**Interpretation of the Elements of the Handbook for Which Faculty Have Primary Authority**

**246.16 Interpretation** All questions regarding the Bylaws to the Faculty Constitution shall be directed to the Faculty Senate Chairperson. The Faculty Senate Chairperson shall immediately consult the other Senate officers and the Provost on all such questions of interpretation. Their agreed-upon interpretation shall be communicated to the person or body asking for it and shall be considered the only valid interpretation of these sections. If they fail to agree on an interpretation, they will present both the question and their respective interpretations to the University President who shall render the final interpretation.

**399.1 Interpretation** All questions regarding material in sections 300-399 of this Handbook shall be directed to the Faculty Senate Chairperson. The Faculty Senate Chairperson shall immediately consult the other Senate officers and the Provost on all such questions of interpretation. Their agreed-upon interpretation shall be communicated to the person or body asking for it and shall be considered the only valid interpretation of these sections. If they fail to agree on an interpretation, they will present both the question and their respective interpretations to the University President who shall render the final interpretation.

**245.10 Interpretation** All questions regarding the Constitution of the Faculty of Indiana State University shall be directed to the Faculty Senate Chairperson. The Faculty Senate Chairperson shall immediately consult the other Senate officers and the Provost on all such questions of interpretation. Their agreed-upon interpretation shall be communicated to the person or body asking for it and shall be considered the only valid interpretation of these sections. If they fail to agree on an interpretation, they will present both the question and their respective interpretations to the University President who shall render the final interpretation

Inquiries are noted in **bold red**. Official interpretations follow in **bold black**.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* Request for interpretation of **305.1.8 Peer Review Committees**

**May pre-tenure faculty and Instructors evaluate Assistant Professors in years 1-5?**

* **The officers and provost agree they may not.**
* Request for interpretation of **305.6.1.3** **Availability of Recommendations to the Faculty Member** and **305.6.1.4** **Right of Rebuttal**.

**With regards to 305.6.1.4, can faculty member rebut only once at the department level or may they rebut at each level of review (both the Department Faculty Affairs Committee level and the Department Chairperson level)?  The same questions applies at the College level (College FAC level and College Dean level).**

* **The officers and provost agree that a rebuttal or written response is appropriate at each or any of the “levels”.  The officers and the provost agree that the department counts as one level and the college counts as a second level.  In certain cases, i.e. for accreditation standards, a third level may exist. Practically, this means that a faculty member has the right to one written response at each level—in most cases, this would be a maximum of two (department and college); in certain cases this could mean three (plus the accreditation level).**
* Requ**est for interpretation of 305.11.2.2.2 Peer Review Committees**

**Are Instructors allowed to serve on Senior Instructor reviews?  It would seem that they can.  However, it is not specified clearly.   How do you read this language?**

* **The officers and provost agreed that instructors should not serve on a Senior Instructor review.**
* Request for interpretation of **305.11.2.7 Window for Promotion to Senior Instructor for Previous Lecturers/Instructors.**

**I want to be certain that Instructors eligible for promotion under the grandfather clause do not have to undergo both promotion and annual review.  I was asked by two of our instructors if they should submit both promotion and their actual year, in case the promotion decision is negative.  I believe they should submit only for promotion and that the decision can be promote and reappoint, do not promote and reappoint, or do not promote and do not reappoint for them as it can be for those seeking promotion in the ordinary year…  I believe the HB supports this (305.11.1.4, “The renewal of an instructor and the promotion of an instructor are separate decisions" and “An instructor denied promotion to senior instructor will remain eligible for a continued appointment as an instructor.” (305.11.2.2.1).** ​

* **The officers and the provost agree that instructors should not have to submit for both. The provost clarifies that the review is not “to reappoint” but rather to determine if the instructor is eligible to be reappointed.**
* Request for interpretation of **305.11.2.7 Window for Promotion to Senior Instructor for Previous Lecturers/Instructors.**

**Will the option to apply for Senior Instructor to include any previous time served as a full-time lecturer and/or instructor be available next year also?  It was my understanding that this was available for the 2016-2017 academic year only, but the language causes one to question as it states that the provision will be removed at the conclusion of the 2018 academic year.  This would be at the end of the 2017-2018 AY.**

**After this year has passed, must the individual be in the sixth continuous year of service as an instructor, or be in the sixth year of service as an instructor.  The University handbook does not use the word continuous.**

* **The officers and provost agree that for this academic year, Section 305.11.2.7, which creates a “Window” for promotion, will be in force. This language will disappear at the conclusion of the 2018 academic year. Next academic year, the relevant language will be 305.11.2.2, which allows instructors who have completed five or more years to apply. The officers and provost agree this service *does not* have to be consecutive, but it does have to be at the instructor rank.**
* Request for interpretation of **305.12.1.3 Peer Review Committees.**

**Should we assume that the one Instructor could be a Senior Instructor?**

* **The officers and provost agreed that an Instructor could be a Senior Instructor.**
* Request for interpretation of **310.1.14 Class Attendance and Reports (c.)**.

**I would like to request an official interpretation from Exec of this section of the handbook (310.1.14 c.) -- I attended a new chair training session where we were told that the University Handbook states that we cannot allow children in the classroom (for example, if you want to bring your own child to visit a class as professor, or if you want to allow a student to have their child visit one day as a guest). I have heard others interpret this as simply stating that it pertains to ISU students, and not allowing students to attend if they are not registered. I would like to request a clarification of this section.**

* **The officers and provost agree that the Handbook section 310.1.14 (c.) refers only to students who might seek to audit a course. The Handbook language prohibits such practice. Faculty have discretion in allowing guests, including children, into the classroom, assuming their presence does not disrupt the learning environment.**