INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

February 19, 2015 HMSU Dede III

Draft Minutes

Members Present: R. Guell, S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, C. Olsen, C. Ball, K. Berlin, K. Bolinger, P. Bro, B. Bunnett, C. Fischer, T. Foster, E. Hampton, D. Hantzis, M. Haque, M. Harmon, B. Kilp, A. Kummerow, I. Land, K. Lee, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, A. Morales, C. Stemmans Paterson, J. Pommier, D. Richards, R. Schneirov, E. Southard, M. Sterling, K. Yousif

Members Absent: A. Anderson, L. Borrero, R. Lugar, L. Phillips, V. Sheets

Ex-Officio Present: A. Badar, M. Mohran, J. Murray, Y. Peterson

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard, K. Brauchle, R. Crumrin, N. Davis, O. Finley, K. Hill-Clarke, L. Maule, L. Maurer, B. Smith, R. Torrence

Guests: L. Hall, D. Keiser, S. Powers

1. Memorial Resolution: George Graesch, read by D. Keiser
	1. D. Keiser: George Graesch started his musical career as a high school musician in Mt. Carmel, Illinois, where he won many musical honors, including twice being named the national champion high school cornet soloist. During World War II, Mr. Graesch participated in the V-12 program and served in the U.S. Marine Corps for four years, including service in Guam and Iwo Jima, as an assistant band director of the Third Marine Division, and as a show band director during the Iwo Jima Campaign.
	2. Mr. Graesch came to Indiana State and worked his way through school, playing under Director of Bands Joseph Gremelspacher. He earned his Bachelor’s degree in music education in 1947 and Master’s degree in 1948. He did further graduate study at the University of Illinois and Indiana University. While a student at Indiana State, he met Lois Slater, who became his wife and lifelong companion.
	3. Mr. Graesch began his teaching career as band director of the public schools in Beloit, WI and Hartford City, IN before returning to ISU, where he worked for 31 years as the Director of Bands and Coordinator of the Wind Division. He was the longest-serving Director of Bands in ISU history and retired in 1984. In retirement, George revived and led the swing band Men of Note and Claudia, which performs dances and concerts throughout the Wabash Valley.
	4. Mr. Graesch was a member of many organizations, including: ISU Alumni Association, Indiana Bandmasters Association, College Band Directors National Association, Phi Beta Mu, Indiana Music Educators Association, Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia, Indiana Retired Teachers Association, and Centenary United Methodist Church. George received the Bright Distinguished Service Medal in band and the ISU Faculty and Staff Philanthropy Award.
	5. An active supporter of the University from the time enrolled, Mr. Graesch established many endowed scholarships in both Music and Nursing. He was honored by the Indiana State University Symphonic Band in the spring of 2013 with a tribute concert, entitled “George Graesch: A Concert of Celebration.” George Graesch’s legacy will not only be the music he performed and created at Indiana State University, but the many hundreds of music educators and performers he taught and mentored.
	6. THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to his students, the School of Music, and the University.
	7. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.
2. Administrative Reports:
	1. D. Bradley: Absent
	2. J. Maynard: Absent
3. Chair Report: R. Guell
	1. R. Guell:
		1. Constitutional Items all passed with substantial majorities meeting all requirements for Constitutional Changes. (255-18; 263-18;276-14; 273-23; 249-46)
		2. M. Morahn has been named to fill in as the TFA for the remainder of the term. We are in receipt of a FAC recommendation on the election/selection of a TFR and will put that on the March agenda.
		3. I want to apologize to everyone here for the lateness of the materials. I seriously considered hoping no one would notice that the lateness of the materials subject today’s agenda items to 246.11 which is at your desk. Upon reflection, the better angels of my nature suggested that I should be open about my mistake in not ensuring that you were in timely possession of the materials and understand and accept the consequences of the mistake. They were prepared but not delivered and I take responsibility for that. After we dispense with the minutes and the fifteen minute open period, I will make a unanimous consent request that we take up the agenda as written and consider the items under regular order. If there is an objection, then each substantive issue will require a supermajority with no more than 10 No’s to pass. I considered hiding behind the weasel word “may.” I won’t do that either. The items that achieve a majority but do not achieve that supermajority will be considered at an already scheduled special session of the Senate in two weeks in HH103. If the Student Evaluation Questions are tabled, that is also the time when we will take those up as well. We need to get those questions to Iota as soon as possible and waiting until March’s end will not suffice.
		4. As part of your planning for the rest of the semester, I want to note that for reasons that will be explained when we get to the CoNHHS name change and School of Nursing creation item, Section 305 of the Handbook, that Dr. Hantzis went over last time, requires further attention. That work will be taken up by them before Spring Break and by Exec and Senate in March with action potentially deferred to April. The April meeting will have several other items, mostly routine, but there is one looming item that must be dealt with before the end of the term, and that is our response to a not-yet-drafted policy on Sexual Violence. This is not to be confused with Sexual Harassment or the Amorous and Familial. A Sexual Violence policy is being now required by the US Department of Education under its broadened interpretation of Title 9’s discrimination clause. In short, we will have to establish what consent is and when consent, though given, isn’t legitimate due to intoxication. We will have to define and deal with Dating Violence. These are but two of the many Gordian knots the policy will have to untangle. Another will be whether faculty will be considered “responsible employees” with response requirements over and above those which now exist. The policy may REQUIRE that all faculty go through some form of training to recognize signs of sexual violence and to understand their reporting obligations. The policy may establish a review body with highly trained staff (and perhaps faculty) serving multiple years on an absolutely gut-wrenching adjudicative body . The best case scenario is that we get the draft policy next week, FAC, SAC, and AAC debate the policy, report to Exec and we report to Senate by April and that we have all done such a magnificent job that you recognize our collective Solomon-like wisdom with a positive recommendation to the Trustees. I have asked the chairs of these committees to clear the decks as soon as possible so as to take up this charge. Please assume, therefore, that an additional Senate meeting during Final’s week is possible.
4. Support Staff Report: R. Torrence: Absent
5. SGA Report: O. Finley: Absent
6. Temporary Faculty Representative: M. Mohran: No Report
7. Approval of the Minutes of January 22, 2015: C. Paterson, S. Lamb. Vote: 28-0-1
8. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
	1. R. Guell: The President has only been to one Senate meeting this year, and I cut short any possible discussion last time we met given we had no one to hear it, but I will be happy to take any issues to him.
	2. B. Bunnett: I have nothing I necessarily want you to beat the President up about, but regarding the Provost candidates, I went to the sessions yesterday, and I was impressed with the candidate. However, I wasn’t able to go to the faculty session, and I regret that because there were only ten people at that session. The weather was awful, and it was an inconvenient time; nevertheless, I was thinking about the candidate’s perception of that. He might have been disappointed at the turnout. He might have misinterpreted that as a lack of engagement, lack of involvement, or lack of interest, and it’s not inconceivable that it would enter into his decision should he be offered the job. I wonder if we as a Senate could encourage our colleagues to attend these meetings so as to not give a false impression.
		1. R. Guell: I will ask C. MacDonald to remind all faculty to attend meetings if they can via her musings. We were both in the presentation session that packed the Whitaker Room. I share your concern. A. Kummerow was at the session for the first candidate, and it was similarly not populated.
9. Student Evaluations. A. Morales, K. Bolinger. Vote: 23-4-1
	1. R. Guell: I request that we be able to take up agenda numbers 9, 10, and 11 through regular order. Are there any objections? Hearing none, we will move to student evaluations. What you have before you is a combination of SAC, FAC, Exec, and a small group of E. Hampton, C. Olsen, D. Hantzis, and C. Blevens that attempted to put together a list of questions. You saw this in a previous edition. We passed a couple of amendments at Exec, so I will simply review them and call them to your attention. In the second question the word “all” was struck to read “My instructor treated students with respect.” The question that had been exclusively for traditional format classes was made for every format. What had been stated by D. Hantzis that the group and FAC had asked that colleges and departments specify default questions that would be included, that the open-ended questions not be required for the biennial review, and they be specific as to whom they would be available—that is, the faculty member, the chair, and the dean. We have one amendment that was offered by K. Berlin, which is in front of you. Vote: 23-4-1
		1. A. Morales: I think these are all great questions for evaluating instruction, but I wonder, there are no questions about learning outcomes other than the question about learning better. Why are there no questions about how well they developed over the course?
		2. R. Guell: Does anyone who worked on these questions care to speak to that?
		3. E. Hampton: Our discussion centered around those constructs that could be applicable to the quality of instruction provided. Quality of outcomes was never brought up. They could be developed by the college, department, or instructor.
		4. C. Olsen: When we talked about it, we saw it as more specific to the individual instructor. We would be able to ask more specific things at that level.
		5. K. Bolinger: It would also be individual to the specific student?
		6. D. Hantzis: I want to emphasize that we felt that there must be questions other than these. This is useless if there aren’t at least college-and department-level questions. Even if departments decide to not substitute their own questions, there is still a set of default questions. Individual questions can vary. B. Balch is on FAC and the learning outcomes might be very different for Education than in Arts and Sciences. I don’t think it’s worthwhile doing this at all if we can’t add our own questions.
		7. M. Haque: Is there a word limit to the responses to the open-ended questions?
		8. S. Powers: I don’t think there is a limit. I think we can set one. It isn’t usually received well.
		9. D. Hantzis: This is precisely the question that is most dangerous to ask in a form that would end up with data being available to everyone. It gets responses like, “Wear real jewelry,” “Choose a hair color,” etc. If this is linked with the other two, the open-ended question data will be made available to the faculty member, the chair, and the dean. D. Bradley said at the Exec meeting it should only go to the faculty member.
		10. K. Bolinger: I want to clarify because there is no “NA” option, but on a five-point scale, wouldn’t the middle “neither agree nor disagree” option become the “NA” option by default?
		11. E. Hampton: I’m not sure which question would be not applicable but I wonder if they could just skip that question. If they didn’t have an opinion they could just skip it.
		12. R. Guell: S. Powers, can we make sure the software will allow non-responses?
		13. S. Powers: Yes.
		14. B. Bunnett: Have we entertained the idea of a four-point scale so they have to decide either positively or negatively instead of a default neutral?
		15. R. Guell: If you wish to add that as an amendment, you may. We will first consider K. Berlin’s motion on the floor. She being the primary, I will second. K. Berlin, R. Guell. Vote: 18-10-0
		16. K. Berlin: After the last Senate meeting I took it back to the faculty in my department and asked them what they thought. They felt the open-ended question needs to be there. The students last semester expressed that they were extremely upset about not having a way to give feedback on courses. They were most upset about it. In my classes I consistently tell them that this is their way to have a voice with the faculty. I consistently stress, “no silly statements.” If they want to be taken seriously, they can’t make statements like “lousy instructor,” but to say specifically what makes them lousy. If they are the greatest instructor they’ve ever had, say what makes them so. It is necessary for them to do this in order for us to make changes in the future. They like that very much here, but not with other instructors. I and my colleagues feel that “What were the best things about this course” and “What would help you learn better” doesn’t give them the opportunity to say “This is what I had a problem with” and “This is what I liked.”
		17. S. Lamb: You have partially answered my question. I would be surprised if a student didn’t see either one of these questions as giving them an opportunity. If the instructor were ugly, biased against a certain group, I certainly would feel that a response to “What would have helped you learn better” would be something like “ I was irritated by the instructor’s bias.” I can’t see any limitation imposed—any blockage that those two questions impose.
		18. K. Berlin: I think you have a better rapport with students than I have. They say “Well, you didn’t ask me what I didn’t like about it, just what I liked.” They are very literal at times. They answer what they are asked. I feel fortunate because the feedback in my classes are very specific as to what I do well and how I could do better. I don’t know if that’s why I stress that. We can’t control what another department or college puts into their questions because we have too many Foundational Studies courses that students are taking.
		19. K. Bolinger: If we only have these three open-ended questions, we may have two that are negatively skewed and one positively. As soon as you use a buzzword like “concern” they are liable to skew towards things they dislike about the course.
		20. D. Richards: Why just not change “concern” to “about?”
		21. K. Berlin: Ask for “additional feedback or comments.”
		22. R. Guell: Do you wish to alter your motion?
		23. K. Berlin: Yes.
		24. R. Guell: To her request that she alter her amendment to “do you have additional feedback” unanimous consent is required.
		25. C. Olsen: I would add “about this course” so you don’t get responses related to jewelry or hair color.
		26. R. Guell: Any objections? Any other comments?
		27. D. Hantzis: I have a question like this in the student evaluation for all classes. I like having this question. Most of the time they are amazing—they exceed the questionnaire—but this would be a third question required at the college or department level and would be accessible to the chair and dean. I like that I can say I didn’t select the responses, but I would like to take out the responses about my boots. I don’t understand why we have to make it available to the dean for evaluation.
		28. S. Lamb: I’m only speaking here in V. Sheets’ behalf, who is not here today. He argued rather passionately about it. He was the one who said this type of question is so formative that if you have Likert questions and you don’t have questions searching out reasonably for response, it’s difficult to help a faculty member improve. He felt strongly that the set of questions they make available to the chair could help temporary faculty members and graduate students form their pedagogies.
		29. R. Schneirov: I would like to add some context here. I think we put way too much emphasis on student evaluations as ways of evaluating teaching. It’s a minor way of evaluating teaching. They have not been proven to be valid—that is, measure what they are meant to measure. They have been negatively correlated with the quality of the teaching. Independently teaching has been evaluated by experts and has been shown that the student evaluation doesn’t come up with anything close to it. There are many studies on this. I think it is extremely important that we be dedicated to improving our teaching. I’m not opposed to having student evaluations, they’re good, but as I see it to have our focus on these student evaluations to be the main focus for teaching and improvement is really a mistake. In regard to these open-ended questions I always receive a small number of evaluations from students—fifty to sixty percent at most. Twenty percent are comments. How representative are they, going to the chair and dean for evaluation on the basis of these comments?
		30. C. Olsen: I think V. Sheets’ point is that when you have graduate assistants and a rotating group of temporary faculty that if you don’t allow the chair access to some of those written comments it will be pretty hard to evaluate them in terms of retention. You could just put those under department level but that seems unnecessary.
		31. S. Lamb: I do recall a study that supported R. Schneirov’s view in that it said that responses to open-ended questions dominate the perception of the chair or dean. If you have one or two responses, a very small number of responses, the rest of the information is not retained. That which is retained by the evaluator is the response to the open-ended questions.
		32. D. Hantzis: I am not opposed to the questions at all, but there are other ways to assure the chair has access to open-ended questions without requiring it of everyone. If we are worried about temporary faculty or graduate assistants then they should be required to submit it on their own. We have a long tradition during my pretenure years to submit them. Now because of biennial review they are available. If the faculty member has then and the department says we want temporary and pretenure to submit them in annual reviews, then they submit them.
		33. K. Yousif: We had this question in Exec and voted it off because the majority felt that this particular open-ended question lends itself to personal comments and invective. They wanted to move responses out of the personal realm.
		34. E. Hampton: I am in favor because there is meaningful feedback not tapped by the other two. It also allows a venue away from those questions. If someone has another kind of comment they will make it in place of the responses of the other two.
		35. J. Pommier: The first two deal with two different things. The first deals with the best things about the course, and the second deals with learning.
		36. K. Berlin: Again I think it’s up to faculty. When we address SIRs with students it’s up to us to stress that we don’t want to hear comments about jewelry and boots. If they want to be taken seriously, have a voice in this university, they have power with these evaluations to let people know what they can improve on. You have to be professional about it for anyone to respect your opinion. I have told them for two years now. I get tons of feedback and it has never been unprofessional. I have that open-ended question in there.
		37. D. Hantzis: Students need this type of socialization from the beginning. Faculty may be seen as being proscriptive and skewing their responses. “They are telling me I can’t write something I want to write.” This is a minor but necessary point. I hope that we eventually develop a role as responsible participants. I don’t want to stand up in a room and say, “Don’t put this in your evaluation.” My department policy says when we give the student evaluations, “Don’t say a word.”
	2. R. Guell: B. Bunnett, you were wondering aloud, and it sounded like you wanted to make the five-point Likert scale to four.
		1. B. Bunnett: You may have noticed a tentative tone in that… I am not convinced.
		2. R. Guell: We are still in open debate.
		3. D. Richards: I don’t see that a neutral position on a question is inappropriate. You could be legitimately neutral. I would prefer five.
		4. D. Hantzis: We just had this conversation in our department, and they force an opinion, but they include “not informed enough” or “no response.” If we don’t have “NA” then we need the neutral position. In the absence of the “NA” or the “I don’t know” we need some place for students to go.
10. Academic Calendar: J. Pommier, S. Lamb. Vote: 28-0-0
	1. R. Schneirov: As far as I can tell, we have gone back to 30 classes each semester?
		1. R. Guell: Yes, to restore the lost Tuesday.
		2. R. Schneirov: I’m happy to hear it.
11. College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services Changes: A. Kummerow, C. Paterson. Vote: 27-0-1
	1. R. Guell: The creation of the School of Nursing is linked here with the change of the name of the college to the College of Human Services. As I indicated in my chair report, section 305 of the Handbook is impacted by what has gone on here, specifically with regard to Nursing, and what has been happening is essentially not provided for in the Handbook. After we do this we will have to backfill and quickly fix 305. The problem is, though there is a School of Music, it’s because it’s essentially a badass department with high-standing faculty, but the Director is really a chair, and reporting happens in exactly the same way. In the School of Nursing, they will be creating an entirely new layer between the department and college. This would be the first. The nurses are required by their accrediting body to have a nurse to evaluate nurses at the level outside the department, so L. Hall’s position has been created, with a status much like Associate Dean. We will have to create a process in 305, and FAC is working to accommodate this new reality. It doesn’t speak to whether they should have a name change or have their own school. Whether this passes or not, 305 will have to be changed.
		1. S. Lamb: This option was made available when we passed the document that created the possibility of Schools.
		2. R. Guell: When CAAC created the possibility of Schools they considered the possibility of departments within Schools and rejected it. A floor amendment on the Senate in 2010 explicitly reversed that and allowed for it. It didn’t create any, but allowed for it.
	2. L. Hall: This is straightforward. We are simply taking the current nursing unit and renaming it the School of Nursing. The big push with this is to align us with peer institutions across the state and the country. Most nursing bodies are Schools or Colleges of Nursing that stand alone. It’s also a matter of external image; how our stakeholders and students view us. Along with that we are proposing a name change to the college that would align us with other institutions that have a nursing school within, changing the name to the College of Health and Human Services.
		1. R. Guell: Any questions for Dr. Hall?
		2. B. Kilp: There were quite a few people voting against it—was there a commonality there? The college faculty voted 32-7-1.
		3. L. Hall: Not that I remember.
		4. T. Foster: When the merger occurred seven years ago, what was the structure that was established at that time? E. Acree was the Dean and became Associate Dean?
		5. L. Hall: She became a chair.
12. Adjournment 4:23pm