

#14

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

January 17, 2016

3:30 p.m., HMSU 407

Final Minutes

Members Present: L. Brown, J. Conant, R. Guell, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins, B. Kilp, C. MacDonald, L. Phillips

Members Absent: S. Lamb

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley

1) Administrative Reports

a) President D. Bradley: Absent.

b) Provost M. Licari:

i) President Bradley and I were in Indianapolis this morning so that the president could give his budget presentation to the House Budget Committee. He did a nice job. The Committee responded well to it and asked positive, substantive questions. That was encouraging. Although the recommendation from ICHE was favorable to us, the Governor's proposal is not. The budget assumptions we have made for next year were built on ICHE recommendations, so we will have to watch what comes out of the Legislature very closely.

ii) Welcome back. It was nice to see so much energy back on campus today.

iii) T. Hawkins: Do you have an update from your budget meeting with the deans last week?

(1) M. Licari: We discussed the reallocations. My plan will be a blend of some S&E reductions in targeted areas to do the least amount of disruption, some staff vacancies that we won't refill, and some savings as we switch some instructor positions to lecturers. We are trying to accomplish a \$600,000 reallocation with minimal disruption.

iv) T. Hawkins: I've heard some disconcerting information about the Foundation. Can you elaborate?

- (1) M. Licari: I discussed this with the deans on Thursday. The Foundation has a number of scholarship accounts that are underwater and we need to honor the donors' intentions.
- 2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins
 - a) At Senate on Thursday the Agenda begins with a budget report from D. McKee. We will then proceed to the Traffic Engineering Technology Minor proposal and follow that with the Exec motion to endorse the FAC recommendations on engagement. We will end with the Exec motion to create a special committee of the Senate on faculty culture.
 - b) Regarding some of the issues we raised last week:
 - i) I contacted M. Hare to inquire about the possibility of FCTE offering a workshop later this spring on the topic of disruptive students. She was receptive and plans to put the topic on their planning board.
 - ii) I contacted D. McKee and C. Barton regarding the possibility of a faculty forum on healthcare. D. McKee expressed her willingness to put something together for later in the semester.
 - c) I met with B. Butwin on Friday to discuss pending and new issues.
 - i) She promised to take the 'sanctuary campus' issue to President Bradley to investigate the possibility of intermediate steps short of a Senate resolution.
 - ii) I updated her on the new FAC charge to address the language regarding 'contracts' and 'appointments'. She will work with L. Eberman on that.
 - iii) She has been working to update the Handbook to reflect official interpretations and hopes to have the changes in place by next week.
 - iv) And, we agreed to restart the discussion on the "working day" definition.
 - v) B. Butwin will attend Exec on 31 January to discuss these issues, as well as data security, Title IX and Anti-Discrimination Policy proposals, and changes to FERPA and Sponsored Programs.
 - d) Otherwise, our Agenda today is light. We will go from Open Discussion to Standing Committees. We will end with an executive session.
- 3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of January 10, 2017
 - a) Motion to approve as amended (D. Hantzis, L. Phillips). Vote: 7-0-1.
- 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
 - a) R. Guell: I asked a question to the Officers about the grade appeal process. If a student files a grade appeal that impacts that student's ability to progress in their degree program, do you assume the grade appeal will fail or that it will succeed? I assumed you would assume the appeal would fail. I wanted an official interpretation of the Handbook. This was a critical point in the student's life. I am fine with using the chairperson's discretion as a standard and as an operational guideline, but it ought to go into the policy. It is such an important step that the chair could suspend the consequence of the grade pending the appeal. I think we need to refer this issue to FAC for a formal insertion into the Handbook, or you need to do a formal interpretation of the Handbook.
 - i) T. Hawkins: My response was that it was best dealt with at the discretion of the chair. It was our sense that the vast majority of these appeals fail, and therefore the

chair should use their discretion. We did not consider this to be an official Handbook interpretation.

b) R. Guell: I have one other issue. Could you have S. Powers draw up something that tells chairs what signatures have to be original and which ones can be copied and scanned?

i) B. Kilp: I thought we decided that an electronic signature was just as good as a wet signature on university documents.

ii) M. Licari: I thought this as well. I will inform S. Powers that we will take them all.

c) L. Brown: I am concerned that there may be irregularities in some of the promotions to Senior Instructor. In one case, the nominal reason for denial is an incomplete file because some student evaluations are missing. However, others with the same missing information have not been flagged for denial of promotion. Therefore, I have reason to believe that this person may be denied promotion based on unsubstantiated student complaints that have not been brought to the attention of the instructor or their department chairperson. If this is the case, this person is being denied due process.

i) M. Licari: I have used consistent criteria in evaluating cases of promotion to Senior Instructor.

ii) D. Hantzis: We need to encourage committees and others doing performance reviews to look at internal consistencies. We need to have professional development for reviewers.

5) Standing Committees: Charges and Liaison Reports

a) T. Hawkins: I have received interim reports from FAC, SAC, and GC which I have shared with you and with the Senate. I hope to have reports from the other committees soon.

b) D. Hantzis: SAC reports that they are going to have a meeting in January where they will have visitors that report on student success initiatives. They say that all responses will be in the annual report. This was a charge they were asked to do by the Executive Committee and if we don't hear back until the annual report, we cannot act.

i) T. Hawkins: I can ask the Committee to report sooner regarding some of the charges.

c) B. Kilp: I couldn't stay for the entire last meeting of CAAC. They have spent two entire meetings on the Health Communication degree. I guess they will finish next week and vote. It is all coming down to Communication thinks there is plenty of health information in their three courses. Y. Peterson thinks they need to take a health class.

i) D. Hantzis: We have primary authority over our curriculum. One department should not be telling another that they must offer their course.

6) Executive Session

a) Motion to enter Executive Session (C. MacDonald, D. Hantzis). Vote: 7-0-0.

b) Motion to leave Executive Session (C. MacDonald, R. Guell). Vote: 6-0-0.

7) Adjournment 4:47 p.m.