INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

December 4, 2014

Minutes

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

Members Absent: C. Ball, K. Bolinger, L. Borrero, I. Land, K. Lee, L. Phillips

Ex-Officio Present: Provost J. Maynard, K. Brauchle, R. Crumrin, R. English, K. Hill-Clarke, L. Maule, L. Maurer, J. Murray, B. Smith, J. Turman

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley

Guests: M. A. Badar, R. Baker, C. Blevens, J. Hauser, H. Tapley, K. Liu

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Bradley: Absent
   2. Provost J. Maynard:
      1. The President cannot be with us today; he was invited to the Washington, D.C. White House College Opportunity Day of Action.
      2. Next week the Board of Trustees will be on campus, and they have a very full agenda to tackle; twelve of those items came from this body. You have all accomplished a lot this semester, and it is appreciated. Also, there will be a board summit, and the focus will be department success. We will try to capitalize on the work of the Departmental Success Taskforce, and the actions supported by you will contribute to overall success. We will talk also about the degree reviews for compliance with the 70 hours/6 semesters rule, and inform the Board about the efforts made regarding the Course Transformation Academy.
      3. Commencement is a week from Saturday, which will be smaller than our spring version.
      4. Lastly, I wish each of you a happy holiday, and I know the President wishes you the same.
2. Chair Report: R. Guell
   1. Student evaluations, especially the response rate, will certainly be one of the things the Executive Committee will be concentrating on in the near future—R. Lugar has expressed concern about it, and there will be a closer look at response rates. We have been getting emails on them, and we are concerned about the low numbers.
   2. I would ask that you consider putting your actions and winter work where your vote was with regard to getting yourselves ready for Blackboard grading in the spring semester rather than the fall. Only seven faculty members have attended K. Bigler’s workshops for grading assistance thus far. We do have commitment from the Registrar and OIT for the ability to move grades from Blackboard to the portal for both Interim and Final Grades. Their goal is to be ready for Interim grading. Also, a couple of faculty members, including D. Richards, have expressed concern about homework software they use that manages their own gradebooks. My understanding is that some software is ready to auto-move grades to Blackboard. K. Bigler also knows a process by which you can download a spreadsheet and then upload it to Blackboard that will only take a couple of minutes.
   3. Regarding Mapworks and the data transferred into Mapworks for first semester freshmen and students at risk, S. Pearcy in the University College has the ability to upload spreadsheet data directly. Folks who have hundreds of students will be able to email spreadsheet attachments and she will upload them automatically. If your class is bigger than 50 students, send it to her; if you have fewer students, enter the data yourselves.
   4. Finally the President has asked me and has mentioned to the Executive Committee if we would create a Kernan-Shepard Report about the structure of faculty governance here at ISU. I believe that shared governance here is not broken, and attempts to fix it could break it. However, the President deserves a response to his request and I would like to have a collection of volunteers from all colleges and various ranks and experience to be in on that conversation. Please send me an email if you are interested in serving.
      1. S. Lamb: I have been through this a couple of times, once under former President Moore—his concept was that half of the members of the Standing Committee should be selected by the administration. I was prepared for this because the chair at the time, W. Carnahan, said to be prepared. The administration is always looking to appoint faculty to the Standing Committees. President Benjamin got the Board with him and appointed a committee. Any time there is an attempt to move shared governance away from the Faculty Senate you have to be careful. We on the Executive Committee sit more closely with the President. We don’t normally have the gut reactions to issues that you supply. That must remain. There has to remain this body as representative of the faculty. Another thing—I think I’m apprehensive about having individuals come into this committee who don’t have vast experience with shared governance, who don’t know what the committees are who are working their tails off, who don’t know the marginal committees. Those who have not seen where issues are coming from—certainly there is value in new input—but input freshly born with no experience, just a desire to please whomever is in power, is not the way to go. I plead with you to be apprehensive, reasonably, about this charge.
3. Support Staff Report: R. Torrence
4. SGA Report: O. Finley (Absent)
   1. OrgFunding applications, interviews, and scoring have been completed. I called an emergency Senate meeting for this past Wednesday, and all were approved. We are hoping to have the money in the accounts before we leave for the break.
   2. SGA setup and orchestrated the Poker Run on the first weekend of Fall Break. Due to the fact it was held on break, turnout was horrendous, but those who participated had fun with it. Three winners each will receive tickets to Arch Madness at the end of the season. We hope to be able to give away several of these throughout the basketball season, ultimately getting a large group of Forest members out at the conference tournaments.
   3. The Forest will be holding another viewing party this Saturday in Dede I for the Chattanooga game. We are looking forward to a large turnout.
   4. SGA’s Supreme Court is now full and all appointments were passed through Senate right before the Thanksgiving break. We look forward to working with the members of the court.
   5. We are also working on sending about 10 SGA students to the Statehouse in the spring as we have done in previous years.
5. Temporary Faculty Advocate: L. Henson. Absent
6. Approval of the Minutes of November 13, 2014: B. Kilp, A. Anderson. Vote: 26-0-2
7. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
   1. R. Lugar: Is the Policy on Amorous Relationships going to the Board of Trustees?
      1. R. Guell: It will go to the Board of Trustees in December as the opening of comment period. That is the way the Policy on Policies works. When Administration wants a policy to get a hearing they take it to the Board of Trustees first. There is then a comment period until at least the next Board meeting.
      2. J. Maynard: I’m looking for the agenda now…it probably won’t be until May. I put forth Extraordinary Circumstances for a May response.
      3. R. Guell: It will likely go to SAC and FAC. There will be time to hear it. Then it will come to Exec and the Senate.
      4. R. Lugar: Is it possible to not address both as the same? It looks as if both are the same situation and will garner a similar response. We might question that.
      5. R. Guell: You are concerned that we are folding in relationships with a son or daughter with a significant other? It will certainly come up, surely.
   2. B. Kilp: Regarding Interim grades—I have heard of varying degrees of success from people. It was early and people weren’t prepared. Has there been any more discussion about effectiveness? We would like to check to see if the students improved. I know people would not support the idea, but having both early grade check and actual midterms would be helpful for advisors.
      1. R. Guell: I will ask SAC, FAC, and SGA to look into it.
   3. D. Malooley: Regarding the response rate to student evaluations, interestingly enough, my technology students are saying it’s because they have to log into the Portal and we will know who they are. I assured them it’s not tracked, but they don’t believe it. Ironically, they don’t trust the technology.
8. Informational Items:
   1. Center for Teaching Excellence: B. Whitaker
      1. B. Whitaker: Thank you, Dr. Guell, for letting me come in to give you all a brief report. I want to tell you what an honor it is to be Director for the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence. I am inspired daily by people who want to embody teaching. Last year we spent getting ourselves established. We want to thank the Library; we are situated right next to the Cup and Chaucer, and they have been gracious hosts. This fall we had a great book study, *Cheating Lessons* by J. Lang, culminating in a visit from him. We also had our Deep Blue Learning series. Four faculty members attended the Best Teachers Institute and came back and recreated the wonderful series. The Teaching by Design series is focused on using best strategies, put together from data from the faculty survey. Going into spring, we have our “pull you in” opportunity—every week, Teaching Tuesday comes to your email and I have tried to make it short and to the point. We are adding new things all the time. Also, there are three quick reads on new ideas, inspiration, etc. We are also on Twitter. On our website our Twitter feed is live. We tweet every day about ideas. We are also working with Videocapture. Through support of Strategic Plan Goal Six we can video capture in the center. We capture some of the advising series, and we can make them available on the Blackboard website. Next semester we will be bringing back Teaching Triangles; three faculty members are put together, and they each observe the others’ classrooms. It’s just an opportunity to watch them teach and learn from that moment and self-reflect rather than being evaluative. We also offer a Brown Bag series, and we are offering at the midpoint Quick Course Diagnostics. We will come into your classroom while you are gone and do activities, gather feedback, and chart it for you to reflect on; you can do with it what you wish—the key to teaching is self-reflection. We will have an Open House in January or February. We will also collaborate with Rose-Hulman in a book study in the spring—on Linda Nilson’s *Creating Self-Regulated Learners*. It will culminate in March, when Nilson will come to campus; possibly St. Mary of the Woods will join us.
   2. R. Guell: The Executive Committee has discussed this, and we would like to nominate J. Conant to ICHE. C. Paterson, A. Anderson. Vote: 28-0-0
9. Report on Whistleblower Policy: Motion to Endorse: M. Harmon, C. Paterson. Vote: 28-0-0
   1. R. Guell: The Policy on Policies was invoked, but the Board is asking for the insertion of a comment between the word “Handbook” wherever it appears, and both SAC and FAC opposed the insertion, thereby narrowing the scope of whistleblower activity. They each issued a reply.
      1. D. Hantzis: I wanted to compliment the drafters. This response is well-written, clear, parsimonious, and representative of what SAC and FAC brought forward.
10. CAAC Items
    1. Early Intervention Minor: A. Morales, D. Hantzis. Vote: 28-0-0
       1. K. Liu: EESE/CIMT are proposing the Early Intervention Minor. Research shows that early learning impacts brain development. Any detection of delays or special needs is critical and saves an enormous amount of money later on in terms of special services. There is a recent change in Indiana licensure in training for Early Intervention Specialist, requiring 36 credits. Right now the 18-credit minor will provide students with the foundation to become an Early Intervention Specialist. It uses existing courses, four in early childhood and two in special education. It will help those who wish to work with children with special needs, in child growth and development, and in working with communities, parents, and agencies.
          1. R. Lugar: Can anyone minor in this and be eligible for certification?
          2. K. Liu: Yes. Currently we have childhood education majors and human development and speech pathology majors taking this minor besides elementary special education majors.
    2. Unmanned Systems Major: D. Malooley, A. Anderson. Vote: 28-0-0
       1. R. Baker: This major grew out of demand from students wanting to get involved in mobile robotics, that is, drones. We have covered land, air, and water versions. The major itself is a great response to the growing demand with our minor. We started the minor three years ago and currently have 151 students. We have already graduated 68 with this minor. People are asking if the program will be implemented by the time they get here. Right now in the minor there are students from 11 different majors. Our 49-hour major leaves plenty of room for students to take a minor and use the technology in another area. Logistics, Computer Science, Earth and Environmental Science, all areas. There is always an application for this technology.
11. GC Item: Doctor of Physical Therapy: C. Paterson, J. Pommier. Vote: 28-0-0
    1. H. Tapley: We tried in 2011 to pass this and it was unsuccessful. We asked for a site visit from the accrediting body and got a lot of feedback—most of the changes you see are from them telling us what we needed. We started a year and a half ago changing our curriculum. The names and numbers of courses were changed. Objectives have also changed. New faculty have come; in fact, all our faculty are new since we tried to pass this in 2011. We submitted our application for candidacy on Monday, and hope to have a site visit in late January.
12. Cleanup on Section 350: K. Yousif, C. Paterson. Vote: 28-0-0
    1. R. Guell: This deals very briefly with objections that were raised by R. Perrin, and the Executive Committee added one minor thing to what is listed as fundraising, defining development listed as “and fundraising.” We eliminated the use of the word “conduit” in 350.2.7 and I believe there was one other similar trivial change.
       1. A. Morales: One thing that slipped through is, of all definitions and descriptions, there is no place where we articulate rank and faculty status of chair. We simply say they can’t be tenured in the chair role.
       2. R. Guell: Correct. There is no requirement for a faculty member to have a specific rank in order to be chair. That is absent. If you wish to raise it, I ask we do that at a later time.
13. Constitutional Changes: Read by Unanimous Consent.
    1. Strike 245.8.5 and All of its Components from Handbook
    2. Strike 245.8.6 and All of its Components from Handbook
    3. Revise 245.3.4 Regarding Election of Parliamentarian
    4. Create 245.3.3.4 Attendance Policy and Number Accordingly
       1. R. Guell: There is a constitutional requirement that an amendment be read at a Senate meeting, be voted upon at the next Senate meeting, and then be voted on within ten days by the entire faculty. Because of the cumbersome nature of the Constitution, a number of these amendments have been sitting on the shelf for a year or more. The Parliamentarian part was passed through FAC last year and the Attendance policy is several years old. They did go through proper channels and Exec chose to bundle them to a larger constitutional vote. With regard to A and B, Liaisons to various governance bodies of colleges and the Council of Governance Chairs, those are largely obsolete entities. What I will ask we do is go through them on substance, consider them as read by unanimous consent, and make sure if you have questions to think about them over break and use our time that way. All bodies have a Senator on them except for the Arts & Sciences Faculty Council because they banned it. In the days of memos having to be done on typewriters and communication being slower, I think having a Senator at those meetings made sense, but in this age they make no sense. I have been the potted plant at Faculty Council, and so have others. We don’t need them at our meetings.
       2. 245.8.6 is the Council of Governance Chairs. This, I believe V. Sheets and S. Lamb can tell you, they felt guilty when they didn’t have a meeting or only had it once. I did it once just to ask, “Do we need it?” and everyone said no. I would like to strike this from the Handbook as well.
       3. Regarding the election of Parliamentarian, 245.3.4, the standard practice of electing the Parliamentarian has been at odds with the Constitution. Exec has always chosen them and had that confirmed at the first Senate meeting. I believe the current practice is better than what is currently in the Handbook.
          1. B. Bunnett: In the proposal’s language it says the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary will be presented for confirmation at the first meeting of the Senate each fall.
          2. R. Guell: That is just the Parliamentarian. The Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary are elected in the early April meeting of the newly elected Senators. The Parliamentarian then is chosen from those remaining six Executive Committee members who are elected at large.
          3. B. Bunnett: The election for Exec takes place at the new Senators’ meeting? Being new to the Senate myself, I didn’t know the other Senators very well, nor Exec, so in a way the election occurred at a time when I knew the least about the candidates. Could that be addressed?
          4. R. Guell: The election is conducted by the Provost. In my memory those elections have, up until the last few years, been largely Polit-Bureau-like…in the last two years there have been contests and very brief statements have been made for officer candidates but nothing has been done regarding Exec members to offer background.
          5. S. Lamb: There have been times when all of those who were nominated for Exec had been asked to put up a paragraph or two on the website to explain their background. That would not help you when officers are elected if you are brand new. I don’t see an immediate solution.
          6. B. Bunnett: May I offer a suggestion? Can we have some sort of activity in which we can all meet?
          7. R. Guell: I can facilitate such a meeting for introductions in March.
       4. R. Guell: Regarding 245.3.3.4, concern was raised several times in different years about a couple of different Senators, and each of those terms seemed to always be addressed as an empty chair and caused their college to be underrepresented. There was no mechanism by which to remedy an absent Senator from serving. This would grant that authority to one who is truly, consistently absent.
          1. D. Hantzis: I know we read it before, and we’re doing it again, but I continue to have concerns about notification to the body. Perhaps not prior to removal. That person has been elected by a body of faculty. The College/Library may not know they are being removed.
          2. R. Guell: There is no prohibition for an amendment that might be offered during the voting session. You are all free to do that.
       5. R. Guell: Regarding 245.9.1.4, Authorization to Make Minor Changes, I wrote this mostly myself, having been one of those who have been either a Senator or Executive Committee member for many years. It was absurd to carry a Handbook that referred to older entities, and it would require a vote of university faculty to recognize reality. We should just rectify it when it changes. This did not go through a standing committee but it did go through Exec as an amendment.
14. Foundational Studies New UDIE Rule Requiring 45 Hours: D. Hantzis, A. Anderson. Vote: 28-0-0
    1. R. Guell: Everyone has in front of them the corrected version, which is to insert what is the square bracketed line that UDIE would require 45 earned credit hours at the time of registration. It will be a prerequisite for each student, and for every UDIE elective. There are still courses missing from the list, and I understand that C. Fischer and D. Hantzis want to jointly offer an amendment at this time.
       1. D. Hantzis: After the hearing of this motion in Exec, L. Maule and I discussed it, and brought C. Fischer in the conversation about this partial list of courses. This list is dynamic; it changes often. We want to strike it altogether so we’re not constantly adding and subtracting courses. We would prefer the Senate understand the catalog copy say, “select from the list of approved courses.” We will then make a determination where the list would be updated. That would be how we prefer to have it read.
       2. B. Kilp: So where, as a student, when they go to the schedule of classes, is there a UDIE list? I agree with this 100 percent.
       3. D. Hantzis: Yes there is.
       4. R. Guell: D. Hantzis, a motion to say, “Select two from the list of approved courses.” Scratch “list” and the thing of substance becomes the 45-hour registration requirement.
       5. B. Kilp: I would like to offer a suggestion to change to 48 hours. I fyou take fifteen hours a semester that would put you in sophomore year for UDIE.
       6. L. Maule: Forty-five credit hours must be earned, so students who are taking 12-15 hours will be juniors by then. It runs parallel with the requirement for junior composition.
       7. R. Guell: The junior composition requirement is 45 hours. When it was higher students who were registering in spring for fall couldn’t register for ENG 305, etc. The only concern I have with the way it is here is the mad rush Wednesday morning when grades are posted…then as a sophomore you can register for classes. Unless I’m wrong, the 305 seats are gone by that time as well as UDIE. The loophole could theoretically allow a sophomore to get in, but they can’t because by that time the seats are gone.
       8. R. Lugar: What about transfer students?
       9. R. Guell: As I understand it you can register for things as soon as the transcript shows the correct number of hours.
       10. C. Fischer: This also came up in our discussions. There may be a small contingent that needs an override to get all their transfer credits in for an AA degree. We need to make sure we don’t have early semester sophomore or freshmen registering. This course is supposed to be an Upper Division course. Some transfers may need some help at registration.
       11. R. Lugar: Sometimes the UDIE that comes in is reading Intro to Psych.
       12. L. Maule: It’s part of the crosswalk. It ended this August, but you will continue to see it for a while.
       13. S. Lamb: I know at one point the length of majors was docked when they had a UDIE requirement in their major that was 300 or 400 level, then it was no longer double-counted. With this passing through so they can’t take a UDIE until they have 45 hours, will that support the argument?
       14. D. Malooley: That wasn’t a consideration. It was that we wanted juniors and seniors to get the classes when they needed them.
       15. S. Lamb: Where did that argument end?
       16. D. Malooley: If a student had a requirement like 305T they no longer had to count it against the major.
       17. S. Lamb: Is that then accepted by the powers that be?
       18. R. Guell: There is one who hasn’t accepted it. The truth is a deal was made with regard to counting directed Foundational Studies courses and how those would count to majors, specifically in the College of Business, who were sitting at 77 credit hours. They made an agreement that two of their Foundational Studies courses were only to be taken by juniors or above. The deal as it was laid out by S. Powers, CAAC, the Provost, and the President at the time was that they would. The President has subsequently changed his mind, but whether he has changed it back I don’t know. This has come very late. He is not, as I understand it, pleased in regard to CAAC’s waiver that was granted to the College of Business and others—specifically with the College of Business regarding calling 71 hours on the basis of double-counting UDIE when it was really 77. That is not related to this issue.
       19. D. Hantzis: I wanted to say that L. Maule and C. Fischer at University College led the council in discussion. Everyone understood that this requirement will be effective for fall 2015 registration, which means this coming March. We will work with advisors to make sure this doesn’t surprise people. We will also reach out to departments who have a course approved as a UDIE to opt out by removing the course; otherwise the language will be attached to that course. They will be assured that the proposal will carry that language. There are some implications.
       20. C. Fischer: This doesn’t stop departments that have other restrictions. One is a senior-only class, for example. This is just the minimum prerequisite.
15. Adjournment