

#6

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

October 11, 2016

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

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

Members Absent: D. Hantzis

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Bradley

Guests: None

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley: none.

b) Provost M. Licari:

i) We had a wonderful student success conference that was well-attended by lots of folks from other institutions. Kudos to J. Powers and his team. I missed the first day, but was able to attend the second. I think the outcomes will be useful to us and to others around the state.

ii) I talked with the deans last week and by email this morning and gave them a jumping-off point for faculty staffing plans to be developed before the president will authorize any academic searches.

(1) T. Hawkins: Does that mean that searches will be authorized? Or is the possibility still that even if plans are put in place, the President is not in a position to search?

(2) M. Licari: The FTE cap for the coming year is basically where we are right now. So no net positions will be added to the total faculty FTE. There will be some replacements.

iii) T. Hawkins: Could you brief everyone on the Honors College status?

(1) M. Licari: This is something I have been thinking about for a while, as a piece of the Strategic Plan to attract larger numbers of excellent, high caliber students and making sure that the experience that these students have on campus is a good one. I have been pushing G. Bierly to think about transitioning from an Honors Program to an Honors College. He is at a conference right now to do some fact-

finding. A few years ago, we didn't have the infrastructure and the number of students needed. At this point, we have a large number of students who graduate in Honors, we have a person responsible for the program, we have specific housing, and we have a separate curriculum. We have the things we need. We need to consider different faculty models other than the one where G. Bierly has to go around and beg departments. We need to make changes in advising Honors students. They have a different curriculum, academic expectations, often multiply majors and minors. There is a lot to keep track of. I think we need to reshuffle the advising from the University College. We have been working with Residential Life to free up space in 500 Wabash to house junior and senior Honors students. I would like to keep them on campus. There is value to having them on campus to serve as peer mentors for other students.

- (2) T. Hawkins: You are hoping to have this in place by next fall?
- (3) M. Licari: Yes, because the number of things to be changed is small, there is very little new to be created. The big administrative thing, the housing, is taken care of. The rest is nomenclature and some advising decisions.
- (4) R. Guell: I was doing a little math while you were speaking. If the Honors Program becomes an Honors College, that would be the 3rd non-academic college dean in 6 years: The UC, the HC and the Distance Education Dean. If you succeed in housing, you risk balkanizing already fairly segregated housing: by academic ability, race, etc.
- (5) M. Licari: In terms of the dean position, G. Bierly and I have addressed that head-on. In my mind, the title of dean or director is irrelevant. He will still report to the Provost.
- (6) R. Guell: Semantics matter sometimes. The faculty has shrunk and the number of deans will have grown from 6 to 9.
- (7) M. Licari: That is the math, but does it really matter? It would be different if we were creating this from nothing and if we were adding an administrator. This is a title change. In terms of the residence, the only change to the current residence situation would be hopefully more juniors and seniors living on campus. Right now, they typically live off-campus. The rest of the housing situation will not change. The ideal would be to grow the number of honors students.
- (8) L. Phillips: I think the perception from the faculty is that there are extra layers of administration that may cut out the possibility of hiring new faculty.
- (9) M. Licari: There's no new anything.
- (10) L. Phillips: But maybe there will be in the future.
- (11) M. Licari: Yes, if the program grew, we would be having the same conversation as we would for any college that was growing.

2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) I would like to start with the reminder that next week is a Senate week—a full five weeks since the September meeting. As it looks now, the Agenda will be weighted towards informational items. Specifically, L. Reynolds will give Senate an update on the Title IX office. We do have the two FAC motions. And, it remains possible that we will have a draft of the Student Grievance Procedures by then. We will see. Looking ahead to our meeting next week, L. Reynolds will be here for the same purpose. As FAC meets

tomorrow, we may have more action items to address ahead of Senate. Today, J. Conant will provide us with an update on ICHE activities. We also have for discussion an inquiry from GC. We will end with liaison reports. Finally, there are a couple of PTOC items. First, B. Eversole has sent the CAS PT guidelines out to the members. She plans to have a report back in time for Senate. Second, L. Behrendt has agreed to serve on PTOC this year as the HHS replacement.

3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes

- a) Approval of minutes as amended (L. Phillips, J. Conant): Vote: 8-0-0.

4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) J. Conant: I have two related issues that I will combine. Chairs in CAS were informed this morning about the changes to the FTE model being utilized by Academic Affairs. In general, I support the goal of eliminating some current, common “FTE adjustments” (like 0.5 FTE adjustment for chairing the department) and reducing the SCH targets appropriately. However, there are two kinds of current adjustments that don’t make sense to eliminate: externally funded buyouts and extra-departmental assignments (like directing the Social Studies Education program or faculty fellowship for CCE or UC). It does not make sense to punish a department faculty for allowing one of its members to perform a workload function for a different work unit. The second concern is that the staffing decisions are based on SFR and SCH targets, but these targets were determined solely on the basis of a historical 3 year average of actual productivity, rather than on a theoretically sound rationale. For example, there is little to defend a SFR in Economics that is a full 4 points greater than the departments in the SCOB. Economics had simply been a good citizen in the years prior to the establishment of the targets and raised the enrollment limits on its courses more than other departments did. If staffing decisions are to be made on the basis of actual SCH vs target SCH, the SCH targets must be rationalized.
- b) M. Licari: I won’t speak for the President, but I will say that you are exactly right. The jumping-off point I gave the deans is intended to focus that conversation. They haven’t been examined since before any of the current deans are here. There has to be a rational staffing plan developed by the deans that reflects the realities of today and reasonableness across departments in the college and across the university. No dean can create these independently. They create a jump-off point and then we talk in a group to be sure that we’ve accomplished that for Academic Affairs. The comments you made about potential disincentives to faculty work: Yes, I’m aware of that.
- c) C. MacDonald: You said the adjustments are going away?
- d) R. Guell: Will I count as one FTE in Econ?
- e) J. Conant: You are adjusted this year, but not next. D. Clark will count against History for directing Social Studies Education.
- f) M. Licari: I do not think this is the place for that debate.
- g) S. Lamb: The ratios that may be adjusted, will they be by departments or colleges?
- h) M. Licari: I gave the deans college-level targets. The deans should, as they are thinking about how staff is deployed across various departments, need to first determine if the targets are not reasonable. If they are not, they can be adjusted. If the deans feel that

faculty FTE needs to be redeployed across their colleges, they can do this. I'm not going to micromanage the colleges and departments.

- i) J. Conant: Having the deans do it gives them an incentive to come up with as low a ratio as possible. It needs to be a university-wide thing, or they have disincentives to make it lower.
 - j) M. Licari: Yes. They need to discuss with their department chairs, and we'll reconvene Thursday morning.
 - k) T. Hawkins: What do you see as the outcome?
 - l) M. Licari: I don't know. It could be a contentious meeting. The fangs come out in a time of scarce resources.
 - m) R. Guell: The difference is in 2008 and 2010 when there were a lot of fangs out and lots of slashing and burning. It seems like all this is about the 300 freshmen that we are down. Either it is not going to happen next year, or we need to plan for fewer freshmen. If this is the case, this discussion is warranted.
 - n) M. Licari: We need to start talking about the 2500 freshman class as perhaps the reality. So I laid this out to the deans as a two-tiered plan. There's a short-term component and a long term. Short term: what kind of cost savings can be done for this fall with a very modest effect on current FTE? We could save over half a million in salary and .25 million in benefits if we converted instructors to part time lecturers.
 - o) R. Guell: That math isn't right. We are just 2% shy on lecturers. That is only 11 people. Are you suggesting that 11 people count for .75 million in excess expense? I don't think so.
 - p) T. Hawkins: Can we have an update on Tuesday?
 - q) M. Licari: There will be more to say, but we won't be done. The more long-term issue is getting to the ideal 70-15-15. As everyone knows, getting to that is a long-term proposition. We have to wait for tenured faculty to retire, instructor contracts to expire. A question for deans: Should an FTE open up in this department, what would I do?
 - r) T. Hawkins: There is the appearance of an October surprise. Nothing earlier this fall gave an indication of this. What I want to make sure is that we are being honest with everyone involved. What is the state of the university now, and what is the future? There is some incongruity between across-the-board pay raises and this.
 - s) R. Guell: The Handbook says we should achieve 85% regular faculty. We are at 87%. This is not far off.
- 5) Faculty Leadership Conference: J. Conant
- a) J. Conant: I just wanted to inform you all that there is, at least every other year, a faculty leadership conference from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. I had never heard of this before.
 - b) C. MacDonald: L. Philips and I have gone to one.
 - c) J. Conant: This one on February 16 is on integrating career skills into the curriculum. Unfortunately it is a Senate day. The morning is the keynote and there are breakouts in the afternoon. I hope some senators will go at least in the morning and then come back in the afternoon. They are encouraging institutions to send teams. It would also be good for people from CAAC and other committees who are not on Senate to go. We need to figure out how to implement career readiness into the curriculum.

- d) S. Lamb: It is an opportunity to work with other officers of other Faculty Senates and see what other institutions are doing. It can be a growth experience. Ours is not the only Faculty Senate in the state.
 - e) T. Hawkins: I think there are things we can do to publicize this.
 - f) J. Conant: It would be nice for us to have a good presence there.
 - g) S. Lamb: We are so fortunate in the Scott College of Business to have things in place already.
 - h) J. Conant: I hope one of the things that happens is that we have more of a discussion among FCTE, the Career Center and faculty to help us do this in places other than COB and parts of COT.
- 6) Graduate Council Item: Discussion of Enforcement Mechanisms
- a) L. Phillips: I met with GC last week and there are a few issues. GC wants to know about the enforcement mechanisms they have to deal with programs that don't comply with program review. Could they suspend curricular review until the programs comply? Yes. They can do this. Are there other mechanisms to enforce compliance? For example, can it suspend travel funds, graduate assistants, suspend a program? Is curricular review the only enforcement mechanism?
 - b) M. Licari: I talked to L. Maurer before coming here. It is clear to me that curriculum is under the purview of the faculty. So if GC wants to exercise that authority, that is fine. The wrinkle is that we currently have grad programs that are not structured well. Those changes shouldn't be held up by the Council, because then we are just hurting students. I don't want a mechanism that could hurt students. Also the resource allocations, travel, GAs are under the purview of the deans in those areas. I would hope GC would say, this program is out of compliance, and recommend to the Dean to suspend things. Use a formal memo or an official recommendation to an administrator in charge of allocating those resources.
 - c) C. MacDonald: So it should go the Grad Dean and the College Dean?
 - d) M. Licari: Yes.
 - e) J. Conant: I understand the Dean under whom this happened is no longer here. And that is a signal. I can understand the frustration that GC feels. I don't disagree, but I would recommend some informal communication to the GC and deans that ignoring that recommendation is not acceptable.
 - f) M. Licari: I'm happy to follow up with that.
 - g) S. Lamb: It should also go to the Chair of the Faculty Senate.
 - h) M. Licari: It should go to the Grad Dean, Academic Dean, Faculty Senate Chair, and the Provost.
 - i) R. Guell: While I was Chair of the Senate, I got a phone call about this. Was that the only one? Or are there meaningful others?
 - j) C. MacDonald: There are pockets of non-compliance.
 - k) R. Guell: If this is a generalized issue, some programs would be more or less immune to these sanctions. For example, if I had lots of external grant dollars, I could be shielded from these mechanisms.
 - l) M. Licari: There are not that many places that are shielded from resource allocations from the university.

- m) R. Guell: The one mechanism that would get their attention is that GC could recommend suspending their program.
- n) S. Lamb: Are there intermediate steps?
- o) L. Phillips: I didn't get the sense that those hadn't been attempted. It is what if the intermediate steps aren't effective?
- p) J. Conant: The GC needs to know that if they do responsible, good work, that their recommendations will be addressed.
- q) R. Guell: The GC needs to know that it has no authority, but considerable standing to make recommendations.
- r) T. Hawkins: Our job is to make sure it has standing.

7) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:

- a) C. MacDonald: AAC has not met.
- b) S. Lamb: No report for AEC.
- c) B. Kilp: CAAC met and approved curriculum.
- d) D. Hantzis: No report for FAC.
- e) J. Conant: FEBC is contacting peer institutions to get information in instructor salaries.
- f) L. Phillips: GC is considering some handbook changes in regard to theses, dissertations.
- g) R. Guell: The current SAC chair is taking a new position, so we will need a new member of SAC and they will need a new chair.
- h) L. Brown: URC met to go over rubrics and will be meeting later this month to review grant proposals.

8) Adjournment 4:42 p.m.