

#17

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 8, 2016

3:30pm, HMSU 227

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

Members Absent: none.

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

Ex-Officio Absent: none.

Guests: R. Guell

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley

- i) We interviewed three architects for the Hulman Center yesterday and are now in negotiations with one of them. The next step is to get a Capital Improvement Board approved and established by the county. The hope is to have a conceptual design for the building and an engineering cost analysis done by the summer so we can then go to the legislature. The goal is to get the Budget Committee to approve the project and release the funds prior to December. This means some tight timelines.
- ii) The Legislature is going to adjourn this week. We will know in six weeks about performance funding from the Commission. You may have noticed a notice of closure for 4th St. Don't expect to drive down that road ever again.

b) Provost M. Licari

- i) By now most people have seen the announcement I sent out last week about Dean Turman's intention to resign at the College of Health and Human Services. I have begun conversations with people about serving as interim dean. I hope to make an announcement after Spring Break. The actual transition won't take place until the summer.
- ii) We have a Strategic Plan Steering Committee meeting tomorrow. We will be working on goal statements and benchmarks.
- iii) I am the chair of the annual Faculty and Staff campaign. This is my opportunity to appeal to you to lead by example and encourage others to participate. Let me know if you would like more information.

- 2) Chair Report: C. MacDonald
 - a) C. MacDonald: I want to give you a reminder about the Inside Track Coaching meeting. Please let me know if you can attend. It's on April 13th at 10am here in HMSU.
 - b) The survey regarding faculty governance is now closed. We received 153 responses. My goal over Spring Break is to begin to compile the data.
- 3) Approval of Minutes of March 1, 2016
 - a) Motion to approve as amended (T. Hawkins, V. Sheets) Vote: 9-0-0.
- 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion: none.
- 5) FAC item: Biennial Review revisions
 - a) C. MacDonald: Everyone received two files: a joined document and a bifurcated one. We will need to decide which to consider. We also have an index of revisions prepared by FAC. There are several issues that went into the review. Perhaps we can begin with a brief overview and then we can go from there.
 - b) R. Guell: We gathered from all possible sources concerns that were raised contemporaneous to the execution of the BR in the fall. We had several lists of concerns and issues. We drafted solutions to those issues. In so drafting, we put out a survey to all faculty to see if our issues were of general concern and if we tackled those issues well. In general, the survey results were between 85-95% favorable. However, we had two issues that did not approach this level of satisfaction: 1) the treatment of instructors and 2) evaluation of department chairs within the BR process. We engaged in conversations with the officers regarding whether the treatment of instructors would be better handled with a separate process. The argument for a separate process was supported by a sense that college committees were concerned about how to evaluate fairly between categories. The results of the BR were disproportionately unfavorable to instructors.
 - i) D. Bradley: Did you correct for the fact that most are quite junior? It wouldn't be unusual that most were not placed in the exceptional category
 - ii) R. Guell: We didn't have actual access to their files so I'm not sure how we would have done that. Some of them, in fact, have been with us for a while. Some were rated as exceptional by their department and/or chair. It was the college committee who would not or could not evaluate someone who was 100% teaching. If you are good in more than one category, that looks better by comparison.
 - iii) S. Lamb: did you account for the limited number of instructors who went up? I think my department had five.
 - iv) D. Bradley: We said instructors don't need to do it until they are in their third contract. Do we know how many applied?
 - v) R. Guell: We did not have that data. Some applied even though they were not required to.
 - vi) D. Bradley: So they are underrepresented.
 - vii) R. Guell: The committee members said essentially yes. I talked to several different members at the college committee level and instructors who felt they were poorly treated. The

- attitude was: "I shouldn't be forced to do things outside of my assignment to be judged exceptional." If committees are not going to ignore the number of assignments they have, we decided that the only solution was to bifurcate the process.
- viii) D. Hantzis: In CAS we reviewed a lot of instructors at the college level. It was contentious.
 - ix) D. Bradley: Did any get exceptional?
 - x) R. Guell: A few.
 - xi) D. Bradley: Our instructors are on the college committees correct?
 - xii) D. Hantzis: We made it optional.
 - xiii) S. Lamb: We do have in COB a document that is going forward that specifies they must be part of the personnel committee. We also have it on the college committee.
 - xiv) R. Guell: Section 305 made it a college option last year.
 - xv) D. Hantzis: The problem is larger. If we want them on committees and their job does not include service, what do we do? Why should instructors be drafted to serve if they are not being paid?
 - xvi) C. MacDonald: I do think if instructors go up against faculty who are excellent in two or three areas it makes comparisons difficult. It is fairer to bifurcate the process.
 - xvii) S. Lamb: Half of the instructors in SCOB are given release time for their service. They have advising responsibilities. When they do their service they can document it.
 - xviii) L. Brown: I think it makes sense to separate the instructors. It avoids unfair competition. I also think we should consider making the BR only for tenured faculty and senior instructors, since they do not have annual evaluations. We should either require everyone to do it or limit it to tenured or senior instructors.
 - xix) E. Hampton: I would agree with something like that. I think we would have an increase in morale if we eliminated the "contributing exceptionally" category. I would strongly argue against evaluating instructors for service. Nearly all instructors in COE are limited to teaching.
 - xx) C. Paterson: Thinking back about the systems of review and merit pay that existed when I was a junior faculty member, I benefited monetarily. It was a different system, and I recognize that. To me, I was getting reviewed annually anyways, and when it was a merit pay year there was another review.
 - xxi) D. Bradley: M. Licari and I talked yesterday about trying to get data on instructors to see what they are doing on campus. I also want to know if they participated in the BR last year. We need to have data. I do not want to rush in and make a simple thing more complicated. That's what we've been fighting since the beginning. If we have to make modifications, then let's do the minimum. As a point of order, we should spend as much time asking why we're not seeing as many "contributing below expectations" as we are "exceeds expectations". I don't mean in individual categories. I'm only talking about overall.
 - xxii) T. Hawkins: If we are talking about simplifying, I think separating out the instructors is a step forward. I couldn't agree more with what E. Hampton said about the "contributing exceptionally" category in general.
 - xxiii) E. Hampton: Guaranteeing a certain percentage of our faculty not exceeding expectations...There's a very big difference between "performance" and "pay".

- xxiv) D. Bradley: It is my guess that proposing to eliminate merit pay in 2016 is not going to fly.
- xxv) T. Hawkins: Can you guarantee raises over the next ten years?
- xxvi) D. Bradley: I can guarantee you will have them during the next ten years.
- xxvii) D. Hantzis: At FAC we recommended not the elimination but the separation of merit pay from the BR. If the intent is to find those who are failing, let it find those who are failing. Let us create another process to identify those who are exceptional. T. Hawkins was on FAC when we made that recommendation. We clearly need post-tenure review. It's not about the elimination of merit pay. Creating one policy has caused problems with nonsense at every level.
- c) E. Hampton: On lines 527-529 in the bifurcated document: I am concerned about the limitless number.
- i) R. Guell: The reason for that line is a numbers problem. Many departments have two or three instructors, many departments I know have three or four. A few have a lot more. The department would have to do an honest evaluation as to whether or not they were contributing exceptionally.
- ii) D. Hantzis: So, the 1/7 calculus would change for everyone else?
- iii) R. Guell: Yes.
- iv) D. Hantzis: There would be a small decrease in the number of faculty in departments with many instructors.
- v) R. Guell: A department like COMM would be harmed relative to the math.
- vi) D. Hantzis: Why are we getting credit for people who are not participating? It is not an injury.
- d) C. MacDonald: I would like to take a poll to see how many of us are in favor of the bifurcated document. A majority seems to lean that way. Is this acceptable to the administration?
- i) D. Bradley: M. Licari and I have not talked about it at all. I would be comfortable if everyone went through the current process. Instructors who receive "exceeds expectations" in teaching would go to the college where the final decision would be made. In that case, the college would have to separate them out. If there are twenty-one instructors in the college and three are sent forward, the college committee would have to determine who makes it.
- ii) M. Licari: The president and I basically agree. My overriding concern is that instructors are evaluated according to what is expected of them. If that has not been happening, that is a problem. The concept is fine.
- iii) D. Bradley: We might want to leave open the possibility that departments like Math and English would prefer to keep instructors within the department. You may want to sound people out on that to see what they want. As long as everyone uses the same form and the same analysis, I am fine.
- iv) C. MacDonald: It sounds like that is complicating what we have.
- v) D. Hantzis: Before we decide, we need to see what instructors are actually doing. What is the definition of instructor? If this is such a big deal, maybe we can transfer them all to the tenure track.
- vi) V. Sheets: Instructor lines were not all designed for teaching.

- vii) S. Lamb: In Business, we consider the practice of business. Because of AACSB we are to embrace instructors and bring in professionals. We are penalized for those who are purely instructional. We're encouraging people to move toward instructional practitioners and scholarly practitioners.
 - viii) M. Licari: There is enough variation between instructor activities. They should at least be evaluated based on their expectations.
 - ix) S. Lamb: Some are not required to do research but engage in professional activities.
 - x) D. Bradley: Is it mandated across the college?
 - xi) S. Lamb: Right. Our documents are college based.
 - xii) D. Hantzis: We had an instructor in our department who participated in the BR. He was devastated that he was not chosen, because he did participate in scholarly reviews.
- e) R. Guell: Issue 2. In the bifurcated document, the issue of the irrelevancy of unassigned domains is not as much a no-brainer as you would think. I came down on one side, while FAC came down on the other side. A lot of people speaking in the survey or forum were troubled by the notion that if they published a scholarly work that was not considered relevant to their work as an instructor then we are in fact discouraging it.
- i) D. Bradley: That is correct.
 - ii) R. Guell: The counter to that is that the reward is a tenure-track line. We do in fact convert lines all the time.
 - iii) S. Lamb: There are other ways of rewarding people who have published. They can attend conferences.
 - iv) D. Bradley: Or teach courses they weren't able to before.
 - v) D. Hantzis: I am concerned about the elimination of scholarly work.
 - vi) R. Guell: If that in fact is more common than a single case, it strikes me that we are doing what we absolutely do not want: making the instructor position a cheaper form of tenure-track faculty.
 - vii) D. Bradley: In my view, if that's happening, there should only be one reason: there is outside money. I don't want any institutional funds used to release someone to do research as an instructor. If it is happening anywhere it needs to stop. In regards to service, I think that is a reasonable use of institutional funds.
 - viii) R. Guell: Whoever is chair next year will need to work on 305.11 if we agree that instructors should not receive institutional dollars for research.
 - ix) E. Hampton: There's a dilemma here in recognizing instructors for the work they are expected to do while acknowledging that tenure-track faculty are advantaged for doing more. I don't see a way out of it.
 - x) S. Lamb: It's a release from teaching if it's somewhat equivalent.
 - xi) C. MacDonald: Let's get data to see what our instructors are doing before we decide this.
- f) R. Guell: Issue #3. Do we continue with the reconciliation meeting between the dean and the department committee? FAC noted at least two situations where it could be argued that the process was gamed by the department chair when s/he was in the minority regarding the evaluation of a faculty member. The intention of the reconciliation meeting was to see if

common ground could be found between the committee and chair. We had a choice between having the dean meet with the committee or eliminating it, and FAC chose to eliminate it.

- i) C. Paterson: This is an example where training could be helpful. The chances of that would be lower.
 - ii) R. Guell: I don't think so.
 - iii) L. Brown: A committee member who represents the majority could go into the dean's meeting with the chair.
 - iv) M. Licari: I like that.
 - v) D. Hantzis: I am one who from the beginning didn't think there was a need for reconciliation. We were overwhelmed at the college level. I think that faculty review should always be independent. As it is written now, there's already a reconciliation meeting at the department level. The dean does not need to be here. It slows down the process.
- g) R. Guell: Issue #4. Interpretive authority. This is comparable to the Handbook language we approved.
- i) C. MacDonald: This will encourage them to come to the Faculty Senate Chair.
 - ii) E. Hampton: The agreed-upon interpretation needs to be shared across the institution. It becomes a kind of case law.
 - iii) D. Hantzis: It's a form of public record.
- h) R. Guell: Issue #5. There were two ways in which information got added to an information flow by someone other than the faculty member. There was the authorized way in which a chairperson was putting in information. And, I guess because it wasn't clearly prohibited, committee members in at least one case heard information brought to them by another committee member. So in the chairperson case, what we are looking at is what qualifies as useful information. One of the things we heard in forum in the surveys is that this process should not become a "gotcha" process for chairs. What could chairs bring? Any documents from the official personnel file and official university data. That is what FAC maintains a chairperson can bring into the evaluation and the reconciliation meeting. To emphasize our point, we added the last two sentences.
- i) V. Sheets: Line 155 needs a comma after "evaluations".
 - ii) D. Hantzis: I appreciate the clarity here. I recommend that we reference Section 570 here. There is a lot of ignorance about the official personnel file.
 - iii) E. Hampton: I'm having a hard time understanding the line "use only information that is necessary." It seems like a lack of transparency. How is this not allowing people to use information that is shared in their evaluation? The president wants a system to identify people who are not doing their work. Does the file help us identify such people?
 - iv) D. Hantzis: You don't want to give multiple examples of something that easily explained.
 - v) V. Sheets: That's why we have taken so much time to create the documentation for that file.
 - vi) R. Guell: That's why we created the deficient performance document. If I am a problem, write me up for it. It also goes to C. Paterson's issue about training.
 - vii) D. Hantzis: We need to encourage each other to be accountable. I think Section 570 is really good. Anytime something goes into your file, you must be notified.

- i) R. Guell: Issue #6. This is the other issue where I referenced committees considering other information. Because you evaluated the legitimacy of a grievance based on this, I think you know that there was at least one relevant case. Let me just say that besides dividing instructors out, there was nothing added. We just put the relevant statement in bold to emphasize that we really mean it.
 - i) D. Hantzis: In that same section it states that they may verify the information. Is that in the same section?
 - ii) S. Lamb: Would you give the short summary of that which is going on with instructors?
- j) R. Guell: Issue #7. We added some roles in 122-125 in the bifurcated document. The first one creates a responsibility for chairs to ensure that faculty submissions are accurate. There needs to be a check of some kind. The second part of the sentence is a concern of the administration. Because data dumping is so bad in the first part of the document and because you can dump into a Word document you can edit, S. Powers asked that the chair check this data.
 - i) L. Brown: That is a lot of checking for numbers.
 - ii) E. Hampton: I disagree with the inclusion of this section. Chairs should not have to fact check the numbers. This seems extremely onerous.
 - iii) L. Brown: I'm happy to make a cursory evaluation, but if I have to look at every person and every class...
 - iv) D. Hantzis: We had to "forgive" all kinds of errors in our department, or we would have lost all kinds of people. Why can't we have a report that draws the right information?
 - v) C. Paterson: I think experience is a good teacher. If an individual makes an error like that there should be repercussions.
 - vi) R. Guell: The \$1500 is a steep loss, since it goes to base. FAC doesn't need the second sentence. The administration requested that sentence.
 - vii) M. Licari: Some mechanism needs to be in place to validate this data.
 - viii) V. Sheets: Can you give me the right to check?
 - ix) M. Licari: Yes. You should have the right.
 - x) D. Hantzis: Why should you have the right? If a faculty member sends me something I look up everything.
 - xi) C. MacDonald: Maybe we can find some middle ground.
- k) R. Guell: Issue #8. The criteria have to be in place for a year.
 - i) D. Hantzis: We need to remove the old dates.
- l) R. Guell: Issue #9. Regarding the consequences of not submitting, FAC debated whether to go to the final degree which would have been a reference to the discipline and dismissal committee.
 - i) V. Sheets: Within that section, I would ask that we reverse one and two.
 - ii) E. Hampton: I wonder why it's an "and/or".
 - iii) R. Guell: Not all of them needed to be applied but all of them could be applied. It was up to the Provost's discretion.
- m) R. Guell: Issue #10. Convincing the departments to establish criteria.
 - i) E. Hampton: I'm confused on what it's telling me.
 - ii) R. Guell: The department can choose to elect the college criteria rather than having separate department ones.

- iii) D. Hantzis: I want this language to match that requiring a department vote. You can choose to say you're going to follow the college guidelines.
- iv) C. Paterson: We have another provision that says the criteria has to be used one year prior. In a situation where a department does not have criteria, then that department will be penalized for one cycle?
 - (1) C. MacDonald: Yes.
 - (2) R. Guell: Or if they want to take a vote at the beginning of the year...
 - (3) C. Paterson: In those situations, departments could say that they are using criteria from a few years prior.
- n) R. Guell: Issue #11. Should departments get to evaluate the chair assignment? This was objected to substantially by a group of chairs. FAC changed its view from supporting to opposing this. Why? There are no written criteria for chair performance. We would have to write a lot of language.
 - i) S. Lamb: It was my impression that faculty in the last review got to do it after the deans, and that seemed not too great.
 - ii) D. Hantzis: The change was made originally because faculty never saw the evaluation of their chair. Faculty got the dean letter in the first revision—the supervisor review.
 - iii) C. Paterson: Not all department chairpersons are regular faculty in the department where they serve as chairpersons. In this situation, this past year the department committees did not have access to the BR documents for chairpersons who had regular faculty appointments in other departments. It is reasonable that the non-home department committees can review and make recommendations on administrative activities. This policy does not currently cover these situations. How should these committees proceed?
 - (1) J. Conant: We had that issue this year. The other unit evaluated the individual and sent it back to us.
 - (2) D. Hantzis: My department gets to read my evaluation from Dean Maule. It really is your department faculty that is reviewing you, because they are the ones saying if your work is valuable to the department.
 - (3) R. Guell: Someone needs to write something about process that is parallel to limiting issues for faculty.
 - (4) C. MacDonald: I would be against doing that. It makes sense not to have departments evaluate chairs without any criteria to evaluate them.
 - (5) D. Hantzis: You would only have access to the supervisor review.
 - (6) C. MacDonald: It is included as part of the file.
 - (7) L. Brown: I look at this like a review of a faculty member. The administrative stuff is different. When I did my BR review, I did administrative stuff last. This is a faculty evaluation. Our colleagues are not evaluating our administrative duties.
 - (8) E. Hampton: In terms of keeping it simple, we should expunge the administrative. We do not have the policies to support what we are doing.
 - (9) D. Hantzis: We do.
 - (10) C. MacDonald: We have no procedures.
 - (11) J. Conant: They ought to have the right to have their opinions.

- (12)C. Paterson: Esteemed colleagues, who says data doesn't exist for administrative roles?
- o) R. Guell: Issue #12. Put evaluations on the evaluation forms. When evaluating someone in the top or bottom category there had to be something written on there.
- (1) E. Hampton: Should you also have to explain the middle ranking? It's an incentive.
 - (2) R. Guell: In an informal meeting in 2010 or 2011, it was supposed to be "simple". If you look at someone's stuff then you're done with them. That was one of the principles outlined six years ago. Yes, we have walked away from that principle at times but we need to remember the idea that the reason is valid. You have a limited amount of information that you put in front of a committee, and the vast majority of people are in the middle.
 - (3) S. Lamb: I am in support of that. How far away are we moving from keeping this simple?
 - (4) T. Hawkins: That's why at the time I argued that "meets expectations" needed a clear definition.
 - (5) R. Guell: You will get drilled by the legislature if you want to define what "meets" really means. It's an inappropriate place for it to occur.
 - (6) M. Licari: It becomes barely what everyone's doing.
 - (7) D. Hantzis: It would be fabulous if we did a simple audit of performance.
 - (8) C. MacDonald: if you can email me comments I will incorporate those. I am hoping we can get the rest of these discussed at the next meeting.

6) Adjournment: 5:28