

#12

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

December 6, 2016

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Final Minutes

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

Members Absent: L. Phillips

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

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: K. Butwin, L. Eberman, M. Herrington-Perry

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley:

i) I was just in Indianapolis, where I met with the chair of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. They have some concerns about the state revenue forecast. They only recently received the Commission for Higher Education recommendations for our funding. Things will be a little slower getting off the ground because of the transition to the new administration. I think they are still generally happy with us.

ii) S. Lamb: How does that translate?

iii) D. Bradley: I think the biggest issue is with the Commission recommendations for performance funding. The revenues from gambling are down.

iv) We have a Board of Trustees meeting next week, and we have a reception between the Senate and the Board.

b) Provost M. Licari:

i) I made some progress on faculty search approvals over the past week. Thank you for your patience.

ii) The SGA rep and I met and discussed the study week and finals week policy. I gave them a copy of the Handbook language. Please follow the policies.

iii) D. Hantzis: Will you make exceptions? With the bomb scare in the science building, some exams were affected.

- iv) M. Licari: I made the decision to cancel the classes. I don't know what the fallout is yet. Those types of exceptions will have to be granted, and I think everyone involved will understand.
- 2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins
- a) We will follow Open Discussion today by considering the 270.10 language proposed by the Assessment Council. L. Eberman is here to take us through two recommendations from FAC. We then have an update from our General Counsel.
  - b) I am pleased to report that the New Senator Informal Meeting last Thursday seemed to go well. We used the entire 90 minutes that were set aside. Senators had a few recommendations for us to consider:
    - i) They would like a formal budget presentation at Senate at least once a year
    - ii) They asked that Academic Affairs find ways to help faculty become more familiar with the Handbook.
    - iii) They expressed interest in special-topic Senate meetings and opportunity for more deliberation.
  - c) Senate meets for the final time this semester this Thursday. You are aware that I made an adjustment to the Agenda to bring these FAC items to the Senate for some initial discussion.
  - d) 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 Trustees on the 16<sup>th</sup>.
- 3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of November 29, 2016
- a) Motion to approve as amended (D. Hantzis, B. Kilp). Vote: 8-0-0.
- 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
- a) S. Lamb: We have a distance student who is dominating the time of an instructor with over 200 emails. The instructor thinks she can survive the rest of the semester. She is a very gracious person and has dealt with it, but it has exhausted her. The student implies threats and the instructor has done everything possible to accommodate the student requests.
    - i) L. Brown: If the student is threatening to inform the chair or the dean, the instructor should copy the chair on any response. This way the chair is in the loop and may stop the "threats."
  - b) R. Guell: I've asked T. Hawkins to charge FAC with examining the experience credit for new Assistant Professors. Currently, there is only faculty review if it comes with tenure.
    - i) T. Hawkins: I have passed it to FAC.
  - c) R. Guell: I want to bring up a topic from about six years ago. A colleague asked about the retirement benefits in the Handbook. We are still doing the retirement incentive. Here are the 2010 Board of Trustees minutes where it was approved. Can you put it back in the Handbook?
    - i) D. Bradley: Let me talk to K. Butwin and find out why it is not in the Handbook. It should be there.
  - d) R. Guell: Now, for our favorite topic, faculty FTE. I have two faculty on grant buyouts, and we will have more FTEs in the department than there are people, because we are

going back to counting the faculty as the FTE and the replacement from the buyout as FTE. This system offers no incentives for grants.

- i) D. Bradley: That is a misunderstanding. When money is available to pay for the part-time lecturer, the FTE will not be double-counted. We just need to find a place to capture those dollars. M. Licari and I are fair guys. Clearly it is not fair to count twice. It's like for full-year sabbaticals. For full-year sabbaticals, replacements will not be counted twice when lecturers are hired for replacement.
  - ii) M. Licari: I'm about to get the sabbatical requests from the deans.
  - iii) D. Bradley: They need to know there is a pot of money from the 40% of the faculty salary for full-year sabbaticals which can be used to hire part-time lecturers.
- e) S. Lamb: Now that M. Licari says we have to be eloquent in our evaluations of our to-be senior instructors, I don't want the university just to pick out the top four. There is an expectation of fairness.
- i) M. Licari: There is an expectation of fairness. 100% of the applications for promotion to senior instructor did not end up on the deans' tables. My response is if you are confident that the instructors have met the criteria and you feel confident moving the application to my table, then do so. There is a comparison of the accomplishments to the criteria. There's no entitlement.
  - ii) D. Bradley: Except for a fair deal.
  - iii) D. Hantzis: I sit on my college P&T Committee. Instructors did get different reviews. However, appointment letters provide no guidance in what is permitted to be evaluated. Even though CAS had professional development as a possible criteria, there was a lot of discussion about whether we could consider particular things. So there needs to be some clarification. For example, if you are an instructor teaching three courses and doing other things, it was unclear. In the Biennial Review it is clear what can't be counted for instructors.
  - iv) C. MacDonald: I would argue that you could consider professional development in teaching in the Biennial Review for instructors.

5) Assessment Council Item—M. Herrington-Perry

- a) Revisions to Section 270.10, motion to approve as amended (B. Kilp, J. Conant). Vote: 8-0-0.
- b) M. Herrington-Perry: The red on the right is changes that have been made to represent actual practice. Yellow is the changes based on the Senate recommendations.
- c) R. Guell: In 270-10 in the last line, we should change "ultimate" to "primary."
- d) D. Hantzis: There are 18 members of this committee and only 8 are faculty. This should be faculty-led. Only 2 are appointed by faculty, the rest are appointed by a dean. I want to see the University College represented since the UC has assessment responsibilities for Foundational Studies. This would mean there would be 9 faculty representatives out of 19 members.

6) FAC Items—Lindsey Eberman

- a) Recommendations for Senate nomination/election process. Motion to endorse (D. Hantzis, Brian Kilp). Vote: 8-0-0.
  - i) L. Eberman: T. Hawkins shared with us the white paper provided by B. Bunnett, and we had a lengthy discussion. The largest point of contention was using "require" or

- “strongly encourage.” We propose using the pre-nominating process to get to know individuals who are interested in the positions. We could use Qualtrics a little more expansively to include information. We tried to create recommendations that would not impact Handbook language while creating a more open process.
- ii) S. Lamb: When the Senate body meets, nominations are made for Senate officers at that very point.
  - iii) L. Eberman: We are trying to make sure that the entire Senate population knows who is interested.
  - iv) S. Lamb: This would have to come in advance of the meeting then.
  - v) C. MacDonald: We have allowed candidates for Senate officers to speak for themselves.
  - vi) R. Guell: As well as send a speaker in their stead when they could not be there.
  - vii) C. MacDonald: So we should allow the Exec nominees to have additional information in Qualtrics on the ballot.
  - viii) R. Guell: Whatever that social is, people are declaring their interest. And, at the end of that process, there could be communication to everyone in the new Senate, a list of who has self-identified as interested.
  - ix) C. MacDonald: I think one additional piece that we have not done successfully is to formally schedule these meetings, both the nominating meeting and the social meeting. Let’s calendar these meetings ahead of time.
  - x) D. Hantzis: Several people on FAC thought it shouldn’t be called a social. It should still be informal, but elevated somehow.
  - xi) L. Eberman: Some said they didn’t go because it didn’t seem important.
  - xii) D. Hantzis: Do you think C. MacDonald’s suggestion of calendaring the event would be in the spirit of FAC’s discussion?
  - xiii) T. Hawkins: Nothing prevents us from endorsing 1 or 2. 3 needs to be separated.
  - xiv) R. Guell: It is important to address the perception of the Senate executive committee as a politburo—the notion that a new or newish member could have felt that all was decided in advance.
- b) Recommendations for student evaluations, motion to endorse (B. Kilp, J. Conant). Vote: 7-0-0.
- i) L. Eberman: I met with J. Nelson to identify people from FAC and SAC to prepare the report. This recommendation is coming from FAC, because we haven’t had a response from SAC in the last four weeks or so. The primary issues are that some people feel like their response rates have decreased. However, overall response rates have improved. There was a long and confusing conversation on the meaning of the institutional mean. It turns out that there is an “institutional mean” generated for every survey. In other words, once departmental or course questions are added, that is considered a different survey and it will have a different “institutional mean.”
  - ii) M. Licari: I will talk to S. Powers and try to figure this out.
  - iii) D. Hantzis: I think we should have a glossary so we know what the terms mean when we get the reports.
  - iv) L. Eberman: Another part of our conversation was that student evaluations should not be the only way to evaluate faculty.
  - v) T. Hawkins: I would like to remove the suggestions for extra credit.

- vi) D. Hantzis: Should peer evaluations of teaching have to be done and included in an evaluation file? I think that our new RPT guidelines could include this.
- 7) General Counsel Update—K Butwin
- a) K. Butwin: Here is what is on the agenda for the December Board of Trustees meeting: we are going to update 210 to be consistent with the strategic plan; they will consider the modifications from 310 that were passed last May; modifications to 350; modifications to 270 if it is passed on Thursday.
  - b) K. Butwin: Coming up for Spring: we have a FERPA policy, but it is not in the Handbook itself.
  - c) K. Butwin: L. Spence and others have been working on 930-941. There are a bunch of technology-type of policies that are irrelevant or need to be updated. Data management and security needs to be updated. We will need an education campaign about those things as well.
    - i) R. Guell: Could we reform the cell-phone policy and the stipend that is part of that?
    - ii) D. Bradley: Is there any way to make that device-independent because new devices are coming out all the time?
    - iii) K. Butwin: We need restrictions about what data should be kept confidential.
  - d) K. Butwin: We will be looking at 360, Sponsored Programs policy changes.
  - e) K. Butwin: Staff Council wants a separate process for minor changes.
  - f) K. Butwin: S. Gamble and I are working with M. Licari to add official interpretations to the Handbook. We will start with the 300s and hyperlink with other policies in that section.
  - g) K. Butwin: I need to do some education around conflict of interest so everybody knows what to do and what not to do. We will do similar things with contract policy as we try to move to a totally electronic process.
- 8) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:
- a) AAC (C. MacDonald): Have not met.
  - b) AEC (S. Lamb): No report.
  - c) CAAC (B. Kilp): There was a lively discussion of the Health Communication Concentration in the Communication major.
  - d) FAC (D. Hantzis): We meet again in January.
  - e) FEBC (J. Conant): We meet tomorrow.
  - f) GC: No report.
  - g) SAC (R. Guell): SAC sent forward comments on the Advising Task Force from a year and a half ago.
  - h) URC: Will meet again in spring.
- 9) Adjournment: 5:26 p.m.