

#14

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

February 2, 2016

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Final Minutes

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

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

Ex-Officio Absent:

Guests: K. Butwin, M. Herrington-Perry

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley:

i) I don't have much of a report today. I think things are going along pretty well.

Anything anyone can do to assist with yield as far as admissions are concerned would be helpful. Applications are down slightly, and we need to get students here. The interviews with prospective Presidential Scholars went well last weekend.

ii) Construction on 4th St. will begin shortly after Spring Break. There will be parking issues, but I think it will be okay. We need to be sensitive to friends in the Arena Building who will be most affected. Half of Lot 21 will be closed, across from the Art Annex. For now, there will be some open spots behind Hines and Jones Hall, but parking will get tighter in the fall. This spring they are relocation sewer and water lines. Additional parking will be built on the west side of 3rd St.

(1) D. Hantzis: Are you going to create more handicapped spots?

(2) D. Bradley: I'm sure they will replace what is lost.

(3) L. Brown: Will crossing 3rd St. be an issue?

(a) D. Bradley: We are working out some short-term solutions. The long-term goal is to build an underground tunnel under Third.

iii) D. Bradley: The big project coming up is the Arena addition. In the next couple of weeks we will be getting reports from architectural firms for the Hulman Center project. Interviews for the position of Athletic Director are coming up. Airport interviews are next week, and the following week will be campus interviews.

- b) Provost M. Licari:
 - i) I will continue to beat the drum for the Strategic Plan. Thank you for your participation in the Town Hall last week—I appreciate it. We had a good Steering Committee meeting as well. The next step is to take the information generated by the Steering Committee to the next Town Hall meeting. We created a set of six draft goal statements and discussed possible benchmarks as far as measuring progress toward these goals. We need a lot of help with the benchmarks. The Town Hall meeting will be on Tuesday, February 9, from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. I am creating taskforces around each goal to draft the language for the benchmarks.
 - ii) Regarding the replacement for N. Davis, I am having targeted conversation with people on campus regarding the qualifications to look for in the search.

- 2) Chair Report:
 - a) C. MacDonald:
 - i) The workshop on *Facilitating Challenging Conversations* is coming up on February 12th. Faculty and Staff are welcome to attend. There is free lunch if you get pre-registered.

- 3) Approval of Minutes of January 19, 2016
 - a) Motion to approve (S. Lamb, V. Sheets): Vote: 9-0-0

- 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
 - a) S. Lamb: I was asked to bring the issue up of chairpersons adding students to classes after the deadline has passed without consulting the faculty member. I don't think it's a major issue, but a faculty member did ask me to bring it to this body. In my role as chair, I do have some faculty who I know are very cooperative, and I know we have some faculty who are very concerned about the numbers in a specific course. Sometimes I do make decisions without consultation because I know the outcome. There are also times that I don't. Apparently this specific event occurred when the chair made the decision, and the faculty member was uncomfortable.
 - i) D. Bradley: Was the concern about the date or the number in the class?
 - ii) S. Lamb: The date. He had already covered a lot of material.
 - iii) D. Bradley: That should occur rarely. I wouldn't make statements with no exceptions, but it should happen very seldom.
 - iv) C. MacDonald: I don't think faculty should be surprised with a new student when they are far into the semester.
 - v) L. Brown: It shouldn't happen over the objection of the faculty member.
 - vi) D. Bradley: There are some special cases. But, perhaps you can give the student an alternative course to take.
 - vii) C. MacDonald: The faculty need to be consulted.

- viii) S. Lamb: I will be happy to have the President's comments in the minutes.
- b) E. Hampton: I have a question regarding the faculty FTE budget recently given to the colleges. If faculty are granted sabbaticals, this would count against FTE budget. Adjuncts hired from a grant buy-out would also affect the FTE budget.
- i) M. Licari: The second is not actually true. We're not double-counting folks there.
- ii) D. Bradley: Funds saved from taking a sabbatical are then used pay for an adjunct—but only if they take a year off. The idea is that we shouldn't count people or dollars twice. That's another reason why the deans need to have an extra FTE or two to spread around to deal with such things.
- iii) M. Licari: In the allocation to the deans, I held back some so that I could deploy them to critical areas. A dean ought to hold back on some for the same reason. We have all been wrestling with this. But that way you have a resource to manage across departments. I have asked deans to report on their deployment of resources. I want to see the results to make sure the sum total of work in the colleges is being covered.
- iv) D. Bradley: That's really small; less than 1% of FTEs are in that category. The reason they're not in there now is because we haven't created a way to record that in Banner. In the old days the information would be floating around on a piece of paper. That's not fair either. We need to record it when someone receives release time for a grant. In addition, it is transparent when it is done right. Some finessing always needs to happen, though.
- c) S. Lamb: We have so many pressures to increase enrollment, which we do. This results in pressures to increase the number of faculty, which we don't do. I always tell my faculty if we go down that route then our numbers won't be as positive as they are. Nevertheless, the onus is falling on the faculty to continue to increase class sizes. There's hardly a core course in the SCOB where we don't set enrollments at 50. It is 50 or capacity, whichever comes first. We don't have the room for more. It's typical that the upper-level courses are around 20-25 or sometimes less.
- i) D. Bradley: It is easy to feel that way. I sympathize. If you look at what we've done with staff reductions, there has been a big reduction there too. It has been a shared burden. I wish I knew another route. I know it doesn't make people feel better when I say everyone is going through this, but every public institution is.
- ii) S. Lamb: I'm afraid you're going to have to aggressively continue that conversation when you continue to forecast the need for larger class sizes.
- iii) D. Bradley: I would like us to have a good conversation so that we can have a solid consensus around a best solution. How do we balance large first-year courses with smaller ones?
- iv) E. Hampton: I think that it would be really useful to have facilitated conversations with the faculty regarding enrollment. Many of us are in favor of getting a better system but we're not sure how to. A good conversation would be a good start.

- v) D. Bradley: I think M. Licari and I would be happy to have those conversations. A lot of people do not want to talk about the FTE model.
- vi) C. MacDonald: That conversation has to include creative ways to handle enrollment and not simply “do more with less”.
- vii) D. Bradley: To get 50 people in a room to talk about it would be more effective.
- d) J. Conant: It has been brought to my attention that there is a department on campus that is not following its bylaws. The faculty is calling the chair on it. I think our system of shared governance is unusual enough in how seriously we take it that there should be a way to remind chairs or deans that the bylaws exist to be followed.
 - i) D. Bradley: I know we need more professional development for chairs.
- e) D. Hantzis: I want to comment on the FTE conversation. I think that we might be surprised to find out how many faculty have suspicions about workload distribution. I’m hoping this leads to a conversation on work and workload.
 - i) D. Bradley: I think in some ways you have to agree to listen to people’s arguments about things that you might not have knowledge about. Perhaps you can justify a small FTE load for music instruction. Perhaps it is best taught one on one.
 - ii) D. Hantzis: I’m more concerned about differences within departments: e.g., salaries and workload distribution.
 - iii) D. Bradley: The salary distribution today is much tighter than it used to be. Everyone has basically the same target, and almost everyone is within 93% of the target. The band is getting narrower.
 - iv) D. Hantzis: I think we need to look at the audit of the instructors. I am concerned with how we are using them. There are big differences between colleges.
 - v) D. Bradley: There are huge market differences. M. Licari just sent me a spreadsheet which I can send to C. MacDonald. It has to be departmental. If instructors want to be involved in research and scholarship, they must recognize that is not considered a normal part of their workload. It is outside the scope of their work.
 - vi) S. Lamb: AACSB has now put us in another bind because now we have four classifications of qualifying faculty.
 - vii) D. Hantzis: The Handbook says they must do what we want them to do as long as it is equivalent to five courses.
 - viii) S. Lamb: This will again challenge us to treat faculty fairly.
 - ix) D. Bradley: We’re going to have to reduce the number of courses overall.
 - x) T. Hawkins: There are consequences to this. We do not have an Asianist in the History Department, though that has been at the top of our priority list for a decade. I’m the only one in History who teaches Latin America. If I were to leave or be hit by a bus, there is no way History is going to replace my line. We will not have a Latin American historian despite the fact that we are counting on Hispanic students for a large part of our future enrollment. How can you tell students who are coming here that they can’t take that kind of history?

- (1) D. Bradley: There are long-term consequences. The real answer is someone ought to get some release so they can get more experience in that area.
 - (2) T. Hawkins: I can resign myself to a situation where History does not receive lines. I can't resign myself to the idea that someone who has a Ph.D. in U.S. history has to go teach a course on China. That can't happen.
 - (3) D. Bradley: That can happen. If there's no way for the University to justify more lines than fifteen, then we need to consider alternatives.
 - (4) T. Hawkins: That's where the quality of our education is compromised.
 - (5) D. Bradley: I'm sure L. Brown can think of some courses that she would like to offer if only she had a more diversified faculty.
 - (6) L. Brown: We have various statistics courses....
- 5) Report on New Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting Process
- a) M. Herrington-Perry: I am here to use you as a venue to get the word out. I have gone to the colleges. I will be working with the associate deans. I am happy to go wherever I am needed. If you are familiar with the old process, you know it was complicated. There were three due dates. The new process, in contrast, requests a single report one time a year. There are no cycles involved. The first report will be in June and will cover Fall 2015 and Spring 2016. If you did work last summer, you can also include that in the first report. You won't have to do anything but update them in the future. We are hoping this can be completed in two or three pages. This system also provides feedback. You will turn in these reports to the deans at the specified time. But they are due to me by June 15th. I will review every report and provide comments. We will have an ongoing record. It will not be hidden away in TaskStream. All of the information will be housed on a publicly accessible website. It is simple, not complex. There is one deadline, not multiple ones. It is cost-effective. The old system focused on compliance. Here you get constructive feedback. I think this is going to work out considerably better.
 - i) V. Sheets: When you say you will be giving feedback to departments, how will that occur? What's the feedback about?
 - ii) M. Herrington-Perry: My hope is that the rubric will show various standards and whether they were met.
 - iii) S. Lamb: You are willing to visit departments?
 - iv) M. Herrington-Perry: Absolutely. Send me an invitation.
 - v) D. Bradley: Hopefully, we can get CAAC to look at assessment plans. That is what the Higher Learning Commission is going to do.
 - vi) M. Herrington-Perry: The first session will be in February 12th and it will be a Q&A session. I will make sure it's advertised.
- 6) University Student Grievance Policy and Procedures

- a) C. MacDonald: What you've received is a work in progress. There have been additional conversations since this draft. We are far from the final draft.
- b) K. Butwin: I think while there are still some issues to decide, they are fairly limited. The policy and procedures are already better than before; there is more clarity. I think the ad hoc committee recognized that more needed to go in. We do have a website that is now available for students to make their complaints. The student can fill out a form. They are general complaints until they become more than that. A. Perone and S. Powers will have a hand in those.
 - i) C. MacDonald: This is a slightly newer version than at Senate.
 - ii) T. Hawkins: I was wondering if you have given thought to something I raised at Senate: a recusal mechanism for the committee.
 - iii) K. Butwin: Yes, that absolutely needs to be in there. My experience is that if anyone raises such a concern, the person is glad to step aside and let someone else serve.
 - iv) E. Hampton: I am troubled by the phrasing for the Standard of Evidence: "more likely than not." It appears to be relatively loose. You're going to have a lot of false positives.
 - v) D. Bradley: What is the standard we are required to use?
 - vi) K. Butwin: "More likely than not" or "a preponderance of the evidence" in sexual discrimination cases.
 - vii) C. MacDonald: that sounds weightier.
 - viii) K. Butwin: We can't use "beyond a reasonable doubt." That is reserved for criminal cases.
 - ix) D. Bradley: I have two concerns. The word "confront" is used in the section on Rights. There needs to be a gentler term. Also do we really want to restrict a person's advocate to a student or employee? If a student brings his mom, can we really oppose that?
 - x) C. MacDonald: What we didn't want to have happen is, for example, someone to ask a newspaper reporter to be the "advocate".
 - xi) D. Bradley: I understand. But we've got to make sure that the person in the least powerful position has equal footing. Maybe we can train an ombudsperson?
 - xii) K. Butwin: We should consider having a group of people trained to help students navigate the process or serve a supporting role.
 - xiii) C. MacDonald: We have also discussed having an individual assigned.
 - xiv) T. Hawkins: Would "question" work as an alternative to "confront"?
- c) C. MacDonald: Shall we bring up the question of academic freedom?
- d) K. Butwin: In the policy there is a reference to academic freedom: 460.1.2. In the discussion about the interim policy, we had a lot of comment about what the exclusions would be. Faculty members proposed that academic freedom should be an exclusion. I don't necessarily agree, because it is so fact specific.

- i) D. Bradley: My thought on academic freedom is that it is implicit everywhere on campus. I think we said in here that faculty have a right to teach their courses. You don't need to put in specific exclusions for academic freedom, because it's already in there.
- ii) C. MacDonald: I would argue that students won't be reading the rest of the Handbook.
- iii) D. Bradley: It's not an exclusion like grade appeal.
- iv) D. Hantzis: There is still everything that does not affect the grade.
- v) D. Bradley: I try to picture this: we've got all these special groups who can't complain because they're protected under federal law. I'd like to put everyone on the same platform.
- vi) D. Hantzis: So a grievance is because of mistreatment?
- vii) T. Hawkins: I don't think putting an exclusion for academic freedom is inappropriate.
- viii) S. Lamb: This is a dangerous path. You are trying to educate young people.
- ix) L. Brown: Sometimes, education can be uncomfortable.
- x) K. Butwin: Ultimately, this is the process to try to identify those things that need to go forward.
- xi) E. Hampton: Who decides if it falls within academic freedom? Teaching me things that offend me might be considered mistreatment.
- xii) D. Bradley: It has to be a personal issue.
- xiii) V. Sheets: What about a student who is religious and takes my evolutionary psychology class?
- xiv) K. Butwin: I think we can work on the language on the scope of the policy. I will also tell you that we have had conversation on the committee.
- xv) D. Bradley: You can note in the procedures, for instance, that the faculty member has the right to teach the content as they see fit if it is within the parameters of what is required.
- xvi) E. Hampton: It at least needs to be conceptualized.
- xvii) K. Butwin: We also do have a second screening. The Faculty Senate Chair will be a part of the discussion.
- xviii) T. Hawkins: I still think you're going to get more faculty buy-in if you are explicit about academic freedom exclusions. I can only see it benefiting the process if faculty are comfortable.
- xix) D. Bradley: There is little disagreement that faculty members should teach content as they see fit. Let's put that in the procedures instead of in abstract terms that we don't agree on.
- xx) D. Hantzis: I think it is fine to translate the term "academic freedom." The question I have is when we talk about applying it to general performance. What does that mean?
- xxi) C. MacDonald: There will be more iterations.

- 7) Executive Session
 - a) Motion to enter executive session (D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins)
 - b) Motion to leave executive session (S. Lamb, T. Hawkins)
 - c) Motion to forward grievance by Dr. Lindsay Eberman against the respondents Dr. Alvaro Gurovich, Dr. Linda Berendt, and Dr. Catherine Paterson to FAC for mediation and a hearing if the grievance is not resolved by mediation (S. Lamb, T. Hawkins) Vote: 7-1-0

- 8) Adjournment: 5:51 pm