  - ii) C. MacDonald: No.
- h) C. MacDonald Issue #10: College Review: Choose between the options offered regarding eliminating or editing the role of the Dean in reconciling department chair and committee recommendations.
  - i) E. Hampton: Eliminate the second reconciliation meeting.
- i) C. MacDonald: Issue #12: Allow the one-page objection for domain specific evaluations and the overall evaluation
  - i) D. Bradley: That's for all? But that does not trigger some review process right? It's not a formal grievance.
  - ii) C. MacDonald: If one objects to being in the category there probably won't be anything that happens.
  - iii) D. Bradley: We do not want to create an infinite loop here.
  - iv) C. MacDonald: This is not a loop.
  - v) D. Bradley: How much time?
  - vi) E. Hampton: Five days.
- j) C. MacDonald: Issue #13: Add "interpretive authority" statement such as those recently approved by Senate for addition to the Handbook
  - i) D. Bradley: It refers to the Handbook, correct? My recommendation was to refer to it.
  - ii) C. MacDonald: But it doesn't apply to this process. It doesn't apply to this piece.
  - iii) V. Sheets: The BR is not in the Handbook.
- k) C. MacDonald: Issue #14: Chairing departments that one is not a faculty member in...

- i) D. Bradley: Does a decision on this not require discussion on whether administrative performance is part of the BR?
- ii) C. MacDonald: It probably does.
- l) Motion to delete issue #15: (C. Paterson, D. Hantzis) Vote: 8-0-0.
  - i) C. MacDonald: Issue #15: Hierarchy of criteria specificity/stringency (University; college; department)
  - ii) C. MacDonald: It's a new item from the last Senate meeting. Someone raised the question.
  - iii) D. Bradley: I worry that this is going to be a lot of lines by the time we're done.
  - iv) D. Hantzis: Even I have a line where this is approaching ridiculous. That is the standard. You can exceed. Unreasonable standards will not be allowed to go forward.
  - v) J. Conant: Let's leave it to training and interpretation of the document.
- m) Motion to delete issue #16 (S. Lamb, J. Conant) Vote: 8-0-0.
  - i) C. MacDonald: Issue #16: Complete sets of official documents should be shared with department committees (including resolutions)
  - ii) C. MacDonald: This is also a response to something in Senate: if a deficiency or grievance was resolved, does this have to be shared?
  - iii) D. Hantzis: Hypothetically, a chair shares with a department that a grievance had been filed. The committee asks for the outcome. You share the file. We are concerned about forecasting a bad action.
  - iv) D. Bradley: You would think that a hundred people were classified as not meeting expectations given the red ink. There were only three.
  - v) C. MacDonald: If we think this is unnecessary I need to hear a motion.
- n) Motion to eliminate "It is also the role of the chairperson..." from issue #17 (V. Sheets, C. Paterson) Vote: 8-0-0.
- o) Motion to approve issue #17 as amended (V. Sheets, D. Hantzis) Vote: 8-0-0.
  - i) C. MacDonald: Issue #17: : Insert the role of Chairperson to ensure required elements present and accuracy of required data
  - ii) C. MacDonald: We had a lot of discussion at Senate. S. Powers said that we can develop a concise document from FAD that would avoid the need for the chair to double-check data.
- p) C. MacDonald: Issue #18: Scholarship be removed from the relevant sections of the BR process for Instructors and the "Irrelevancy of unassigned domains."
  - i) C. MacDonald: There are two parts to this. The first is more important: people are evaluated based on their assigned work. I believe this to be important.
  - ii) V. Sheets: On line 359, we need a colon.
- q) Motion in favor of the unified document Issue #19: (D. Hantzis, V. Sheets) Vote: 5-2-1

- r) Motion to approve the second part of issue #18 (irrelevancy of assigned domains): (V. Sheets, J. Conant) Vote: 8-0-0.
  - i) C. MacDonald: Issue #19. Bifurcation.
  - ii) D. Hantzis: I said at Senate I was persuaded by D. Bradley's view on this, but I will support the majority if they vote for bifurcation. I think we should give training a chance.
  - iii) T. Hawkins: The way I think about this is, like D. Hantzis, the problem is the process. I understand that D. Bradley's view is that there is a symbolic problem with separating the faculty. With those two in mind, it's process versus symbolism.
  - iv) D. Bradley: What problem is not corrected with the revisions that we just made? Does the language focusing on evaluating instructors for specific assignments not solve this?
  - v) M. Licari: I'm in the same boat. You evaluate the instructors with narrow responsibilities without creating an entirely new system for it.
  - vi) J. Conant: I suspect that they are not being put forward as exceeding expectations.
  - vii) V. Sheets: I appreciate the importance of having the process right, but we correct that by making it clear that we won't consider irrelevant domains. I was struck that 1/8 of instructors were recognized. That is close to the 1/7 ideal.
  - viii) D. Hantzis: If the issue is that we are evaluating people on what they are assigned, but the assignment is smaller, that is a problem.
  - ix) V. Sheets: I think it is culture and I'm not sure process can fix it.
  - x) M. Licari: Having a process to fix a people issue is hard.
  - xi) C. MacDonald: Also people having different work. Comparisons are hard.
- s) Motion to take no action on issue #20 (S. Lamb, C. MacDonald) Vote: 5-2-0.
  - i) C. MacDonald: Issue #20: Clarify that faculty do get to assess the effectiveness of their chair regarding their administrative assignment.
  - ii) C. MacDonald: This is in regards to faculty getting to evaluate their chair through their review.
  - iii) D. Bradley: I would like to say in the time we have, the only viable solution is to leave it alone as it is in the current document or say that there will not be administrative reviews. Attempting to do a lot of finessing around that will probably take a lot more discussion.
  - iv) C. MacDonald: I agree.
  - v) D. Bradley: I am fully okay with the idea that we need to exempt the administration assignments from the BR and commit over the summer or next year to update, modify, or mend the chairs evaluation.
  - vi) M. Licari: I agree.

- vii) S. Lamb: I can live with forgetting it this year. But, I feel very strongly that faculty in general select their chairs. Not to allow chairs to have their work evaluated by their peers is incorrect. I think they should be a part of the BR process. I think moving in any other direction would remove them from the domain of faculty. I can live with leaving it the same as this year for next year.
- viii) D. Bradley: I was suggesting that chairs be still part of the BR but only in the three areas of teaching areas.
- ix) E. Hampton: I'm in favor of eventual evaluation of the administrative assignments in the BR. But lacking criteria it should not be done now.
- x) J. Conant: I can live with D. Bradley's proposal. By far, the most important thing to me is that faculty get to provide as much evaluation of their chair as they want. I think I agree with S. Lamb in principle that the major issue is faculty evaluation. I'm ready to throw that out for now with the promise to address at a later date the inadequacy of the current process of chair reviews.
- xi) S. Lamb: My motion would be to keep it as it is in regards to chairs.
- xii) E. Hampton: As far as I know, criteria do not exist yet. They would have to be put into place by Sept 21<sup>st</sup>. Is that not correct?
- xiii) D. Hantzis: We do have sections in the Handbook. I'm not completely convinced that it can't wait another cycle. Let's focus on "administrative assignments".
- xiv) C. MacDonald: We need to do something bigger with administrative assignments. We can't cover that today.
- xv) D. Hantzis: D. Bradley's correct. We can't solve the problem. This change was a consequence of the pilot year. It was added because faculty asked for the opportunity to do that. They felt completely excluded from the faculty chair.
- xvi) T. Hawkins: Everyone knows how I feel about this. I think by leaving it we are punting. I agree with the president that we should remove administrative evaluations from this document. We should tell faculty they will have a voice by creating a chair-evaluation process outside of the BR. I think it would solve a lot of problems with administrative assignments.
- xvii) S. Lamb: I object. All we have to do is make the language a little more clear.
- xviii) C. MacDonald: This probably needs further discussion. We cannot accomplish a large change to this due to the timeline. I'm taking a pragmatic view here on what Senate will vote for by April 28<sup>th</sup>.
- xix) D. Hantzis: I agree with T. Hawkins in the long run. Senate voted Exec's earlier recommendation down. The faculty defeated it. I hope that we do make sense of administrative assignments. We need definitions.
- xx) C. Paterson: I have experience with faculty administrative assignments. There are so many differences within faculty fellowships and other administrative assignments.

After we implemented the initial BR the first time, the provost, at the time, seemed willing to consider administrative assignments over 50% in a different pool due to substantially different roles. They would be routed directly through the Provost's office. There was some follow up to that conversation, but events overtook it. We need to remember that there are solutions outside of the current BR procedures that could effectively deal with issues such as these. D. Hantzis: The BR is supposed to be faculty led. The merit pay is where the problem comes from. Some faculty fellows are paid; some are assigned traditional faculty work and others are assigned what is traditionally viewed as administrative work. There are different notions. I believe that some faculty fellowships should exclude you from the BR and others should not.

t) Motion to approve issue #14 (D. Hantzis, C. Paterson) Vote 6-0-0.

6) Adjournment: 5:15 pm