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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2017-2018

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

April 2, 2018

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Approved

Members Present: L. Brown, B. Bunnett, T. Hawkins, M. Hutchins, A. Kummerow, L. Phillips, B. Roberts-Pittman, S. Stofferahn

Members Absent: None

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Curtis

Guests: Lindsey Eberman, Kelly Wilkerson, and Katie Butwin

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Curtis
		1. No report (absent).
	2. Provost M. Licari
		1. All of the CofT dean candidates have visited and the search committee has forwarded its suggestions. I have been in communication with the search consultant, have another call set up for later this week, and anticipate making an offer before the weekend. We had good candidates, I am very pleased.
		2. The graduate dean search is underway. This one will be an internal search, pretty compact, and hopefully complete before the end of semester.
		3. Finally, the vice provost (for Enrollment Management) ad has been out for almost a month. The pool is being built. We will have candidates here the last two weeks of April. The participation part of the search will be over before faculty and students leave for the summer.
2. Chair Report: L. Brown
	1. We will spend most of our time today talking about BR. The officers and provost had a good conversation about it at pre-exec. The task force wanted to hear the discussion here at Exec before putting it together.
3. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of March 20, 2018
	1. **Motion to approve (A. Kummerow/B. Roberts-Pittman); Vote: 8-0-0.**
4. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. B. Bunnett: At our last meeting I mentioned the April 5th get together with recent new faculty. RSVPs were to go to Morgan [Brown]. Morgan said about 40 people have responded. It looks like we will have a good turn-out. If you have not responded and can come I encourage you to do so. It will be good for new faculty to meet you, hear what the senate does, and how they might participate now or into the future.
	2. A. Kummerow: Senate elections are open until Friday?
		1. L. Brown: Yes.
	3. B. Bunnett: What is the Exec election process?
		1. L. Brown: On April 12th those serving on the 2018-2019 Senate will elect the three senate officers and nominate people for the six Exec seats. Virgil [Sheets] will send out a Qualtrics survey with the names of the nominees, the new senate members will vote for six. Virgil will report the results to me and Lindsey [Eberman].
			1. B. Bunnett: Can you clarify what is happening on the 12th?
			2. T. Hawkins: The Faculty Senate session on the 12th is for the newly elected senate and those who will be returning next year. If you are on next year you will need to attend.
			3. L. Brown: Yes, and on April 10th [on the 9th floor of HMSU] we are holding an orientation session for the newly elected senators. If anyone is thinking about running for an officer spot or for Exec, they can make their intentions known there, campaign a bit.
				1. M. Brown: Yes, and last week I contacted those running for Senate and informed them of these dates. I received word that only one person could not attend.
			4. B. Bunnett: I have a message that Tim [Hawkins] shared at the end of the 2016-2017 academic year. It mentions that after people are nominated, they will be allowed to speak, that photos and bios of the officer nominees will be posted on the website, and elections will occur through Qualtrics. So on the 12th the election for the officers will take place?
			5. L Brown: Yes.
				1. M. Brown: In DEDE III at 3:30pm. We are using one of our ‘special agenda’ sessions to hold these elections.
			6. B. Bunnett: And it will happen through Qualtrics?
			7. L. Brown: For the other six Exec positions, yes. They will be nominated on the 12th and the vote will happen later on Qualtrics. It will be sent to only the members of 2018-2019 Senate.
	4. B. Bunnett: Does anyone know, maybe Tim [Hawkins], what the competition was like this year?
		1. M. Brown: We had 18 nominees total. There was a contest only in CAS and HHS. The others had only enough nominees to fill the open spots.
		2. B. Brown: Is that normal?
		3. T. Hawkins: Yes, it sounds similar to last year.
		4. L. Brown: Last year, CAS and BCOE were competitive.
		5. T. Hawkins: With the CAS, some years there are more open seats, others less, but the overall number of people interested in running is consistent.
		6. B. Bunnett: This year and last year only one person ran in the CofT?
		7. L. Brown: Yes.
		8. M. Licari: Yes, they had no alternate so they were down a senator. That was their fault.
		9. T. Hawkins: This problem was addressed when we approved the constitutional changes for the selection process.
		10. L. Brown: If the college bylaws allow for it.
		11. M. Licari: I am not aware of any others.
		12. L. Brown: Also, the provost runs the officer elections.
			1. M. Licari: Yes, I will be there. It is on my calendar.
5. CAAC Items (see curriculog for all items): Kelly Wilkerson
	1. Medical Sales Certificate**; Motion to approve elimination (T. Hawkins/A. Kummerow); Vote: 8-0-0.**
		1. K. Wilkerson: This was a certificate that required business students to take science courses to better position themselves for medical sales. We found that it became an afterthought and did not increase students’ marketability. David Fleming took it to his board, board members said that medical salespeople need more analytical and math skills than science so we developed a new Financial Services Selling minor which will address these needs. We are going with minors instead of certificates. They are easier to place on students’ transcripts.
			1. A. Kummerow: Is there anyone in it?
			2. K. Wilkinson: I do not believe so, but if there is we will easily be able to transition them out.
6. Biennial Review Discussion
	1. L. Brown: Lindsey [Eberman] is here. If you have any concerns this gives you all the chance to bring them up before we write up the actual language. Do you want to explain [to Mike]?
		1. M. Licari: Yes, the task force met over a week ago and went back in forth a bit about structure and philosophy of merit pay. It was suggested that merit pay be tied to the university awards instead of the process we are using now, I had some concerns about that model. I prefer that decisions about merit pay be made at the department level, locally, rather than at the university level. That issue remained unresolved at the task force meeting. I took the conversation to my advisory council and then to the three Exec officers.
		2. M. Licari: While most are okay with removing merit pay from the BR process, there is a great deal of disagreement about both what to, then, do with it and about whether “exceeding” expectations should be a part of the BR at all.
		3. M. Licari: With regard to “exceeding,” I think it is pretty clear that we need to seriously consider the idea of stripping out the top end of the BR. We should use the BR to indicate whether or not a faculty member is “meeting expectations” in one, two, three or all of the areas. Then, we should develop merit pay that is mostly independent of the BR. This would probably address concerns within the BR process, and would allow for another run at creating more sensible/strategic structure for merit pay. It would allow a merit pay structure to be created without the baggage of long running discussions of BR. I was not here for the start of those conversations, but I understand they were thorough and that there are some issues we need to avoid. While the current structure is satisfactory, something needs to be done. I support that. I think merit pay should happen outside of BR, and we should use the BR to be an up or down scale and to offer remediation.
		4. L. Brown: And if you are “not meeting expectations” in one or more categories you will not eligible for the merit pay.
		5. M. Licari: Yes, that is an important link, and would be the only link between the two. If “not meeting” in one or more areas then you are not eligible for merit pay. I like that approach, the deans like it. It is something we can all live with. By developing BR and a merit pay system separately, we can pass something for the BR and take some time with how we want to redo merit pay.
		6. L. Brown: Each department could determine its own merit pay system. Each would get a certain amount of money to distribute based on a head count of regular faculty. That would ensure that pre-tenure faculty would be eligible. Individual departments would be responsible for developing their own merit pay systems, each department has a different mission.
		7. M. Licari: Yes, it is important to keep it at the department level. I am concerned about moving the awarding of merit pay to the university level. We would start to lose sight of the important differences across departments.
		8. L. Eberman: We need to make sure to include everyone [by rank] in the BR evaluation process if everyone will be eligible for merit pay. Some of the politics and culture surrounding BR might change if we encourage more people to be part of the process. If the two are separated, that would help the culture too.
		9. L. Brown: Would it be everyone or smaller representative groups? We would leave that up to the departments.
		10. M. Licari: Yeah, I do not know if we want to get into that right now. I am comfortable with the idea of separating the two and having merit pay decided at the department, level.
	2. T. Hawkins: It does seem to me that we are endorsing FAC’s document that strips out the top end. FAC voted on it, that seems to be the direction we are heading, we are assuming that it will be removed.
		1. L. Eberman: Out of the current FAC proposal, you would have to strike “exceeding” if you want it pass/fail. Doing so does not change the dynamic of what you are saying.
		2. L. Brown: If we left “exceeding” in, it becomes a gold start, not a pay raise. It could potentially be helpful somewhere down the road.
		3. A. Kummerow: Or hurtful.
		4. B. Roberts-Pittman: We spent a lot of time redoing our P&T documents to identify what it means to meet, exceed, not meet expectations.
		5. M. Hutchins: Would be have to change our P&T documents?
		6. L. Eberman: No, they are separate processes.
		7. M. Licari: We would be moving the bar.
		8. L. Brown: We would want to raise the floor on “meeting” in some cases. Maybe we can require departments to show FAC their guidelines. There are still too many departments that do not have them, any, guidelines.
		9. L. Eberman: A department could rely on the college’s guidelines but if you want merit pay to be local, the departments should all have guidelines.
		10. M. Licari: It would be lazy for departments not to have them, not to have them locally.
	3. B. Bunnett: With regard to politics, I have never noticed in the library that anyone getting “exceeding” with merit pay was resented by others.
		1. L. Brown: I have not either, but I have noticed it in other departments.
		2. L. Eberman: In the feedback from faculty, yes, the resentment is there. This is my third time reviewing BR. Most of the concerns stem from the 1/7 rule.
		3. B. Bunnett: If it were local, departments could decide to keep “exceeds.” Whoever achieves it would be able to get the merit pay increase.
		4. L. Brown: I guess they could do that, it would be up to the departments.
		5. B. Bunnett: In my experience, the mindset at the Library is ‘more power to them’ if they are exceeding expectations and getting merit pay.
		6. L. Eberman: I am glad that has been your experience, maybe you all can get everyone else on board.
		7. B. Bunnett: The point is if that “exceeds” no longer exists, will a department be able to use that?
		8. T. Hawkins: For the university it would not exist, but each department would have to identify who would get merit pay. By definition you are selecting and creating an “exceeds” category.
		9. L. Brown: So pulling exceeds out, is this something we want to do?
		10. L. Phillips: Just to be clear, these are separate processes that, technically, would not affect each other but to Bridget’s comment about some consistency between P&T and BR, it is worth thinking about.
		11. ML: We talked about this yesterday. At first we thought it was redundant, without being tied to merit pay, exceeds is reduced to a gold star. There still might be value, the recognition could translate to something tangible later. If a faculty member is up for a university level reward, multiple “exceeding” expectations could help. There are instances where I could see symbolic value becoming tangible.
		12. L. Eberman: Symbolic value is a way for the provost’s office to recognize as well. It might feel like a pat on the back, but people like to see their name in print.
		13. M. Licari: Everyone likes to be acknowledged for their work.
		14. T. Hawkins: The problem is are you asking too any other people to weigh in simply for a sticker. If you ask the college and your peers to evaluate for nothing other than a sticker, that is a lot of added work.
		15. L. Brown: The college review would only be triggered in the case of does “not meeting.” That would save some work.
		16. T. Hawkins: I do not know if this is the place to go into it further, more for the task force.
	4. L. Brown: Steve [Stofferahn], do you think eliminating “exceeding” would be acceptable to the chairs given their recent discussion of the elimination of the 4th category [administrative work]?
		1. S. Stofferahn: There is a rare chair that would expect to get merit pay. They do not want to be considered for it. The 4th category was a different issue, I do not really think they are linked.
		2. L. Brown: What is the value of 4th category? Chairs are reviewed as chairs every three years.
		3. T. Hawkins: Right.
		4. M. Licari: Yes, their chair duties are reviewed specifically.
		5. L. Brown: Chairs would be reviewed by the dean on the same things. The BR and chair review would overlap every other time so that they would be reviewed two out of every three years on the same things.
		6. S. Stofferahn: I brought it up to chair’s council last week. Let me read you my take away, what I wrote right after the meeting, Tina (Kruger-Newsham) read this and confirmed that this was the spirit of the conversation:

Following up on our earlier conversation in Exec, I initiated a discussion at today’s meeting of campus Chairs, asking for feedback on some of the proposed Biennial Review changes. First of all, there was much rejoicing at the idea of turning this into a “Triennial Review,” just as there was a very positive response to the notion of separating merit pay from the process. No surprises there. More substantively, the Chairs were unanimous in their dismay at the idea of removing the fourth category (“Administrative/Other Assignment”), as that has provided a key avenue by which Chairs may meaningfully document their unique activities—many of which do not readily fall under the normal parameters of the other three categories. Some discussion ensued as to whether, if the fourth category were indeed eliminated, it might then be more appropriate to have Chairs evaluated as a separate group, according to College, by a panel of faculty with administrative experience appointed by Senate Exec. That is a messy solution, however, so several people suggested that it would be much simpler just to retain the fourth category, at least for Chairs.

* + 1. M. Licari: Good point.
		2. T. Hawkins: I do not think it is at all. By making it pass/fail you are saying to chairs are you ‘meeting expectations’ as a faculty member who is also chair. Administrative duties are being evaluated every three years.
		3. S. Stofferahn: This came from the fear that BR, under bad circumstances, could be used to punish chairs for having spent their time on these difficult-to-include activities which make faculty members’ lives more productive. Something could be inserted such as “given fact that you serve as chair…”
		4. M. Licari: I see the concern but I do not think it has to rise up to a 4th category. We understand their scholarship might take longer.
		5. T. Hawkins: We already do that in other places. When we say ‘regular faculty’ we are talking about tenure, pre-tenure, instructors, and senior instructors, each with unique expectations. That kind of understanding is built into what we do already.
		6. S. Stofferahn: To what degree? There should be some language. Chairs need to be able to document how many hours out of the week they do administrative work. They still need to publish and teach, but on a different schedule. Something along those lines would help alleviate the concern.
		7. M. Licari: A lot of this is related to stress of the top category and what concerns chairs. They know they are “meeting”, but it is hard to show “exceeding.”
		8. L. Phillips: Is there a way to document the extra work in the 3 year review?
		9. M. Licari: Yes, that is exactly what it is for.
		10. S. Stofferahn: As part of our follow up conversation I listed odd duties that do not necessarily fall neatly into service such as dealing with complaints against faculty members from students, work that is hard to categorize.
		11. L. Phillips: Is there a way to put that kind of work in the 3 year review?
		12. L. Brown: Yes.
		13. S. Stofferahn: The basic concern that chairs show up to their office early in the morning and try to do research but cannot because of the administrative duties that pop up.
		14. L. Brown: Think about Dean Olsen, the extra work that the 4th category adds for the deans. In his case, not having to write letters for eighteen people every year or two out of three years about the same administrative duties.
		15. A. Kummerow: We already evaluate different categories differently, but not for chairs. Would it be just as easy to add what they should do?
		16. S. Stofferahn: As part of the BR document?
		17. T. Hawkins: We do not have definitions for the others.
		18. M. Licari: It is based on faculty responsibilities. If you are a chair your faculty responsibilities are reviewed every 2 years and your chair responsibilities every 3.
		19. B. Bunnett: Do we have to do it that way?
		20. M. Licari: Should the BR include chair responsibilities? That is really the question we are discussing.
		21. B. Bunnett: We should not have to have a 4th category if we agree to say that chairs are different. Do we have it spelled out for instructors?
		22. T. Hawkins: In our P&T documents.
		23. B. Bunnett: We should go with something written. We know what chairs do but it might be better if it was explicit.
		24. L. Eberman: With respect to Chairs’ Council and Steve’s perspective, if BR is a review of faculty duties how much you teach and how effective you are as a teacher should be evaluated. I do not think teaching, in particular, should be evaluated differently because you are a chair. I worry about putting a blanket statement in that chairs are different. If we allow for differences in faculty duties, we are not serving the university’s mission.
		25. B. Bunnett: There could just be a statement. “Consideration should be taken into account of chair’s duties.”
		26. S. Stofferahn: But our teaching duties might be pulled in different ways. For example, right now I am teaching one class. I am not going to cycle through all of the classes I used to teach.
		27. L. Eberman: I only teach doctoral students. The evaluation should be based on what your department’s guidelines.
		28. S. Stofferahn: This speaks to a larger conceptual point, the majority of a chair’s time is not spent on teaching. It is fine to examine the quality. Are you producing quality teaching and scholarship? To boil it all down, if you simply put a chair next to a full time regular faculty member, it is rare to find a chair who produces the same amount of scholarly material.
		29. L. Brown: Something can be added to the department’s criteria to acknowledge that.
		30. S. Stofferahn: Would we have to have the department language in place by September 20, 2018? No one wants to do that.
		31. L. Brown: Would it be much of a shift?
		32. T. Hawkins: All we are asking is to eliminate “exceeds” and to frame the role of the chair in such a way that the review of the chair, what chairs document, is shaped by the fact they are also serving as chair. Chairs will be graded through that lens. It should not be an issue if a chair does not have the same scholarly output as a faculty member because their chair duties are taken into account, they are reviewed through that lens.
		33. S. Stofferahn: Is there a catchall phrase? There is nothing in there now. One concern is people think chairs spend 5 hours per week being chair when it is really 35 hours. You are spending all this time and there is no way to record it. The 4th category was where that was recorded, if you take that away you need to have some vague language that alleviates some of this concern.
		34. B. Bunnett: It should not be just assumed or understood.
		35. T. Hawkins: Chairs could include all of their chair activities in the service category and then it would be clear why the range of scholarship is what it is. There is a place to list all those things. I do not think it should be an issue, but I am not a chair. The biggest problem is that chairs, in the past, believed that they were at a disadvantage in convincing their departments that they should be in “exceeding.” Then six years of resentment built up as they sought to emphasize their work with no way to exceed.  In a worst case scenario their teaching and scholarship might end up not meeting expectations.
		36. L. Brown: If that happens, then they should not be chair.
		37. S. Stofferahn: I want to try to convey that, among chairs, what was discussed among them was the exact opposite of what Tim just said. Chairs are not concerned about merit pay.
		38. L. Eberman: If they are not interested in the merit pay, why does it matter?
		39. S. Stofferhan: It is about where to document all of the work that they do.
		40. T. Hawkins: The point of the 4th category was to document all that work and funnel it into “exceeds.” That was the rationale.
		41. S. Stofferahn: That is not how it played out and now, with the elimination of the 4th category, there is a desperate need for a place to put that information.
		42. L. Eberman: This does not just affect chairs. It can be for faculty fellows or program directors. They are paid more for what they do. It is hard to see how that should be rewarded again.
		43. B. Bunnet: How are they rewarded?
		44. L. Eberman: Through merit pay.
		45. B. Bunnett: But we heard chairs do not expect or want it.
		46. L. Eberman: If they do not want the money then why do they want a place to put the stuff? Do they fear that it would be a punitive measure? Is this concern just in CAS?
		47. L. Brown: No, it is across the institution. At least the meeting had chairs from all the colleges.
		48. S. Stofferahn: The task force could put in a vague phrase.
		49. L. Brown: Faculty reviewers have to put on different glasses all the time, they should understand that.
		50. B. Bunnett: If all of that was listed in one service obligation then the chair would come off looking good in that one category. In the other two he or she could come off not looking so good unless the extra chair duties are taken into account by reviewers.
		51. L. Brown: A lot of the work could be listed as service. I view most of my activities as service to my department. They may not be traditional service, not like serving on a committee, but the work is still service.
		52. S. Stofferahn: There is a long list of things. I think most of the work is outside of a regular faculty member’s orbit. If you dump it all into service, it also puts a reviewer in a weird position.
		53. L. Eberman: It will also go against your nine pages.
		54. S. Stofferahn: If the task force wanted to hear more from the chairs, I am sure they would be willing to share their thoughts.
		55. L. Brown: We can talk to them. We will figure out when we can do that.
	1. A. Kummerow: Can we get confirmation that the “if applicable” language applies to executive directors, where they exist?
		1. T. Hawkins: What you are looking at might not exist next week. It is purely hypothetical at this point.
		2. L. Eberman: For example, if a director is at the level of a department chair, we can change it to “if one exists” instead of “if applicable.”
		3. A. Kummerow: Yes, that would be good.
1. Standing Committee Reports
	1. AAC
		1. T. Hawkins: AAC meets on Thursday. The first item on the agenda is the Provost’s visit then Leah Reynolds will discuss the President’s Committee on Inclusive Excellence.
	2. AEC
		1. A. Kummerow: No report (charges completed).
	3. CAAC
		1. M. Hutchins: CAAC did not meet this week. It is now looking at enrollment numbers, one of its charges for the year. Exec should expect a few curriculum items next week.
	4. FAC
		1. S. Stofferahn: FAC met, but I was not able to attend.
			1. L. Eberman: We had an informal meeting so there are no minutes. We discussed some general issues related to department’s P&T guidelines and will send a report to Liz.
			2. L. Brown: Are any missing?
			3. L. Eberman: The COB approved theirs, but I have not received it yet. HHS has some issues. The college committee went back and reviewed the college guidelines, but that means FAC will most likely not be able to review them by the end of the year. If there was a charge do complete them in May at least two of the current FAC members would be around to do it.
			4. B. Bunnett: Did you receive the Library’s?
			5. L. Eberman: No, I emailed the Dean, I will check.
	5. FEBC
		1. B. Bunnett: FEBC met on Monday. They discussed PT faculty parking. The committee would like to pursue it further even though the parking committee did not change its decision. FEBC is thinking of ways accommodations might be made, perhaps through an appeal process based on need. Not all PT faculty have the same need, some are teaching one course and working full-time. FEBC will likely pursue this next year.
		2. B. Bunnett: They then reviewed charges for this year. One was to continue regular annual reports on salary and health insurance. They will be working with the new HR director to on that.
		3. B. Bunnett: Another was to work with AAC, FAC, and Institutional Research to produce annual reports about faculty salary. The committee requests Exec come up with some data points for the joint report with the goal that one report can come from the three of them each year. Coordination is lacking. I suspect you will not see anything but a staffing report from AAC.
		4. B. Bunnett: Another charge was to review salaries for gender equity. Debra Israel was charged with this, but is now on sabbatical.
		5. B. Bunnett: Retirement was the other thing we talked about. FEBC was given the charge to ensure everyone is aware of the retirement benefits. According to the survey, many are not. FEBC proposed that Diann McKee present information to colleges and/or departments on regular [yearly, every other, every three years] basis so faculty can better prepare for retirement.
	6. GC
		1. B. Roberts-Pittman: No report (was not able to attend).
	7. SAC
		1. A. Kummerow: SAC is meeting next week.
	8. URC
		1. L. Phillips: No report (charges completed).
2. Adjournment at 4:56pm.