

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

Executive Committee

August 18, 2015, HMSU 227, 3:30pm

Final Minutes

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

Members Absent: none

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President Bradley

Guest: K. Wilkinson

1. Administrative Reports

- a. President: none
- b. Provost Licari: I am happy to be here. I think I've gotten off to a good start, but that could be for a sheer lack of data. I would hope that if I am not off to a good start, someone would let me know. I am looking forward to our meetings—I've already had more than one with Chris already. I'm ready to start and ready for the year.

2. Chair Report:

- a. C. MacDonald: I would like to officially welcome you to campus. I would also like to officially welcome Shelby McConnaughey as the administrative assistant for the Senate. She will be working on getting the website updated. The Blackboard site will also be getting updated. She is in Gillum 103J, just across from Maria Wiant's old office. So, stop by and see her.
- b. I, like B. Guell, intend to be a one-term chair. In terms of my agenda for the year, my focus will be to increase transparency with faculty, the administration, and the Board of Trustees. To that end, the first thing I did was write the Overview of Faculty Governance document that is available on the University Faculty Blackboard site. Tomorrow I hope to send out a list of liaison assignments for Senate standing committees. If you are not happy with your assignment, let me know.
- c. I intend to reinstitute liaison reports to Exec. In addition, once we finalize charges I plan to create a master spreadsheet to track their progress in committee. And, I hope to start posting agendas on Blackboard, so they are more available to faculty as well.

- d. I am going to ask you today to endorse the faculty Blackboard site as the site for standing committees to post agendas, minutes, and other materials. FAC has done a wonderful job already. Other committees need to follow this lead.
 - e. Now the Biennial Review. An open forum concerning the BR process and procedures will take place at on Thursday at 4:30 in HMSU 407. Please encourage colleagues to attend. Once we get the results from the forum, the officers will prepare a FAQ for the faculty.
 - f. I completed the “It’s On Blue” training today. I encourage you to do so. The program allows you to stop and begin again. You will have no trouble completing it.
 - g. Standing Committee charges. The initial draft was difficult because many committees did not file a report last year. We need to encourage them to do so. I will be checking with committees in the hopes of getting missing reports compiled and posted.
 - h. Come prepared for the Exec photo next week. It will be on the agenda for next week’s meeting.
 - i. Motion to regard the Faculty Blackboard site as the designated website for Senate standing committees. Motion to approve (C. MacDonald, D. Hantzis) Vote: 9-0-0
3. Approval of Minutes of April 28, 2015 and April 30, 2015 Motion to approve (V. Sheets, E. Hampton) Vote: 7-0-2
4. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
- a. C. Paterson: The recently passed Handbook language on Sexual Misconduct needs to be updated to reflect the title and/or name of the new contact person.
 - b. C. MacDonald: I think we have to include the individual’s name. However, minor changes to the Handbook can be addressed with the Minor Changes policy we passed last year.
 - c. S. Lamb: B. Guell filed a grievance last term. I would like to report that the grievance will be dropped. It is my understanding that the President is going to share a letter with former and new executive members. I wish to thank D. Bradley for the amount of cooperation he gave during the process. All significant issues raised by B. Guell were addressed. I thought both B. Guell and the President showed great tact.
 - i. T. Hawkins: I received the letter today.
 - ii. S. Lamb: Good, that is really pleasing. I went prepared to do enormous mediation. I didn’t have to do enormous mediation.
 - iii. C. MacDonald: I want to thank you for taking this job. I would disagree you didn’t have a part. I believe you did have a big part in the outcome.
 - iv. S. Lamb: When the issue is raised at Senate, I ask for your support.
 - d. D. Hantzis: First I want to thank C. MacDonald for the work you’ve done to date. I want to share that I met with a first-generation mentee whose only major concern was the price of textbooks. He was charged \$187 by the Bookstore for an AHS 111 textbook, with no option to rent. I did a Google search and found multiple rental options and a cheaper copy on Amazon. I then checked my own textbook and had the same results. It concerns me that first-year students are the

most likely to buy from the bookstore and the least likely to research their options. What can we tell students?

- i. S. Lamb: I recall that the president suggested that we point to more inexpensive routes.
- ii. D. Hantzis: Does that violate any contracts?
- iii. C. MacDonald: We can encourage students to find cheaper alternatives.
- e. S. Lamb: I attended the freshmen event at the Hulman Center and was impressed at how well it was done.
- f. C. MacDonald: I have a question for the provost since I just completed the It's On Blue training. There is a recommendation that faculty add relevant language to syllabi. Has the University prepared anything that faculty could include?
 - i. M. Licari: We have nothing yet. I will investigate where we are and what we can do to make this possible.
 - ii. C. MacDonald: It would be helpful to know what our resources are since we are going to be responsible.
 - iii. D. Hantzis: this is new to our freshmen as well. We need to make sure that they understand what they need to do.
 - iv. M. Licari: Advisors will be able to steer students after classes are done being added for the semester.
- g. C. Paterson: When we revised the Biennial Review we required training for the reviewers. Is there an update on that?
 - i. C. MacDonald: Faculty training in the FAD is ongoing. College specific trainings are taking place. Those are just the things I know going on. There are efforts underway.
 - ii. M. Licari: S. Powers is putting together workshops during August and September.
 - iii. C. Paterson: Who are the workshops designed for?
 - iv. T. Hawkins: as far as I know they are designed for individual faculty. I don't know that there's any group training for departments or committees.
 - v. D. Hantzis: We really wanted training for people serving on review committees.
 - vi. T. Hawkins: I haven't heard anything about that.
 - vii. S. Lamb: I know S. Powers did send out information. It was sent to the chairs for department training. Susan is initiating conversations with the Deans.
 - viii. C. Paterson: They have a really tight schedule.
 - ix. D. Hantzis: Has the issue of the due date been resolved?
 - x. C. Paterson: Departments may establish an earlier deadline for their faculty to submit material to review committees, not colleges.
 - xi. C. MacDonald: There is still time.
- h. C. Paterson: Is there a meeting on 1 September?
 - i. C. MacDonald: No.

5. Selection of Parliamentarian

- a. C. MacDonald: I nominate Eric Hampton. Motion to approve (C. MacDonald, V. Sheets) Vote: 8-0-1

6. Handbook Section 246.2.2.2 Proposal

- a. C. MacDonald: This moves us to the revision of 246.2.2.2. This was brought to Senate last year but was tabled. We are considering a revised version of this language. Motion to approve proposal with revisions: (C. Paterson, V. Sheets)
Vote: 9-0-0
 - i. C. MacDonald: I made some revisions to the draft from B. Guell. I also received suggested changes from D. Hantzis.
 - ii. S. Lamb: So, two slates are sent forward. Exec may send a third. The Senate can reject that and choose between the others. In this version, we don't go back to the committee. Senate must choose one slate. Why can't we follow the same process as that used to select Senate chairpersons? If three run for the position, the one with the fewest votes is eliminated and then there is a run-off.
 - iii. V. Sheets: Doesn't the second paragraph say that?
 - iv. C. MacDonald: If the Senate votes the Exec slate down, what is the better option? What would you like to do instead?
 - v. V. Sheets: It's quite possible they will reject it and think that's worse.
 - vi. S. Lamb: It's wise not to return it to the senate committee one more time. If the Senate rejects the Exec slate, then I would vote on the slates until one gets majority.
 - vii. C. MacDonald: Is it the will of the group to move in that direction?
 - viii. D. Hantzis: We give the edge to the faculty and allow the Senate to choose.
 - ix. C. Paterson: I like the idea. That removes any threat.
 - i. C. MacDonald: If the Exe Committee has composed and recommended a third slate, a single vote will be held among the three slates. If no slate receives a majority of the vote, a run-off vote will be held between the two slates receiving the highest number of votes with the slate generating the highest number of votes being the Senate's recommended slate.
 - x. V. Sheets: Is this constitutional language?
 - xi. C. MacDonald: I will confirm and proceed as needed.

7. Minor Handbook Changes per 245.9.1.4

- a. C. MacDonald: Change #1 updates the language for the temporary faculty advocate on FAC. Change #2 adds language on the University College to Section 245.3 Structure of the University Faculty Senate. Motion to approve Change #1 (S. Lamb, V. Sheets) 9-0-0
 - i. D. Hantzis: Regarding #2, is the exclusion based on voting? If the UC ends up with faculty, will we amend this?
 - ii. C. MacDonald: Yes.
 - iii. D. Hantzis: I just want to make sure this is not a way to prevent it.
 - iv. V. Sheets: Much as I agree with this change, I don't think this is a minor change consistent with the intention of 245.9.1.4.
 - v. S. Lamb: I agree.
 - vi. D. Hantzis: Is the alternative a constitutional change?

- vii. C. MacDonald: Very good question. 245 is Constitution. 246 is Bylaws.
- viii. V. Sheets: It's not urgent, but how do we approach it?
- ix. C. MacDonald: I will take a look at that. If it's a constitutional change, I will wait and put it together with other constitutional changes for the Senate. Thank you for bringing that to my attention, Virgil. Shall we separate the University College language from the motion to approve the changes to the language concerning the temporary faculty advocate? Motion to approve recommended language 245.3.1.1.4 (V. Sheets, D. Hantzis) Vote: 9-0-0

8. Informational AAC Item

- a. C. MacDonald: I would like to invite K. Wilkinson to the table.
 - i. K. Wilkinson: I would like to recognize the work D. Richards did here. This report is a standing charge for the committee. Our primary goal was to look at the Handbook language stipulating that tenure and tenure track faculty teach at least 65% of the instructional hours at this University. We are now below 50%. The data has been adjusted for early retirements and changes to the rank of instructor.
 - ii. D. Hantzis: I really appreciate the value of this type of data in terms of missions and goals. It is particularly important to disaggregate the various categories of faculty, including contract faculty from instructors. Also, we need to disaggregate the E from the EAP, because it skews salary information. FAC discussed the need to change the language from T-TT to Regular Faculty. This would mean that instructors would count.
 - iii. S. Lamb: We did not have regular faculty when the 65% number was suggested. If this doesn't include Faculty, then the data is not damning. We should be talking about them.
 - iv. K. Wilkinson: We need to reword the document.
 - v. D. Hantzis: Figure 6 is important. We seem pretty close to the mark.
 - vi. L. Brown- Does it make sense to keep the benchmark at 65% or should we change it to 80% or something? It is still a lot of instructors. Who are we depending on for instruction?
 - vii. D. Hantzis: the language in the Handbook uses 'regular faculty' now. In figure 9, it would be helpful if temporary faculty were disaggregated from contract faculty. How much do we rely on the people with the fewest resources?
 - viii. E. Hampton: Are we phasing out one-year situations?
 - ix. S. Lamb: I don't know. It seems that the president does not like repeat one-year contracts.
 - x. K. Wilkinson: We have three.
 - xi. L. Brown: We have one.
 - xii. C. MacDonald: We have one as well.
 - xiii. L. Brown: One I had to make part-time because we had him for 3 years and are unwilling to make him full-time.
 - xiv. C. MacDonald: The president doesn't want it to be the norm.

- xv. D. Hantzis: I appreciate what the report says. It is critical that we have regular reports from committees that provide answers to our questions.
- xvi. V. Sheets: What are the reports that FS and EC would be interested in? I would hate to put people to work without direction.
- xvii. C. MacDonald: Perhaps both AAC and FAC can work together.
- xviii. S. Lamb: Excellent beginning. I want to know more about the subsets of regular faculty, as Darlene is suggesting. Do we use the term “adjunct”? Do we call them faculty? We have to have a starting point.
- xix. C. MacDonald: I agree. Thank you Kelly.

9. Charges for Standing Committees

- a. C. MacDonald: This is an initial draft. Motion to approve initial version as amended (S. Lamb, V. Sheets) Vote: 9-0-0
- b. C. Peterson: I am worried about the amount of charges for certain committees.
- c. C. MacDonald: The Provost had a suggestion for this. We might consider creating a policies committee as an additional standing committee.
- d. M. Licari: A committee charged with creating or revising policy might, for example, reduce the load on FAC.
- e. C. MacDonald: FAC could create a subcommittee. Let them decide what it should be.
- f. S. Lamb: The Board of Trustees now can send charges to us via the Policy on Policies. Is that something that this new committee would interact with?
- g. V. Sheets: Would we send university level policies to FAC?
- h. S. Lamb: I am worried about giving up too much power.
- i. C. Paterson: It appears that FAC’s plate is already quite full.
- j. D. Hantzis: All committees deal with policies, but FAC is FAC and everything ends up there. What part is review and advise and what part is the generation of policy? I like the idea that a committee is dedicated to policy, one that can follow up on issues. FAC talked about following up on a survey of non-TTT faculty, for example. And, PTOC responsibilities.
- k. V. Sheets: What about annual report? I understand committees don’t present reports anymore. Historically we used to have a spring faculty meeting. I, as chair, stopped doing this because no one attended unless they were giving a report. My experience is that even with deadlines it is hard to enforce. Can we ask for reports at the last meeting of the Senate? After graduation, we won’t see reports.
 - i. C. MacDonald: The dates were changed from August to June, but many still have no idea that they have to do a report.
 - ii. S. Lamb: Perhaps a short verbal report at the last FS meeting?
 - iii. L. Brown: How long will that take?
 - iv. V. Sheets: The Senate can observe that they did the report.
 - v. C. MacDonald: I like that.
 - vi. D. Hantzis: I was Chair 3 years of FAC. I would volunteer to create a template of the annual committee report. We did this in FAC on an Excel spreadsheet.
 - vii. C. MacDonald: We can put them on the Blackboard site.

- viii. C. Paterson: CAAC meets weekly. The last meeting of the Senate might be before their last meeting.
- ix. C. MacDonald: We have often written final reports saying that certain issues remain to be addressed.
- x. V. Sheets: Some reports are submitted with things left undone. Then, we know what remains to be done the next year.
- xi. C. MacDonald: Looking at the AAC charges, is there a Task Force on the Academic Calendar?
- xii. C. Paterson: I served on AAC last year. There was a Task Force.
- xiii. D. Hantzis: There was an issue about losing a day.
- xiv. C. McDonald: Perhaps AAC can respond to the draft of the Academic Calendar without establishing years?
- xv. C. MacDonald: Are there other things that you wish to add?
- xvi. S. Lamb: I suggest a slight modification to number 5. We have had some years where administrative positions have been reviewed by AAC but haven't been sent forward to EC for comment. It is so much more powerful when AAC has a voice and reports to EC.
- xvii. D. Hantzis: I would ask that FAC concern itself with 12-month faculty positions. There are many more than I thought we had, not only librarians. They have no access to grievance. These are 12-month faculty working for 9/10 months. If we're going to work on work load, perhaps we can work through a task force.
- xviii. C. MacDonald: We are thinking about the Grievance Task Force. If you have other things to add on, I'd be happy to hear them.
- xix. D. Hantzis: We need a review of P&T guidelines as soon as possible. And we need to energize PTOC.
- xx. C. MacDonald: Mike and I are going to write a letter.
- xxi. D. Hantzis: Keep in mind departments that do not have guidelines for non-tenured track.
- xxii. C. MacDonald: I will write that in and think about how to write a letter to PTOC.

10. Adjournment 5:03pm