

#11

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

November 29, 2016

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Final Minutes

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

Members Absent: none

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Bradley, Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: none

Guests: K. Butwin, L. Eberman

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley:

- i) I'm giving my talk to the budget committee in Indy next week, so I will not be at the Senate meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup>.
- ii) I was in Florida over break and had a number of good meetings with alumni.

b) Provost M. Licari:

- i) I hope everyone had a good break last week. I spent last Monday in Indianapolis at a day long workshop for K-12 in Indiana. Since we do a lot of teacher preparation, we will keep our eye on that state debate.
- ii) The reading summit sponsored by Duke Energy that is hosted here was also on Monday. They are expanding it to a two day event: day one for reading and day two for math. Congratulations to everyone involved with that.

2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) Following Open Discussion, our Agenda today consists of consideration of the FAC proposal to revise calendar definition in the Handbook. I would then like to take a moment to discuss the pending amendment to revise the Attendance Policy. We will wrap up with liaison reports.

- b) Ballots for the constitutional amendment went out on Monday. The process uncovered a glitch in the list of Regular Faculty provided to our electioneer—it did not include

Regular Faculty holding full-time administrative positions. Considering Senate's need to communicate effectively with the faculty, we need to ensure that a comprehensive list is always available. Next year we need to start with a list that is definitive so we are not missing a whole class of people.

- c) A reminder about our New Senator Informal Meeting on Thursday at 3:30. Everyone here is invited. I encourage you to pass on your accumulated wisdom.
- d) Senate meets for the final time this semester next Thursday. At present, I do not expect it to take as long as the last meeting.
- e) We will meet twice more the following week: our December Informal at Condit House on the 13<sup>th</sup> and the meeting with the Board of Trustees on the 16<sup>th</sup>.
  - i) D. Bradley: It would be really good to have people there for the BOT meeting.

### 3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes

- a) Motion to approve as amended (J. Conant, D. Hantzis). Vote: 9-0-0.

### 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) R. Guell: Is the threshold for unpaid bills for registration supposed to be \$500 or \$1000?
  - i) M. Licari: The intention is \$1000. Perhaps there is some confusion. We'll get that straightened out.
  - ii) D. Bradley: For students who are well along in their program, go beyond even that. For students in their last semester, they need to finish. The Commission is introducing legislation to not hold transcripts for unpaid university bills. *The Chronicle* has noted that Georgia State has had incredible results with this.
  - iii) D. Hantzis: I think a lot of students don't even see their advisor, because they think they won't be able to register. I'm happy to see the threshold increased.
- b) D. Bradley: I would like to discuss reducing the detail in the minutes. I think when people are not in the room, they could misunderstand. They are not present to see expressions, hear tone, and perceive the nuance. For example, some concern has been expressed at how we value instructors. The whole issue of trying to balance the faculty has been turned into something negative when it is not.
  - i) S. Lamb: We went back and forth on this when I was chair. Generally, I find more angst when minutes are abbreviated than when they are not. This is the only conduit to distribute information about what happens here. Faculty are not going to come to the Exec meetings. I do strongly caution against going down that route. We are given the opportunity to review the minutes before they are disbursed. We have in time periods past asked the President and Provost to make comments, suggestions, editing. I think this is one of the attributes of the Faculty Senate that allows it to be viable. I'm awed by the number of people who read them.
  - ii) L. Phillips: More minutes rather than fewer are part of shared governance. Also the historian in me is driven by these. I would be more in favor of the process.
  - iii) R. Guell: I am primarily to blame for the extended minutes. Before I was secretary they were extraordinarily brief. Brief minutes leave gaps for a re-investigation of legislative history, which occurred just this morning about Section 310 and if it was removed from the Handbook. I was able to go to the detailed minutes of that meeting and find that what was passed through the Senate did not get to the Board. And we wouldn't know that if we didn't have minutes. And, we also wouldn't know things

- like your absolute insistence that instructors and lecturers not be paid university funds for research, except for external grants because that statements is not found in the Handbook but it's in the minutes several times. The only way we get there is with detailed minutes. This opportunity on behalf of our faculty is like the UK parliamentarian form of questioning the prime minister. People have more confidence in a system when they know their representatives are able to challenge and be on the record.
- iv) T. Hawkins: Having been secretary and now being in this position, I have thought about this. I know D. Bradley that you have talked in general about your preference for more abbreviated minutes. I know this comment today was in response to a specific comment made to you. My general response is that detailed minutes allow us to seek clarification about comments that some might find unclear or unsettling. Your regular presence here and at Senate—and your willingness to be questioned—allows faculty to get answers to their questions. In this particular case, Senate is where a clarification was requested, and you had the opportunity to provide it. It does us all a great service when we can get people engaged. We should always take the opportunity to improve the minutes. And you have the right to edit your statements before the minutes are approved and made public.
  - v) D. Bradley: That means I need to read them.
  - vi) L. Brown: ...and I as the FS Secretary have to continue to write them...
  - vii) D. Hantzis: I agree with D. Bradley. I like to capture the main points. I think deliberation is important to capture. If we are saying we are going to record deliberations, we should have them, which is one of the reasons I prefer we do topics and votes taken. I appreciated R. Guell's comment about legislation. I reference K. Yousif's points in Senate about Exec as a gatekeeping committee. The other thing is Robert's Rules of Order. If we are going to capture deliberations, we can clarify and clean later. When you are representing a body, your words need to be captured in the minutes. We shouldn't be able to say, this is off the record.
  - viii) R. Guell: I do not agree that we should not have the option to go off the record, if necessary. There are times, although this meeting is open, when an important issue needs to be raised but the detailed conversation should not be in the minutes.
  - c) S. Lamb: I was very pleased that the engineering B.S. passed. It was an interesting debate. The program was solid, there were a few criticisms, but most of us felt this was a positive direction for the institution to go. We have been FTE'd to death. So many reactions were a result of a fear that it was a zero-sum game. I am glad that was addressed.
    - i) D. Bradley: I think the arguments against the program really are answered by having the FTE model. If A&S is generating half of the hours for the degree they are going to get 50% of the FTE. We have not talked about what the student: teacher ratio is intended to be in COT. I think it's about the same as SCOB. This model we are using does a better job of protection positions. It's based on numbers.
    - d) B. Kilp: Regarding that Leadership workshop. At my table, when we were talking about evaluation models and the comments that are made on student evaluations, the understanding is that comments are owned by the faculty and can be brought to the biennial review. Then it was brought up that comments could be seen by chairs. Faculty should be reminded that that is the case. As a former member on my personnel

committee, I was concerned that the chair has information that the committee doesn't. Why is the chair able to see them? Isn't he or she just another faculty member?

- i) D. Bradley: The chair will always be privy to information that others don't have because of the role they play. Some of that will be written down and some may not.
  - ii) M. Licari: It's interesting that the personnel committee doesn't have access. It would be good for them to have it. It's a data point about teaching.
  - iii) B. Kilp: The faculty member can choose what comments they want to offer and the chair can see them all.
  - iv) D. Hantzis: We are still in transition from being the only one getting access to the comments. First it was on paper and just went to the faculty member. Then we went electronic. There is a legitimate need that faculty understand what can be seen. It is different for the Biennial Review than the annual review for tenure track, in my opinion. In the case of the Biennial Review, the chair is asked to share information that no one else may have and go to the personnel committee for a response.
  - v) D. Bradley: We don't need to ask the candidate for that anymore. We have it.
  - vi) D. Hantzis: In the case of annual reviews, there is nothing provided outside of the candidate file.
  - vii) D. Bradley: We can meet in the middle on that.
  - viii) D. Hantzis: And the same for annual reviews. I have faculty asking for letters from last year that I think the university should be assisting with providing. It does say in the Biennial Review that the chair can share information and is protected for sharing.
  - ix) D. Bradley: The annual review is intended to be formative.
  - x) D. Hantzis: The Biennial Review is intended to be summative. I think we could use the language of the Biennial Review to revise 305.
  - xi) C. MacDonald: The problem I see is the Biennial Review is inherently different than annual, pre-tenure review. The whole goal in the Biennial Review is to reach a consensus. Then we move on. Because there is no consensus building in pre-tenure review, I would be hesitant to copy and paste.
- e) R. Guell: I am concerned that things that happen like at Ohio State will reactivate the desire among state legislatures to open up concealed weapons on college campuses.
- i) D. Bradley: That bill has probably been introduced to the legislature every year I've been here.

5) FAC Item—L. Eberman

- a) Working day definition. Motion to approve language in 506 (D. Hantzis, C. MacDonald)
- b) Motion to table: (C. MacDonald, D. Hantzis). Vote: 9-0-0.
  - i) L. Eberman: We clarified the definitions based on the conversation we had here. The language was generally accepted. Then we put in insertions. I also did a side by side to help clarify which term would be applied where.
  - ii) K. Butwin: I am aware this is on the record. I have concerns about the academic working day and the implications this may have for payroll purposes and frankly the clarity in a faculty member's obligation to only begin work on an opening day of term and closing day of semester.

- iii) C. MacDonald: With the current definition of “working day”, there are none in the summer. But, that is not true. The nature of faculty work is that it extends past the closing day. We are talking about the requirement of being available to be on campus.
- iv) R. Guell: The reason we pay on September 1st is because new faculty were not getting paid until October 1. We created the fiction of starting on September 1. The understanding is that we were going to give you the same amount of money in a different amount of time. I believe this can be resolved in 310 under teaching duties or somewhere in the 500s that faculty have responsibilities to prepare for their courses and conduct scholarship throughout the year,
- v) K. Butwin: In early August, faculty are clearly preparing.
- vi) R. Guell: There is the Office of Sponsored Programs concern. If a faculty member is doing work all summer, they have been paying themselves out of that grant money. If it’s federal grant money it matters if you are a 9 or 10 month institution.
- vii) S. Lamb: This could be a time to search through the minutes. It was stated to us and was assured by administrators that this is only for the reasons R. Guell mentioned. It was not to change the 9 month status.
- viii) K. Butwin: The issue is the BOT statement that was adopted in 06/07 is a reality. Faculty are clearly working in August whether they are on or off campus. If the desire is to address on-campus activities during the early August/late May period, I think there are other ways to address the issue of on-campus activities in early August. I think there are periods in August where no one is expected to be available because it is not an academic working day.
- ix) T. Hawkins: Could we add language to clarify, or is the definition the issue itself?
- x) D. Bradley: Is this topic on the agenda because of the sponsored research issue?
- xi) R. Guell: No, because people were insistent on having meetings on or before the 15<sup>th</sup> or after final grades had been done. That’s its focus and why it’s been added to the agenda. There are issues with payroll and OSP. I don’t think this is ready for a vote today. The officers and B. Butwin need to be comfortable.
- xii) D. Bradley: The issues need to be separated. There is not one school in America that does not have a 10 month contract. Put three months’ pay in the contract. We can’t make too many rules for two people.
- xiii) C. MacDonald: We need to be able to compel faculty to participate in certain things in the summer, like grievances. I do understand that here are some additional issues related to payroll and OSP and as a result of that, I am happy to make a motion to table this.
- xiv) L. Eberman: I was thinking that adding “available on campus” might be helpful in adding clarity to the last one.
- xv) D. Hantzis: If we add available, what does that mean, what is my responsibility for the summer?
- xvi) D. Bradley: It may be that these are too blunt. Any time when we have a procedure or a time limit, a working day is any day the university is open and operating. For some purposes a working day is going to have a different meaning. But for all our legal or procedural processes, a working day has to be a day.
- xvii) R. Guell: For the purposes of discipline I would stipulate that. For a purpose of student grievance, I would say it makes you open to summer service. That is fine. But for faculty grievance, the clock should start on opening day.

- xviii) D. Bradley: Can't you imagine a circumstance that is not true? You can't just hold off three months for adjudication.
- xix) D. Hantzis: It's not every faculty member. It's those who are on the committees. It's difficult to explain to faculty and students and their parents. When we had an old system, committees were asked to define to whether they would work in the summer. We fought for three days on penalty or reward. We have to be careful and recognize what needs to be done by whom.
- xx) D. Bradley: We need a statement at the end that says we have professional responsibilities that we will have to deal with outside of this definition. You can't be sitting in south Terre Haute and say I'm off contract. But if you are in Bangkok, you obviously can't attend. You can't say on principle I'm not going to participate because it's on particular days.
- xxi) J. Conant: It sounds like we need a salary, committee and grievance definition. If a grievance comes up and you've got a ticket for Bangkok, then no.
- xxii) L. Eberman: I take D. Bradley's point, but I think that belongs somewhere else. The definition of duties of faculty is 310 because it addresses faculty only. Putting in the duties and responsibilities, I think we should put that in there, our responsibilities.
- xxiii) D. Bradley: We all have to admit there are off hours and weekend times where it may be appropriate to be on campus.
- xxiv) D. Hantzis: I want to bring up spring break—we had one college that required every faculty to be on campus because the university is open. I was troubled with faculty acting like spring break is like winter break.
- xxv) T. Hawkins: Do we want to table everything that is present or discuss specific items?
- xxvi) C. MacDonald: I move to table it all.

#### 6) Discussion Item—Senate Attendance Policy

- a) T. Hawkins: I wanted this discussion assuming that the constitutional amendment passes. In that event, I think it's important to decide what we want to do. I know of three senators who are or will be subject to the current language. Assuming the new language passes and we operate under "may lose the seat", I would like us to consider the process that would bring the matter to Exec. Does the chair have any discretion?
- b) R. Guell: We could raise the attendance issue. Under Robert's Rules, the body can bring topics under new business.
- c) D. Hantzis: But we would then have access to personal information when it is not necessary.
- d) D. Bradley: R. Guell is bringing this as a theoretical example.
- e) D. Hantzis: There were clear objections in Senate with Exec being given this authority.
- f) C. MacDonald: If this doesn't pass, it's in the position of the chair exclusively.
- g) R. Guell: If you bring it to the Executive Committee or not, I think it's good form to bring in everyone under executive session.
- h) D. Bradley: All or none, probably.
- i) T. Hawkins: It would be best, I think, to wait until January and bring in any current cases under the new policy. We will then deal with the others as they arise.

- 7) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:
  - a) AAC (C. MacDonald): Have not met.
  - b) AEC (S. Lamb): No report.
  - c) CAAC (B. Kilp): Have not met. Officers are discussing the Communication Health Concentration.
  - d) FAC (D. Hantzis): Meeting tomorrow.
  - e) FEBC (J. Conant): Have not met.
  - f) GC (L. Phillips): They met during our informal. They are considering a Data Science degree.
  - g) SAC (R. Guell): Have not met.
  - h) URC (L. Brown): Have not met.
  
- 8) Adjournment: 4:47 p.m.