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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 8, 2015

3:30pm, HMSU 227

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: President D. Bradley, Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: none

Guests: R. Lotspeich, R. Gonser, T. Balch, C. Berchild

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Bradley
      1. We have been mulling over the diversity consultants’ report for the last few months and considering what Student Affairs needs. The decision is that there is going to be a Diversity Programming position in Student Affairs (SA). W. Banks talked to E. Ervin. She is going to move over to SA to provide programming on diversity/inclusion. At the same time, we still have issues on making progress in campus-wide diversity, for example with faculty. We need someone to help with recruiting and policy. That person will be working for M. Licari. So, N. Davis is moving from SA to be part of M. Licari’s staff. That’s going to be part of my email that will go out today. For now they will switch offices. The idea is that Elonda will focus on student affairs and Nolan will focus on the academic side. He will report to the provost and attend Cabinet meetings, at least quarterly. My biggest take-away from the report is that we need to look beyond the numbers and consider results. We’ve seen that in community service. We’ve got to look at impact. What are the results of our volunteering work? On the diversity end, how many faculty do we have from minority backgrounds or who have other attributes that differ from the mainstream? How can we assess their impact? Hopefully Nolan can look into that. We have two people with great strengths in different areas.
      2. I would like to mention again our record-breaking enrollment and our *Washington Monthly* rankings.
      3. Next Wednesday (September 16) I will be giving my fall address. I hope you can come. We are going back to having a reception with alcohol. We have moved the address up half an hour. I promise it will be shorter than last year. I will be talking primarily about the Strategic Plan: what has worked, what hasn’t worked, and where we go from here.
   2. Provost M. Licari:
      1. In regards to the new strategic planning process, I appreciate the cooperation from those of you around the table who will be participating. The first steering committee meeting is on the 17th.
      2. Regarding the BOT meeting that was held, my take-away is the concern expressed by trustees about student success. Some specific concerns are department and collegiate efforts. We will be concentrating our attention there, and we will be asking departments to draft a meaningful set of plans that they can actually implement. Chairs have expressed their need for more support and guidance during the academic year. I do intend to provide for more project management.
      3. The Board also had some curricular concerns. Despite our efforts, they remain concerned about inflexible majors and other obstacles to timely graduation. Our long-term efforts need to include curriculum review, to build in flexibility. At the same time we need to maintain academic integrity and quality.
      4. Thank you, C. MacDonald for your *It’s On Blue* comments. It’s important for all of us in Academic Affairs to be on top of this. We are the ones who students will turn to. A quick review of the spreadsheets suggests that faculty appears to be lagging as far as completion rate goes.
         1. D. Bradley: 58% of Faculty and Staff have completed it.
         2. M. Licari: We need to remind them to do the training. The overall freshmen completion rate is 1/3 with 45% first time full-time freshmen
      5. Across the campus, we need to encourage our colleagues and our students. Or we run into a challenge in regards to registration.
         1. L. Brown: Would it be possible for chairs to get a list of their faculty who have completed the training?
         2. M. Licari: Yes, it’s being compiled now. Right now we just have a huge list of those who did complete.
         3. S. Lamb: I was interested in the comments from L. Maule at the faculty retreat about those students who dropped out. A good percentage of these individuals were dropping out not so much due to grades but for economic reasons.
            1. D. Bradley: The majority of students leave with good academic standing.
            2. S. Lamb: Considering our retention issues, what might be done in regards to those students?

M. Licari: J. Powers has circulated a report about these students and what departments can do to retain their upperclassmen. We don’t want them to leave, especially if they are in good standing. Retention and graduation rates defy a silver bullet. Many groups have a role to play.

* + 1. The Board also has expressed its interest in curricular and student-support efforts to reinforce our students’ career readiness. We have turned our attention towards those efforts now. I think we can do more to make sure our students have meaningful careers after graduation.
       - 1. V. Sheets: When might we expect to hear about positions for next year?

M. Licari: It is being worked on now. I’ve made some decisions, but I can’t yet give you an exact date.

1. Chair Report:
   1. C. MacDonald:
      1. I hope you had a relaxing weekend. The first informal meeting for Exec is on Thursday on the 9th floor of HMSU.
      2. “It’s On Blue” training: 1/3 of undergraduates have completed the training. Next week is designated IOB week. There will be a big push. The completion rate for faculty and staff together is about 60%. We do still need to encourage Faculty and Staff to get their IOB training done.
      3. I have set up a meeting with the Temporary Faculty and will ask for nominations for a TF advocate to the Senate. I hope to put in place a more formalized process for selecting nominees.
      4. Three-week attendance reporting is due. Encourage colleagues to complete this.
2. Approval of Minutes of August 25, 2015: (V. Sheets, T. Hawkins) Vote as amended, 9-0-0
   1. T. Hawkins: D. Hantzis sent in some minor revisions.
3. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. E. Hampton: I find it troubling that collegiality could be considered off-limits in a review process.
   2. C. Paterson: I looked at the AAUP White Paper on this issue. I think rather than getting someone’s interpretation, it is best to consider the document as written. Committee A did this.
      1. D. Bradley: the term ‘collegiality’ has become politicized.
   3. C. MacDonald: For those of you not on EC before, the AAUP report is a recent addition to our agenda and is not a required part of our process, but is contingent on the chair’s continued approval. The AAUP often raises vital issues.
   4. D. Hantzis: For two years in row FAC attempted to bring to the top of its agenda a policy of non-discrimination. We could never get it done, but there is a lot of good work out there. I would suggest that sometimes the term collegiality is used as a threat by bullies. Let me also state that I am a long-time member of AAUP.
      1. S. Lamb: May I suggest that AAUP would be more valuable if we had a larger faculty representation.
   5. D. Bradley: I want to touch on grievances. My goal in this discussion is that you have to be personally damaged in order to file a grievance. In my view, B. Guell did not file a “grievance” over the summer. He pointed out a procedural problem. We need to have a process come forward that lets us distinguish between “grievance” and “problems”.
      1. S. lamb. That was noted by some on Exec.
   6. T. Hawkins: I have learned a lot about Lynyrd Skynyrd this week. A number of people have contacted me about the homecoming band. Whether they are an ISU-sponsored band or not is irrelevant, because they have been promoted by ISU and are part of the ISU homecoming experience. This is a band that literally and figuratively wrapped itself in the Confederate flag. Although the band has disassociated itself from the flag recently, their fan base continues to display it. The symbolism of having Lynyrd Skynyrd perform at the Hulman Center on the same evening and within a couple of blocks of the African American Cultural Center, where Sam Dixon will be receiving a Distinguished Alumni Award, is disturbing. ISU needs to be aware of the possibility that our African-American alumni will be seeing the confederate flag.
      1. D. Bradley: We rent out the facility. It is difficult for the Hulman Center staff, which has been given the charge of renting the place, to make money. There is no doubt that the confederate flag is a socially unacceptable symbol. Not long ago, it was not. Hulman Center will also be hosting another country band that uses the Confederate flag. In their contract, it says they will not display the flag. Lynyrd Skynyrd has publicly stated they will not display it. I will be willing to talk to N. Rogers about the confederate flag.
         * 1. C. MacDonald : I grew up in Alabama, I have done research about the “Sweet Home Alabama” lyrics. My concern is the fans, for we have less control over them. I do think we need to make it clear that the Confederate flag is unacceptable. I would find it disturbing to have the flags near the African-American Cultural Center.
           2. D. Bradley: Growing up in the west, the flag was a statement of anarchy and anti-establishment sentiment with little to no relation to race.
           3. T. Hawkins: For decades, African Americans have seen it as a symbol of racism. We do not want to question freedom of speech, but we do need to be sensitive to those who are being invited to campus, especially on Homecoming weekend. We should primarily be concerned about our alumni. African American alumni are probably not going to look at the band in any positive way.

D. Bradley: The fact that it’s on Homecoming is a coincidence.

J. Conant: My perspective, first and foremost we have to protect our students and community. We have been warned. We need to take action. Who knows what’s going to happen. We need to be prepared.

S. Lamb: All it takes is one individual to mar this event. We will make the news in the most derogatory fashion. John, as you’ve said, there are limitations to what we can do, but we can take precautions. It is necessary.

D. Bradley: Clearly we need to assess whatever issues there are.

* 1. T. Hawkins: We are less than two weeks away from the Biennial Review deadline. There still seems to be a lot of disagreement about the process. In particular, a number of people have concerns about page length. If someone submits beyond the requirement, what are the consequences and who is in the position to do something about it? Do they hear from Academic Affairs and from us?
     1. D. Bradley. Page length is one criterion that is unchanged.
     2. T. Hawkins: The difference is that we used to submit on paper. Now we submit on the FAD. Here the material can appear in links. How does this translate?
     3. D. Bradley: Tell a faculty member: “If you can get it on the right amount of pages, it’s okay.”
     4. D. Hantzis: I reviewed the April minutes. People are confused. There was supposed to be training for reviewers in August and we haven’t trained.
     5. C. MacDonald: That comes from Academic Affairs. T. Hawkins, please put in the next musing about the page limit.
     6. T. Hawkins: Who has ultimate authority? Can I state who in the musings? If the reviewer gets a report that goes beyond the requirements, what are the consequences? We have to have some kind of policing authority or it’s meaningless.
     7. D. Bradley: Page limits are valuable things and we don’t want to give them up. I would suggest that as a first shot, the committee returns it and you have 48 hours to correct it. If the person says no, then they are noncompliant. If someone says they don’t agree with their committee, C. MacDonald and M. Licari can look at it. Please don’t give up on the page limits.
     8. J. Conant: But we could give the Chairs the authority to do something.
     9. C. MacDonald: I did put it in the FAQ. As the work flow is set up, the report will go to the chair first. This would give the chair to have the ability to say they need it to be revised.
     10. T. Hawkins: For the future, this has shown me that actual paper has its advantages versus the database.
     11. D. Bradley: I would suggest that people submit as a PDF with no links whatsoever.
     12. T. Hawkins: It would help if you could submit a paper copy as a master. Page limits can easily be checked there.
     13. L. Brown: Only the committee chair has access in the FAD. Then s/he has to download all the PDFs, which I think is weird and cumbersome. At that point, you’re better off with the paper.
     14. C. Paterson: Regarding the database, every time it asks me to provide a link, I ignore it. It has saved me so much time editing the document. I think that for some, it’s going to be meaningful. The idea behind the FAD is to have a living Vita.
     15. J. Conant: So the work that needs to be done in the future is in the FAD, itself.
     16. D. Hantzis: I do want to remind us that we still have a window to help people (time frame). The system was set up so we can access it right away. I think we can still help people. We have time as the Senate to communicate with the faculty. We can send some prompts. We don’t submit from the department to the deans until the 10October.
     17. S. Lamb: I appreciate sending forth musings on this issue. I think Mike should be in this too. If we have a definitive document out there, I have expressed the opinion that you can use links.
         1. I also hope in the next musings that we can recognize that we have a non-tenure/tenure-track faculty member serving on the Senate.
     18. C. MacDonald: What do we do about people who don’t do what they are supposed to do? It goes back to IOB. What do we do for those who don’t?
     19. D. Bradley: That came up in Cabinet. It could be then that you have not completed your self-evaluation. If something is mandatory, we have to have a discipline process. For students, we can put a registration hold on the account. For employees, we have to tell them ahead of time. We have not put anything like that in place. We need to. We do not have anything in the procedures or handbook. This is an example where we need something.
     20. C. Paterson: The goal is to have 100 percent of people to do the training. The thing is to engage 100 percent. If we want them to do these, if we say were going to dock you a day’s pay, it’s not going to work.
     21. D. Bradley: In general 100 percent means 100 percent. If there are situations where the training is inappropriate for some people, we need to implement another type of training. Everyone has to do some kind of training. We do need penalties.
     22. C. MacDonald: We need to be more encouraging in department meetings. We will take time and find ways to encourage people to make it easier for them.
     23. D. Bradley: Most of the people who are looking for exceptions are acting out of contrariness.
     24. E. Hampton: It would be a bad idea to tie this to the BR.
     25. C. MacDonald: Nothing was agreed to.
     26. E. Hampton: We would need Senate buy in first.
     27. D. Hantzis: Better to think of it as employee responsibilities.
     28. D. Bradley: Everyone needs to think about it differently.
     29. C. MacDonald: If you didn’t do your training yet, then you get the letter in your file and it can go in your next BR.
     30. D. Bradley: Will that be acceptable in Washington?
     31. D. Hantzis: Can we give them two classes?
     32. D. Hantzis: Without board policy, we don’t have fines in our procedures. How about -- No personnel actions will be processed until it is complete.
     33. D. Bradley: Are you all willing to back M. Licari and me up on that?
     34. C. MacDonald: Yes.

1. AAUP Report
   1. R. Lotspeich: AAUP~ISU Chapter believes the following issues warrant the attention of the top faculty leadership at Indiana State University.

Academic Freedom and Textbook Selection: Last fall we reported to the Senate Executive Committee about a controversy from the Scott College of Business regarding choice of textbook for a particular course. After an investigation by chapter officers, the results of which have been circulated, we concluded that current policy at ISU generally, and in the College of Business in particular, compromise the academic freedom of instructors to choose course materials while offering no substantial offsetting gains.

We recommend that consideration of a policy change about textbook selection should be given as a charge to the Faculty Affairs Committee, with background information provided from our investigative report (dated 25 May 2015).

Collegiality as a Criterion of Faculty Performance: Recommended best practices from the national AAUP exclude collegiality as a criterion for faculty performance, and the University Handbook states an intention to follow AAUP principles. Yet collegiality was recently used in the evaluation of a tenure track faculty member of the College of Arts and Sciences, including partly as a justification for a conditional reappointment. In fall 2014 a department in the College of Health and Human Services planned to explicitly include collegiality in their guidelines for promotion and tenure as a criterion for faculty performance. AAUP~ISU Chapter advised the department against that, and they altered their guidelines to exclude collegiality.

We recommend that the senior faculty leadership take steps to inform all ISU faculty and academic administrators that collegiality should not be a part of evaluating faculty performance for either biennial reviews or for retention, promotion and tenure.

Divergence of Criteria for Research Performance in Tenure Evaluations: In an annual evaluation case referred to AAUP~ISU Chapter, a Dean used a criterion of research performance that diverged from that of a departmental personnel committee. Standards of performance in the professional work of faculty members should be established by faculty colleagues and not by administrative officers. This is best practice recommended by national AAUP and is an essential area of faculty Primary Authority. Moreover, this is a principle contained in the University Handbook. Administrative officers should not substitute their own criteria for those of a departmental personnel committee in making retention, promotion and tenure recommendations.

We recommend that the Senate Executive Committee take steps to inform chairpersons, deans and others involved in the evaluation of faculty members for retention and tenure that the criteria established by departmental personnel committees should not be replaced by alternate criteria at subsequent stages in the evaluation process

Shared Governance and Academic Freedom in New Faculty Orientation: We believe the New Faculty Orientation programs have not paid sufficient attention to the topics of Shared Governance and Academic Freedom. These are issues of subtlety that are not well understood by many in the academic community. At the same time, they are very important in the professional lives of faculty members.

We recommend that the Senate Executive Committee work with the organizers of the New Faculty Orientation to provide more effective education of new faculty members in these two crucial areas. AAUP~ISU Chapter stands ready to collaborate on New Faculty Orientation sessions devoted to Shared Governance and Academic Freedom.

Due Process in Conflicts and Communication with the Board of Trustees: The student grievances pursued against faculty in the College of Health and Human Services last spring created substantial controversy and damaged the reputation of ISU as a place to pursue academic careers. AAUP officers were approached for advice in those cases, and we are hopeful that such egregious failures to follow due process will not occur again. It is not clear whether the Board of Trustees has been informed of the student grievances and the surrounding controversy, or of the subsequent grievance filed by Professor Guell in reaction to how those student grievances were handled. The Board should be informed about these events because they have relevance for the Board’s role in oversight of ISU policies and the work-place environment.

We recommend three things to the Senate leaders related to these matters. First, that you emphasize in your communications with faculty and administrators the critical importance of following due process in all situations of conflict. Second, that you engage the Board of Trustees on these matters to ensure that they have been adequately informed about the events and their potential consequences.

Third, we have been informed that one reaction to these events has been to charge the Faculty Affairs Committee and a task force to develop procedures for student grievances against faculty. In our view this is a mistake. While we agree that students should have the right to have their concerns about faculty conduct heard by ISU authorities, a grievance procedure is inappropriate for this purpose. ISU already has a mechanism through which students can file complaints about faculty conduct, which is administered through the Office of Student Conduct and Integrity. This complaint procedure is adequate, fair and appropriate for students’ concerns. To establish a second procedure for this purpose is a waste of faculty and administrator effort and will likely result in unnecessary confusion. It should not be pursued.

* 1. S. Lamb: At one time there was much discussion about collegiality; some departments say it “affects productivity” if it impacts others doing their work; negatively affects progress of department in achieving its goals. Is there AAUP language that might incorporate this side of things?
  2. R. Lotspeich: if the behavior is so egregious that it degrades the person’s personal work then it will be reflected in other areas.
  3. D. Bradley: the term collegiality has become politically charged. We may have to come up with a different word. Anyone who works at ISU and interferes with the good work of the university need to be held accountable. If they decide not to get along, it is going to affect P-T decisions. If we can’t use that word, we won’t. But, we have to say that that “behavior” is going to have an impact. People do not earn tenure. That is something the University gives them.
  4. R. Lotspeich: If someone is actively obstructionist, that can be addressed in a separate way—maybe a grievance. It is a slippery slope from actively obstructionist to constructive dissent. Where is the line?
  5. D. Bradley: It comes down to semantics. We need another term that describes behavior that goes beyond being nice.
  6. S. Lamb: I have always felt good that C. Hoffman and B. Guell were always considered collegial. They have strong personalities. But they provided productive criticisms. Administrator after administrator spoke positively about their behavior. There is a lot of danger in misinterpreting the term collegiality. The word can incorporate constructive criticism. We need to allow that interpretation. I am concerned about that path, but I am aware that the institution needs to address behavior that affects productivity.
  7. V. Sheets: One last point regarding grievances. How do students work through Student Conduct to address faculty issues?
  8. D. Hantzis: It’s not sufficient for faculty. Student Conduct and Integrity Complaints have three steps. The process states that “complaints with merits will be resolved.” Student Affairs and Faculty Affairs need to make sure that there is a delineated process in place to address these issues. I am concerned that this basically states that you can submit something but it doesn’t mean we have to do anything about it afterwards.
  9. R. Lotspeich: This is not the appropriate place.
  10. D. Bradley: This is the way it is all over. The faculty grievance process deals with grievances between peers. It is the same with students. We have had little oversight at the university level at what is happening at the department level. Regarding the summer grievances, the College did the best it could with a pretty unworkable process. We need a university process that talks about the details of complaints of students against students, students against staff, etc. Grade appeals need to be handled at department level. Title IX has to be handled at university level. The current situation is outdated. Students can’t be treated as something less than adults; they are not peers, but they are not children. Now, with regard to deans and chairs, regarding research, I hope you are not saying that a department’s views on research cannot be challenged by chairs, deans, the President. If you are, I find that unacceptable. I think those other individuals have responsibilities. What if a department decides that research is not important?
      1. C. MacDonald: We are more concerned about a situation where three articles are required and the dean says, “well, you don’t have five.”
      2. R. Lotspeich: Departments are where these standards are set.
      3. D. Bradley: Then CAS has some problems. There have been cases where departments have voted unanimously in favor of someone and the college committee has done the opposite.
  11. E. Hampton: Can you elaborate on the case where collegiality was used in Promotion and Tenure? Was the situation where they were evaluated by collegiality and behavior was used as point of criticism as the faculty? Do you think that’s inappropriate?
  12. R. Lotspeich: It was used as a criticism.
  13. E. Hampton: Peers can comment on collegiality.
  14. D. Hantzis: As long as it does not become a fourth category.
  15. C. Paterson: Can you clarify?
  16. R. Lotspeich: It happened in a 3rd and 4th year evaluation. The individual was seen as not working in the best interest of the department.
  17. C. MacDonald: Collegiality was in the mix; comments were not broken down into the three domains.
  18. J. Conant: I have experienced a case where a colleague has devalued work without working against faculty or students. It reduced the quality and quantity of work in the department. There was not a grievance. That wasn’t an option. It did poison the departments and did devalue the department’s work.

1. Curriculum Proposals:
   1. CAAC—Suspension of Theater Education Minor:
      1. Motion to Approve (D. Hantzis, V. Sheets) Vote: 9-0-0
      2. C. Berchild: A number of years ago when we had a major curriculum reorganization Theater Education was a track in the major. A few years ago in a slightly smaller revision, it was moved to a minor with the FUSION group. Since S. McFadden and L. Genosko are no longer working with it, no one is interested in the minor. There is only one class that separates the major and minor. It makes sense to our faculty that since no one wants to teach it, that we shelve the minor. We do not want to eliminate it.
         1. D. Bradley: What’s the market for theater education?
            1. C. Berchild: It’s so-so. Theater educators oftentimes are the first cut in primary education. Really there’s not as much of a market as there was 10 years ago. We are hoping that turns around.
   2. GC – Revision of School Counseling M.Ed.:
      1. Motion to Approve (S. Lamb, V. Sheets) Vote: 9-0-0
      2. T. Balch: We want to pull the section on licensure requirements out because the requirements have changed.
      3. R. Gonser: I did not hear anything in the IOB in regards to graduate students.
         1. D. Bradley: Grad students who are teaching should probably go through the faculty course.
         2. C. MacDonald: Make sure they don’t have to take both.
         3. D. Hantzis: Make sure graduate students do not have a hold on their accounts.
2. Additional Charges for Standing Committees
3. Liaison Reports:
   1. T. Hawkins (AAC): Met Sept 2nd. AAC elected officers and reviewed charges. Kelly Wilkinson is chair.
   2. C. Paterson (AEC):
   3. L. Brown (CAAC): Met Sept 3rd. Meetings: Tuesdays 12:30-1:45. SAMy Anderson is chair.
   4. V. Sheets (FAC): Met last week at 3:30. B. Guell was elected chair.
   5. S. Lamb (FEBC): Sent out request for a meeting time.
   6. E. Hampton (GC): Met Wednesday at noon and will be meeting at those times.
      1. Chris. I may need to switch you.
   7. D. Hantzis (SAC): SAC met Friday.  They elected officers and reviewed charges.  They plan to populate subcommittees for each charge and to meet monthly.  Cheryl Blevins was elected chair.  A question was asked about the faculty/administrative drop charge. I mentioned the possible work on degree simplification--e.g. process obstacles (not courses).  I indicated a charge might be forthcoming to a task force or to standing committees; in any case SAC will be in line to review recommendations.
   8. J. Conant (URC): Will be meeting on the 17th at 9am.
4. Adjournment: 5:29 PM