

#5

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

December 8, 2016

3:30 p.m., DEDE III

Final Minutes

Members Present: L. Brown, S. Buchanan, B. Bunnett, M. Cohen, D. Cooper-Bolinsky, B. Corcoran, E. Gallatin, N. Goswami, R. Guell, J. Gustafson, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins, M. Howard-Hamilton, M. Hutchins, B. Kilp, J. Kinne, A. Kummerow, S. Lamb, K. Lee, C. MacDonald, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, N. Nichols-Pethick, L. Phillips, A. Solesky, F. Stewart, S. Stofferahn, H. Tapley, K. Yousif

Members Absent: K. Berlin, J. Conant, J. Kuhlman, A. Payne

Ex-Officio Present: None

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

Guests: L. Eberman, M. Herrington-Perry, S. Powers

1) Memorial Resolutions

- a) Read by T. Hawkins. Vote: 29-0-0.

The Faculty Senate has received notice of the passing of Mr. Paul Selge, Associate Professor of Physical Education at Indiana State University. Mr. Selge passed away on April 20, 2016. He attended Indiana State Teachers College on a county scholarship and earned a Bachelor of Science in Education degree in June 1943. At ISTC he competed in basketball, swimming, and won a Golden Gloves award in boxing. He was a three-time member of the Associated Press & United Press 1st Team, All State Small College Football Team.

In September of 1943 Paul reported for active duty at the U.S. Navy Midshipman School at Chicago, IL. He was commissioned as an Ensign and assigned aboard the USS Lamar, APA 47, as a landing craft commander. He deployed to the South Pacific and participated in five combat assault landings. In July 1946 he was released from Active Duty and joined the Navy Reserve in Terre Haute. In April 1951 he was recalled to Active Duty for service during the Korean War. After the war, he continued to serve and later commanded the Navy Reserve Training Center at Terre Haute. He retired at the rank of Commander in 1970.

In September of 1946, he returned to Indiana State Teachers College and was employed for the next 37 years as an Instructor of Physical Education. During this tenure, he coached alternately

football, track and swimming. Mr. Selge was a 1st Class inductee into the Indiana State University Athletic Hall of Fame in 1982.

The Faculty Senate acknowledges Mr. Selge's dedication to enriching the lives of many and bringing out the best in those whose lives he touched.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Mr. Selge's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to his students, his department, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

- 2) Administrative Reports:
 - a) President D. Bradley: No report.
 - b) Provost M. Licari: No report.
- 3) Support Staff Report: R. Torrence
 - a) No report.
- 4) SGA Report: A Velazquez
 - a) Please nominate students for the President's Medal. It is the highest award for a student who must be a junior or senior, who is good at academics, leadership, and community service.
- 5) Temporary Faculty Advocate: M. Muyumba
 - a) Some of my colleagues and I were talking about developing a teaching award for temporary faculty. We thought we should be represented with such an award because our entire job is teaching. So, if any of you would like to help me develop this, please let me know.
- 6) Chair Report: T. Hawkins
 - a) First, I would like to remind everyone of the reception scheduled with the Board of Trustees at 4:30 (9th Floor) HMSU on the 16th. We need a good turnout. This kind of opportunity for direct communication between Senate and the Board is new. We need to make sure it counts and continues.
 - b) Second, I am pleased to report that the New Senator Informal Meeting went well. I want to thank the senators who took the time to attend and participate. We used the entire 90 minutes that were set aside. Let me note a few of the suggestions made at the meeting:
 - They would like a formal budget presentation at Senate at least once a year.
 - They asked that Academic Affairs find ways to help faculty become more familiar with the Handbook.
 - They expressed interest in special-topic Senate meetings, in other words an opportunity for more deliberation.

We will try to move in these directions during the Spring. As a start, I can say now that I have arranged for D. McKee to provide a budget update in January.

- c) In other matters, the window for voting on the constitutional amendment closes tomorrow. I will let you know the results when they come in, but it does appear that we have met the minimum requirement of votes. Pending the outcome of the vote, Exec and I have decided to defer any possible action under the current Attendance policy until January.
 - d) I have been asked to clarify something that was said in response to K. Berlin's question about curriculum votes. To be clear, a negative vote at Senate stops a particular proposal. A department can revise and resubmit. Or not.
 - e) Regarding our Agenda today, we will act on the Assessment Council language, as amended by Exec. We also have two items from FAC that were endorsed by Exec on Tuesday. They appear here as discussion items, should we wish to begin that discussion now. If you feel you have had sufficient time to review the language and find it acceptable, we can move to endorse.
- 7) Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes of November 17, 2016
- a) Motion to approve as amended (L. Phillips, D. Malooley). Vote: 27-0-2.
- 8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
- a) S. Lamb: I would like to thank B. Bunnett for opening the process for the selection of officers and Executive Committee members. We have changed since the historic days of R. Clouse. He was a master in his domain, but tremendous games were played back then and I think it is way past time to open the nomination process up and the selection process up and try to make sure we have more than one candidate for positions and so on. I was just as guilty as anyone and I benefitted from his role. We have been criticized for many years because of our closed process.
 - b) L. Phillips: I want to thank T. Hawkins for the new senator meeting. I want to encourage you to have more of them.
 - c) L. Phillips: Many of us are concerned about the impending Trump Presidency and its impact on higher education and on our student population. I would like to encourage President Bradley and Provost Licari to advocate for ISU's more vulnerable students and take the bold step of making ISU a "Sanctuary Campus." Other colleges and universities are identifying themselves as such. They're making strong commitments, ahead of time, to students who may face deportation or restrictive measures designed to make it difficult for them complete degrees. ISU has long valued students who come to Terre Haute from other countries. There may come a time, and let's hope not, when we, the ISU community, have to engage in acts of civil disobedience to protect our students. I encourage ISU to pledge its support, publicly, to do so should it come to that. Some colleges and universities are taking their "Sanctuary Campuses" further by simultaneously reaffirming their commitments to members of student populations who are already facing increased incidents of harassment and discrimination as a result of the election, particularly students of color, gay, lesbian, and transgender students, Jewish students, Muslim students, and women. I encourage ISU to do the same. The stance the University President and Provost take on these issues provides direction and a framework

for the University community. Identifying ISU as a Sanctuary Campus will go a long way toward protecting our students in what has already and will likely continue to become an increasingly hostile environment.

- d) C. MacDonald: This is from one of my colleagues: I am troubled by the recent revelation that some graduate students who are assigned as GA's or TA's are not able to access and complete their course evaluations as students; their IOTA accounts only allow them to view the evaluations that have been completed for them as instructors. In conversation with my now-4th year doctoral students, I learned that some of them have been having this issue since Fall 2015, which means that a full year of my course evaluations have been affected without my knowledge or the opportunity to correct it. As a faculty member who teaches primarily graduate students on assistantship, I would guess that up to 90% of my students have been unable to complete evaluations. For faculty who teach graduate courses, this has an obvious potential to impact the evaluation of teaching effectiveness for biennial, reappointment, promotion, and tenure reviews. I would like to hear the university's plan for addressing this issue so that we are not left with paper workarounds after investing so much time and so many financial resources in an electronic system.
- e) D. Hantzis: During the last senate meeting a statement was made concerning the representative responsibility of senators. The statement, as recorded in the minutes we have now approved, observed that senators represent the faculty as a whole, regardless of the college from which they were elected and refers to the Handbook as the source of this observation.

At the time, I did not recall such language. Since the meeting, I re-read the Constitution and By-Laws. The relevant section 245.3 Article III: Structure of the University Faculty Senate appears to me to define senators as representatives of their colleges—the faculty of which nominate and elect them. The membership rules explicitly ensure that each college has at least one representative.

I believe other references and policies, including our attendance policy, affirm this relationship. As a body, the Senate represents the university faculty and our individual efforts are rightly informed and guided by our responsibility to the college body that elected us Senators.

I would like to ask the officers of the Executive Committee to ensure clarity as to the role of senators vis a vis representation during deliberations of matters before the Senate.

- f) S. Lamb: I'd like to strongly support L. Phillips' statement. I don't know if it can be moved to an action item, but I can recall way back when, when international students were swimming with me. As we got closer and closer to the election and their fears mounted, I assured them it wouldn't happen. And then it did. There is some risk, but I think we should do it.
- 9) University Assessment Council: M. Herrington-Perry
- a) Motion to approve recommended revisions to Handbook Section 270.10 (B. Kilp, A. Kummerow). Vote: 29-0-0.

10) Discussion Items (FAC): L. Eberman

- a) Motion to endorse recommendations for Senate nomination/election process (E. Gallatin, J. Gustafson). Vote: 29-0-0.
 - i) T. Hawkins: The reason I put it on the agenda as discussion rather than an action item was to make sure that we have sufficient time to review material before we vote on it. If there is a sense that we want to start discussion now and wait until January to vote, we can do that. If we want to entertain a motion to endorse, we can.
 - ii) L. Eberman: FAC worked off of B. Bunnett's document. We had a lengthy conversation about making the process more open without changing constitutional Handbook language. We wanted to create an environment where people could be visible, through the Senate at large or through the Qualtrics voting process. We also had a lengthy conversation about the last one, encouraging multiple nominations, but not to prohibit the process if only one person agreed to stand for election.
 - iii) A. Kummerow: I'm thrilled to see this. I just look at the FAC vote, and I'm curious what was the opposition to this?
 - iv) L. Eberman: We had two options on the table for "require" and "strongly encourage." In general, the consensus from FAC was to open up the process and make it available to all senators.
 - v) D. Malooley: Would this be an area where the senators at large are being elected, or for the Executive Committee?
 - vi) C. MacDonald: The first is for senators at large and the rest for officers and Exec.
 - vii) D. Malooley: My College is down a senator because we didn't have an alternate. We need to encourage colleges to elect alternates. Where would this go in the Handbook?
 - viii) C. MacDonald: I think this could go into the Overview of Faculty Government which is a less formal document than the Handbook.
 - ix) K. Yousif: Was there a discussion of the fixed time for Exec that precludes participation of anyone who is a caregiver?
 - x) J. Kinne: Were there any more radical or interesting ideas that we aren't seeing here?
 - xi) L. Eberman: I don't think so.
 - xii) T. Hawkins: We want to make sure that people who are voting for senators have all the information ahead of time and also in terms of the Executive Committee nominating process. There was a sense that it is too rushed and there was not an opportunity to consider other candidates. It was funneled in a way that eliminated alternatives. So this language was created to open the process.
 - xiii) J. Kinne: Can we make it more clear?
 - xiv) C. MacDonald: We are endorsing the content of this, not necessarily the exact wording, which can be made more clear.
 - xv) K. Yousif: At the other meeting there were more radical ideas. This is clearly moving in the right direction, but it is just a band aid.
 - xvi) T. Hawkins: Yes, but this was not the charge given to FAC. I offered as a point of fact at the other meeting that other universities have senates that meet more often and don't have an Executive Committee.
 - xvii) R. Guell: You have friends that work at Rose-Hulman where they have an all-faculty meeting twice a year. And it is weak. I would caution against anything that

- might weaken the faculty role. The voices at Exec may be insular and have too many of the same people year after year, but it is an extraordinarily powerful voice that has been heard from administration during my tenure here.
- xviii) S. Lamb: We have been cited as a model by AAUP as having a strong Handbook and Senate. I worried that we would rub the nose of the Board of Trustees in the Handbook and then they could get rid of it in 37 seconds or less. If we make this stronger, that is OK. But we have to be on guard that we don't make it weaker. We need to make sure that we are not a body who is always nodding its head. I think throughout the years we have been doing this. We should examine everything to see if it is a stronger body. A few years ago, we made recommendations like fire every third administrator, and we weren't taken seriously.
- xix) T. Hawkins: No one would argue that we have the perfect model. Last year concerns were raised. Now there are a significant number of new senators and charges were sent to FAC, not to blow it up, but to address these concerns. This year will give us an opportunity to see how this works.
- xx) D. Hantzis: B. Bunnett brought these up on the floor of the Senate and it went to FAC. I think S. Lamb's and K. Yousif's point are to make sure shared governance remains strong. We should think more deeply about what faculty authority and responsibilities are. I hope this inspires us to look at our colleges, to look at the governance documents there since what we do here should be reflected there.
- b) Recommendations for student evaluations
- i) L. Eberman: A subgroup of FAC and SAC discussed this. We met with S. Powers to discuss this and met with FAC and SAC groups to address key things like how can faculty improve response rates. There was a lengthy conversation about "institutional mean" and the fact that they are tool-specific. For example, if your department adds questions, that's one tool. So my "institutional mean" is not representative of the institution at large, but just among my department. The idea is that people need to know that you can't compare "institutional mean" across the campus. We also discussed that student evaluations are not the only criteria that should be used to evaluate teaching and we recommend a peer evaluation process to strengthen this.
- ii) T. Hawkins: So the language passed by Exec had small changes: "needed" to "encouraged to."
- iii) K. Yousif: You removed the final clause of part b.
- iv) D. Hantzis: I appreciate FAC's recognition of the role of student course evaluations, as one piece of what should be a robust set of data. I believe a request for some attention to recent and current research informing our understanding of the value of student evaluations of courses in order. Research documents that multiple biases concerning the identity of professors influence evaluations. This semester, a "last nail" article was published reporting results of an extensive examination of prior claims about value of student evaluations and their correlation with student success. As we make increasing financial, oversight, and time investments in soliciting and securing student evaluations of courses, I believe faculty should operate within a research-supported understanding of the appropriate and valid use of data gleaned from those assessments.
- v) B. Corcoran: I guess I'm a little troubled by the word "behooved" and I think that sounds fairly threatening. Are we heading down the road where faculty will be

- judged on their response rates? There are a lot of faculty who don't engage in coercion or bribery and there are faculty that refuse those sorts of practices for very legitimate reasons. I'm also concerned because I don't see any institutional responsibility. The entire endeavor is put on the faculty when the problem of response rates is one of the technology shifting. The university made the decision to leave SIRs regardless of the issues with that particular tool. We are left now with a technological fix which has just made things worse. I don't see it as entirely the faculty responsibility to fix a problem that wasn't created by the faculty.
- vi) L. Eberman: I think we are trying to create a document that creates some insight for faculty engagement.
 - vii) S. Powers: Before, with the SIRs, a whole bunch of students never responded because they never received them. Some faculty never passed them out. So, if you look at the total number of students, there are 55,000 student evaluations that go out and 60% are completed. Before, fewer than 50% of students were returning them. This is not to say another option cannot be adopted. We were being charged around \$21,000 for E-SIR.
 - viii) S. Powers: In terms of the problem of GAs not getting evaluations, we didn't know about it until a few days ago. We have fixed that problem.
 - ix) T. Hawkins: This will not be the last word on student evaluations. We wanted to give committees an opportunity to shine the light on the process.
 - x) S. Powers: President Bradley sends a reminder three times during the evaluation period. Since it comes from Iota, they get the emails from students and then send them back to us.
 - xi) D. Malooley: Could we have a Blackboard column that gets populated if students complete the evaluations? I don't want to look at a print out and add it to Blackboard.
 - xii) L. Eberman: The reason the language was removed was it was too much like coercion.
 - xiii) R. Guell: I think we need more discussion.
 - xiv) J. Gustafson: I think it might be more helpful to talk about what is being done with student evaluations. At best, it gives you some sense of student learning. At worst, they are terribly biased. I would rather see something a little more creative come out of this, peer evaluations for example, rather than looking at just this one element. I don't think we should encourage extra credit.
 - xv) L. Eberman: One thing that is important to remember is the task force on P&T. We want to make sure the evaluation of faculty is more inclusive and doesn't rely on just one thing. It is difficult to tackle all of that when the charge is to address student evaluations, not the broader issue of the evaluation of teaching.

11) Adjournment 4:25 p.m.