INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

April 30, 2015, Dede III, 3:30pm

**Minutes**

Members Present: R. Guell, C. MacDonald, A. Anderson, C. Ball, K. Berlin, K. Bolinger, L. Borrero, B. Bunnett, C. Fischer, E. Hampton, D. Hantzis, M. Haque, M. Harmon, B. Kilp, A. Kummerow, I. Land, K. Lee, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, C. Paterson, J. Pommier, D. Richards, R. Schneirov, V. Sheets, E. Southard, M. Sterling, K. Yousif.

Members Absent: P. Bro, S. Lamb, R. Lugar, A. Morales, C. Olsen, L. Phillips,

Ex-Officio Present: Provost J. Maynard, A. Badar, K. Brauchle, R. Crumrin, L. Maule, L. Maurer, J. Murray, J. Sheese, B. Smith, J. Turman

Guests: C. Blevens, K. Butwin, K. Darin, D. Hews, E. Memmer, S. Powers, L. Spence, T. Steiger.

1. Faculty Senate Scholarship Presentation
   1. C. Blevens: On behalf of the Student Affairs Committee, it is my pleasure to introduce this year’s two Faculty Scholarship recipients, Erica Memmer and Kelsey Darin.
   2. I want to thank the Student Affairs Committee’s Scholarship Committee members, Dr. John Liu, Dr. Azizi Arrington-Bey, Dr. Alina Waite, and Dr. Lisa Phillips for their hard work, as well as to Maria Wiant and Franci Rubin, who did a wonderful job of soliciting and organizing the applications through Academic Works.
   3. I also want to give a very heartfelt thank you to the faculty, particularly members of this body, for their donations to the Faculty Scholarship fund. Through that generosity, these students will each be receiving scholarships of a little over $700.
   4. From the 230 applications that were received, the Committee reviewed 40 applications. An indication of their outstanding academic achievements is reflected by the average 3.81 GPA among them. After reviewing all 40, the committee has chosen two very deserving winners who are with us today.
   5. Our first recipient, Erica Memmer, is a sophomore Biology major with a minor in French. She is in the ISU Honors Program and maintains a 3.66 GPA. She is an undergraduate researcher in Dr. Jeffrey Stone’s lab and has participated in the Summer Undergraduate Research Experiences Program since 2014. Erica’s faculty recommendation stated “Erica is always a motivated and highly dependable researcher.” She is active in many extracurricular activities and displays her commitment to community engagement and leadership skills in Delta Gamma Fraternity for Women, ISU Environmental Science Club, Dance Marathon for ISU’s Food Recovery Network, and the ISU Pre-Med Club. Erica plans to pursue a career as a psychiatrist.
   6. Our second recipient, Kelsey Darin, is a sophomore Marketing major, who minors in Language Studies. She maintains an excellent 4.0 GPA, having completed 57 hours. Kelsey’s faculty recommendation stated that she is “an exemplary student who is always well-prepared and who sets the curve for each test.” Another faculty member stated they even tried to talk Kelsey into changing her major from Marketing to Accounting because she “has a strong work ethic and a high standard of personal integrity that would make her an outstanding CPA.” She actively participates in ISU Sycamore Ambassadors, Dance Marathon for ISU’s Food Recovery Network, and the National Society of Collegiate Scholars. Kelsey plans to work in the marketing department of a large company after graduation.
2. Memorial Resolution: Henry Tamar, Presented by D. Hews
   1. D. Hews: Henry Tamar, 84, of West Terre Haute, passed away on September 9, 2014. He was born in Vienna, Austria, and immigrated to the United States in 1939.
   2. He earned a Ph.D. in Sensory Physiology from Florida State University. He was the head of the Division of Science and Mathematics at Pembroke State College in Pembroke, North Carolina from 1958 to 1962.
   3. Henry relocated to Terre Haute when he accepted a teaching position at Indiana State University as Professor of Physiology and Anatomy. His teaching involved many students in medicine and nursing, and he taught at the university for 36 years.
   4. He authored the book *Principles of Sensory Physiology* in 1972. In his research publications which spanned 1965-1972, he documented a new species of protozoan, morphological structures related to mechanisms of locomotion, and the movement patterns of jumping ciliates, as well as examined the distribution and morphological variation in both freshwater and marine species.
   5. After retirement Henry still enjoyed conversing about science with his departmental colleagues. He was also a longtime member and past president of the Wabash Valley Audubon Society, a passion he shared with many other members of the Biology department.
   6. Henry enjoyed his research, his years of teaching college Students, and especially nature and being in the outdoors. He was a kind and thoughtful person who will be missed by all.
   7. THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that if further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to his students, the College of Arts & Sciences, and the University.
   8. 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.
3. Administrative Reports
   1. D. Bradley: Absent.
   2. J. Maynard: As you can see, the President is not with us. You have probably also heard on the news that the budget has been approved. It was confirmed yesterday with the Legislature. When all was said and done, additional funding was approved, with an increase of 1.7 percent in year one and 1.8 percent in year two. They also approved a performance budget reallocation of 2.4 percent in year one and .08 percent in year two. The bottom line is, we are coming in at $1.5 million less than last year’s operating budget. When they factored in the performance metrics we took a reduction. It’s not what we would have liked to have. Activities will determine what that means. We are still waiting for tuition guidelines from ICHE, and that will take a couple of days yet. On the news, several policy makers were said to have suggested no tuition hikes for up to four years. Every percentage of tuition increase equals $1 million for us. Factoring into that the additional loss of $1-2 million will tighten us up considerably.

Graduation is next weekend, and hopefully having two ceremonies will work out well. It’s a learning experience for us, and we will adjust.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone for a very productive year in the Senate. The Standing Committees, the Executive Committee, and the Senate alike worked very hard—harder than we’ve worked in years. This year’s work will have a lasting impact on this institution. I kid a lot about the pain of working with the Senate, but this is my last Senate meeting—I know I said this two years ago, but I mean it this time. Thank you.

1. Chair Report: R. Guell
   1. R. Guell: If you would consider the pleas of the Foundation and its desires to hit you up for annual faculty fundraisers, a good spot was represented earlier with the Faculty Scholarship. Please consider donating to that—in your payroll deductions think about the Faculty Senate Scholarship. I had K. Darin in class, and she is an excellent student; both students are deserving of every dollar we are able to give.

I want to thank you on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee and the officers for indulging us in twelve meetings. It was a rather brutal schedule, especially this month, and you came prepared with good ideas. I’m sorry that R. Lugar is not here; I wanted to thank her again for saving a really bad September meeting with an alternative to one more meeting on the biennial review discussion. She saved the tenor of the Senate. There was much thoughtful debate throughout the year.

* 1. C. MacDonald: Jack, when you were first hired at ISU what was it, 3 years ago? Ok, it may have been a few more than that. You served first as my Dean before almost immediately, being called up to serve as Provost. I think I speak for all of us when I say thank you for your years of service as Provost. You have seen us through two presidents with vastly differing styles, and weathered many storms with us. We appreciate the respect you have for the role of shared governance and for the voice of the faculty.
  2. I remember when you originally announced that you were stepping down from the role of Provost, that I wished you were staying, so that I could have a year with you as Provost while I was an officer. Thanks to Biff’s early departure, it turned out that I ended up getting my wish. And while I wouldn’t wish ever to have four Provosts in as many years, I am happy to have this time to work closely with you.
  3. This last year in particular, we have been thankful for your leadership, as we worked together to fend off micromanaging from above, to navigate difficult personnel decisions, and to work our way through a myriad of policy changes. We have appreciated your ability to balance wisdom and kindness with rigor and integrity, and we will be sorry to see you leave this role, although we know it is overdue. The next Provost will find you have left him some very big shoes to fill.
  4. And now for Bob. I confess, that at one point, I was uncertain what type of Senate Chair you would prove to be, but it appears my fears have been misplaced. Rather than aggressively insisting on your way and badgering us all to death, you have chosen to work us all to death instead. In all seriousness, you have shown yourself to be a good listener, and a good leader, willing to admit when you are wrong, at least after the fact. Your high energy and dedication to principles have led us to accomplishing more this year than I can recall a Senate doing in any of the 14 years I have served. I wanted to hope that this would leave me little to do as next year’s chair, but I am discovering the list keeps growing. My one promise to you returning Senators is that no huge Handbook sections are on the list, at least not yet. Thank you both for a productive year.

1. Support Staff Report: R. Torrence: Absent
2. SGA Report: O. Findley: Absent
3. Part-Time/Temporary Faculty Representative: M. Mohran Absent
4. Approval of April 23, 2015 Minutes: M. Harmon, A. Anderson. Vote: 24-0-2
5. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
   1. C. Paterson: I had a question about the biennial review, particularly the training for recommendation of final decisions. I heard nothing and we will be heading in to fall semester soon enough. What is going on with it?
      1. R. Guell: I will start by saying J. Maynard and I will be composing a joint letter next week to advise deans and chairs regarding the biennial review, section 350 changes, and section 305 changes to ensure understanding of the rules. I know it doesn’t address training.
      2. J. Maynard: I discussed it with S. Powers and she assures me she will have something to announce. I don’t know the specifics yet.
      3. C. Paterson: It goes beyond the chairs and deans.
      4. D. Hantzis: I think the point was well taken. We wanted to express frustration. We were finished by November. It clearly stated we needed departments to begin their reviews with faculty, then because decisions have to be made, FAC and other committees were profoundly involved in revisions. Several times we tried to encourage groups to sit and review policy differences. We don’t know how to motivate them.
      5. R. Guell: I will also say that in mid-July the combination of outgoing and incoming officers will meet with Provost Licari, and it will be number one on the agenda. There will be some faculty input on how that training would take place and it would be a mid-August kickoff. It is on my list of things to ask for.
   2. J. Maynard: I do have one more point on the budget: we have funding for the addition to the Arena. In the next two months we will be very aggressively finalizing those plans. In the early fall of 2016, a 36-month renovation will begin in the middle section of the Arena. The space is needed drastically, but it will be nice when it’s done. Congratulations to those who got this done; it is the largest project in the history of the university.
   3. D. Malooley: I would just like to, as C. MacDonald did, publically give kudos to J. Maynard and R. Guell.
6. CAAC Item
   1. University 299: E. Southard, A. Kummerow. Vote: 24-1-1
      1. R. Guell: It is extraordinarily atypical for the Senate to be in the business of approving courses, and we are in this position because every course that has had a UNIV prefix has come before the Senate. UNIV101 was controversial in the 1990s; those of you on the Senate three or four years ago remember the attempt at 201 and 301, which failed. When 299 came as a course, I chose to pull it all the way to Senate in terms of jurisdiction. I have no question about the wisdom of the course. That is also then the reason for the second item, which is to go to regular order as it regards courses with a UNIV prefix that only when they are called to Senate or Exec or CAAC would they be reviewed at University level.
      2. T. Steiger: For approximately a decade we have been offering a ten-week, very intense experience called Research Experience for Undergraduates. For the last four years, many more students have had these experiences, which now extend into the arts. We buy their time, pay them money to stay on campus and have research experiences alongside faculty. When we started this program, the easiest vehicle was through student wages, essentially making them employees. It worked well until the university responded to the Affordable Care Act. At that point, the new policy came out that no student could be employed for more than 27 hours per week. Last summer, we came up with a solution to recognize that these aren’t employees, they’re doing an internship, and we treated these as scholarships. They were paid every two weeks and the internal compliance people sounded the alarm, stating they looked like employees. We had a discussion on how to do this, and we will treat them as interns still, and pay them up front, but we didn’t have a course name. Initially we had a credit-bearing experience, but then who pays for it? Also, when you put them in a course, it changes the experience. It is designed to be outside of a course. It appears as a zero-credit course on their transcripts. We searched for an appropriate course without having every department find their own course, and 299 was it. It really is a compliance issue. We don’t want to flag any IRS issues, etc. The syllabus you see in the proposal is thin and breezy because there are too many possibilities, from Chemistry to Art to Technology. Every conceivable discipline is included.
      3. K. Bolinger: What is an exposium?
      4. T. Steiger: For the last four years it has been a celebration of student research and creativity. We renamed it from “symposium.”
      5. J. Pommier: I assume a faculty member supervises this course of zero credit hours? It’s almost undervaluing the role of instructors.
      6. T. Steiger: It is an experience. We will have faculty working with them on a daily basis. It’s already been happening for years.
      7. J. Pommier: Then it should all be an experience. Why take a zero-credit course and justify a 1, 2, or 3 credit class?
      8. T. Steiger: We just don’t want to raise any flags with the IRS. This is the way it is done at other universities. This is the solution to this problem.
      9. J. Pommier: They can say, “What about internship? We should have zero-credit internships.” The faculty should get credit for supervision.
      10. T. Steiger: I agree absolutely. My suggestion is that they are listed on the faculty activity report at supervisors. I think this is a separate issue.
      11. D. Malooley: Originally the proposal stated a 0-6 credit hour course and it was modified to 0-3. In what conditions could it be zero credits versus three?
      12. T. Steiger: The student could possibly do this for three summers. It just makes it repeatable.
      13. D. Malooley: Zero for each? When would it be three?
      14. R. Guell: If a student wanted to use a scholarship to pay for it, to get credit hours towards the 120 they need. They could choose to make it a three-hour course but they would use their scholarship to pay for it.
      15. D. Malooley: A student can’t choose their credits. Somehow it has to be offered.
      16. R. Guell: It would require a mutually agreeable arrangement to do this. faculty aren’t coerced into being a research supervisor. They say, “I want this student to do this with me.”
      17. C. Paterson: Are faculty compensated for their efforts?
      18. T. Steiger: I believe there is some token compensation that Chemistry and Physics gives that comes out to about 40 cents per hour…it is largely voluntary. We have not had any trouble in the past finding faculty who want to do this, especially among younger faculty who see the value.
      19. C. Paterson: Might I encourage your or someone else to find that of value?
      20. T. Steiger: The President told me the last three times I saw him that this is the most expensive initiative strategy. With everyone I have had to eliminate compensation and put the funds towards the students. Deans have provisional token compensation for a select set of faculty. When we have faculty who have students who apply and present at nationals they are given $250 for that. That is the only time.
      21. D. Hantzis: I think this is a problem the Senate should take up. They created guidelines for what we historically called “TBA” classes. My department, until this fall, required that every major do an independent project with a faculty member. We need to continue to explore this. The guidelines are not unreasonable. This is basically like COMM 464, etc.
   2. Instruction to CAAC on UNIV Prefix Courses
      1. (1) That the University College Council is a duly authorized and elected body of the University College, and as such, has the authority to create courses. That CAAC, Exec, or Senate may draw any course in any college into its jurisdiction for review, but that the default be that course approvals stop at the College level. (2) That any change to the Foundational Studies program, because it impacts every undergraduate student, constitutes a major change and would therefore be reviewed by CAAC, Exec, and Senate. R. Guell, C. Paterson. Vote: 26-0-0
         1. R. Guell: The Executive Committee recommendation is to treat University College as any college, allowing them to create courses subject to that college’s review. All courses can be pulled by CAAC, Exec, or the Senate for review and, just for clarification, we could make it clear that any change to the Foundational Studies program would be considered a major change and would come to the Senate. I would ask that a motion be made to instruct CAAC.
         2. D. Hantzis: In number two, where we attempt to clarify jurisdiction, as an officer of the University College Council, a couple of times this year, we were talking about the difference between changing the program and a course in the program. Do we mean that any course that carries Foundational Studies credit?
         3. R. Guell: No, not any course. But, if for example, they were going from two UDIEs to one, it would come here.
7. General Counsel Item
   1. Conflict of Interest: The last sentence to 912.3 was struck as per AAC and FAC recommendation: “Further, a consensual romantic or sexual relationship that involves significant power disparities may make the consensual nature of the relationship questionable.” D. Hantzis, M. Harmon. Vote: 26-0-0
      1. R. Guell: Thanks to K. Butwin for taking the interim Counsel job and working absolutely tirelessly with FAC, SAC, and AAC on several issues. This one, as you may or may not have surmised, came originally as “Amorous and Familial Relationships.” This is the response that we have come to in order to deal with those clumsy phrases. We are now putting this in one “Conflict of Interest” Statement. Since you received this document, Exec met on this and AAC’s and FAC’s recommendations were emailed to you. The sentence in 912.3 was recommended to be struck.
      2. K. Butwin: This was all in development at the point when I became General Counsel. In early discussions we talked about the problem with “Amorous Relationships.” There is a potential for a conflict of interest, similar to financial conflict of interest, supervisory, or contractual obligation or authority or arrangement. There is actually a state law about financial conflict of interest and you may not know that because we have a conflict of interest policy for that which is buried in the purchasing policy in 630.17. I suggested we pull that up to have this be an overall conflict of interest policy to deal with financial and personal issues which we have defined here as familial relationships in which there is a supervisory or evaluative relationship and consensual sexual or romantic relationships in which there is a supervisory or evaluative relationship. We have two avenues. You will note there is the potential for additional guidelines in departments as it pertains to compliance.
      3. R. Guell: It took many meetings and a lot of anguish, and I think that how well K. Butwin ended up working with Senate ended up being an indicator of how well she will do in her new position. Congratulations.
      4. K. Butwin: I will be a better General Counsel because I was a faculty member.
      5. R. Guell: What this boils down to is if you will teach your child, all you have to do is tell your department chair and work out a way to monitor and deal with the conflict of interest in evaluation and grading. On the sexual/romantic relationship side it gets more complicated. You have to tell your chair of the relationship and then any evaluative or supervisory relationship has to be modified in some way that is to be developed in terms of guidelines by each of the VPs. Dr. Licari will have to come up with what to do with a faculty member who falls in love with her dissertation advisee, for example. At that level we need a policy that will be about disclosure and dealing with the issue.
8. AAC Item: Change to 246.2.2.2 (Search Committees for President and Provost): R. Guell, A. Anderson. Motion to Table: A. Anderson, M. Harmon. Vote: 26-0-0
   1. R. Guell: One concern that presented itself to us actually happened in the immediate aftermath of the recent Provost search. We would potentially have missed an important candidate by having to go backwards. In the current process, AAC creates the slate. It would move forward, and if it was shot down by Exec or Senate it would go back to AAC. M. Licari interviewed with another campus almost a full month before he visited us. If it had been just another month we would have lost him as a candidate. Having the possibility that we would have to engineer an iterative process; J. Maynard agrees this is a potential problem to be solved. We initially proposed a solution in which power was taken away from AAC. They didn’t like that, and responded with a different way of handling that and created the possibility of having to send something back. Exec recommended a process where AAC produces a pool from which they choose two non-overlapping slates. If Exec rejects both slates, then Exec would produce a third slate on its own from the pool. The Senate would then get to choose which of the three it wanted to endorse so there would be no possibility that we would not have a slate to offer. That was what Exec is recommending and I will make that motion.
      1. D. Malooley: Which are we recommending?
      2. R. Guell: The one in the document labeled “C.”
      3. D. Malooley: “C” is the “Guell-suggested changes?”
      4. A. Kummerow: Just for clarification—AAC will create two separate slates?
      5. R. Guell: They will create a pool of fifteen and from that build two separate slates and present them to Exec. They will choose one or say both are acceptable. The Senate will endorse either the first or the second. If anything passed Exec it would be an AAC-approved slate. If Exec rejected both slates it would produce one of its own from that same pool of fifteen. Then there would be three slates for the Senate to choose from. If the view was that Exec was trying to manipulate the system, the Senate would be able to pick one of the two Exec rejected.
      6. D. Hantzis: I understand the process that 246.2.2.2.1 says the Senate will vote on the slate. If the Senate failed, I think we’re saying, to support by a majority than all three slates would be voted on and a plurality would be elected. The initial work is not technically rejected but in terms of rhetoric the Senate has rejected a slate and is asked to vote on it again.
      7. K. Bolinger: You are being asked to vote again. The language, while harsh, is correct.
      8. R. Guell: Are you suggesting in the second sentence “if the Senate rejects” to substitute the words “fails to adopt”?
      9. D. Hantzis: If they fail to earn a majority of votes? That’s not how it reads.
      10. R. Guell: The fourth word changes to “fails to adopt?”
      11. D. Hantzis: It’s not clear that if the Exec fails to earn a majority vote on a slate that it will be voted on.
      12. A. Kummerow: I’d like to make a motion that all three be presented.
      13. K. Bolinger: There will only be a third if the first two are rejected.
      14. A. Kummerow: But Exec will reject those?
      15. R. Guell: There is no need for this to be settled today. We have, with hope, 4-5 years before we have to do this again.
      16. C. Paterson: It might be wise to include a statement that says if Exec wishes to offer a new slate, people can be added to those.
      17. R. Guell: That’s essentially what it is. That language is there.
      18. C. Paterson: I think the word used was “rejected.”
      19. R. Guell: I believe that this needs more wordsmithing.
      20. D. Hantzis: I think that it is important to make sure we don’t end up with a situation where no committee is approved. Plurality is a good choice.
9. Committee on Committees
   1. Standing Committees: M. Harmon, A. Anderson. Vote: 27-0-0
   2. All-University Committees: M. Harmon, A. Anderson. Vote: 27-0-0
10. Endorsement of a joint committee of this year’s and next year’s officers plus this year’s FAC chair to work on three matters that may need to be resolved prior to the August Senate meeting (Guell, Lamb, MacDonald, Conant, Hawkins, and Hantzis). a) A policy on Gender-Based Violence; b) Whistleblower Procedures; and c) Biennial Review reports that will be harvested from the Faculty Activity Report software. Any actions taken would be subject to 2015-2016 Senate review. M. Harmon, A. Anderson. Vote: 27-0-0
    1. R. Guell: As alluded to earlier, these have been left open. It’s possible that we need to do something over the summer on that. There is the possibility that we will need to put in what some had hoped would have been in, but got taken out of what was passed last week, specifically protections against violence that the current policy that we passed didn’t address and many believe should have. A recent letter from the Department of Education suggested that was what needed done by July 1. I will now ask for endorsement of the joint committee of this year’s and next year’s officers and the FAC chair to work with Administration over the summer prior to the Board of Trustees meeting, and it would have the endorsement of the faculty as a preliminary endorsement. They would of course be subject to faculty review.
11. V. Sheets for S. Lamb
    1. V. Sheets: I didn’t realize I would get my own line in the agenda. S. Lamb couldn’t be here and asked me to read this. This is clearly his prose:

“Dear Colleagues, I have been active in the Faculty Senate for a huge number of years. Never have I seen a Chair work harder for the benefit of the institution than Dr. Guell. He is the Energizer Bunny.

Bob is a larger-than-life character. His personality has the style of one who plays a consistent role in a television setting. He never leaves character, and it is so dissimilar to any individual I have ever known. He is a master of the analytical, and yet at times, he is completely ruled by his tremendous passions given his insistence on literal interpretation.

Bob was absolutely essential for the success of faculty issues and perspectives.

Both the President and Bob believe that if a problem ever surfaces—just once—that the Handbook must be altered in case the problem surfaces again. And both Bob and the President are closely aligned with dear friends who are a constant source of issues.

When the President would identify issues, Bob would address them, and prepare draft after draft of solutions. Bob could identify solutions faster than the President could identify issues. Bob frustrated the President, and the President frustrated Bob. The rest of us were able to relax.

Our President believes absolutely in his own abilities, but so does Bob.

Our President is a master of spreadsheet analytics, but so is Bob.

Certainly, both have very small egos and are very passive in nature.

I truly believe that Bob must serve again as Chair, perhaps in a few years. Wait until the Handbook again becomes outmoded and has gone through several years of patchwork modifications. Then it will be necessary to again bring forth this bundle of energy and rely on his unique obsession of combining precision with vision, so that we can again rely on the Handbook for guidance. If a problem can be addressed with language and analytics, Bob will find the route.

Let us all stand and demonstrate our gratitude to the man who brought back clarity to the Handbook while preserving and strengthening the role of faculty. Thank you.”

1. Adjournment 4:32pm