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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2018-2019

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 11, 2018

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Approved

Members Present: C. Ball, M. Chambers, M. Cohen, K. Games, B. Guell, T. Hawkins, R. Peters, S. Phillips

Members Absent: L. Brown

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: President D. Curtis

Guests: Katie Butwin

1. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of September 4, 2018 (File #1)
   1. Motion to approve as amended (M. Chambers/R. Peters); Vote 7-0-0
2. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Curtis
      1. No report (absent).
   2. Provost M. Licari
      1. The search committee for the Vice President for University Advancement met Friday morning to process the feedback and candidate performances. Our findings were summarized in a memo sent to the president on Friday afternoon. The search committee assumes a successful offer will be extended soon. Our work is over; it is in the president’s hands now.
      2. Thursday, we will be in Bloomington with the Higher Education Commission for the opening round of presentations by the presidents. President Curtis will be giving our presentation that includes asking for capital funds for the Dreiser Hall renovations. It is the early stages.
      3. Kudos to everybody in the Library for holding a successful Library Extravaganza last Thursday. It was busy and loud which I think was a good sign.
3. Chair Report: T. Hawkins
   1. Let me provide an update on issues that have emerged over the past week:
   2. New concerns have been raised about the FAD. We discussed the issue yesterday morning at the Officers/Provost meeting. It seemed to us that the best overall solution for now would be to invite Susan Powers to attend the next informal Exec (9-25), where we could discuss it in a more relaxed setting. She has agreed to do so. Until then, we are going to prioritize one specific concern regarding rejoinders and see if solutions present themselves. Stay tuned.
   3. BR: I asked the provost yesterday to remind deans to confirm with chairs that departments need to begin the process that will align their BR materials with the changes made at the university level by Senate last spring. These discussions will parallel the work that FAC is doing. FAC will confirm in October that the departmental alignments have occurred. FAC will also provide guidelines for departments as they move into Phase Two of this operation: creation of a merit-pay process.
   4. Working Day definition: the issue was raised last week here at Exec. The officers and provost discussed this yesterday. Speaking for myself, I am satisfied that the definition of Working Day as stated in Handbook section 246.14.4.1.1, which covers the Bylaws, provides sufficient flexibility for now:
      1. For the purposes of these Bylaws, working days are defined as Mondays to Fridays when classes are in session on campus except during the summer sessions. Exceptions to this guideline may be made only in special circumstances as determined by the Executive Committee.

There may be reason to tweak this language. At the moment, I am not aware of any specific reason to do so and will not ask FAC to consider it. Absent a compelling case, I believe that we risk doing more harm than good if we decide to be more precise with the language. Otherwise, we will find ourselves once again grappling with some thorny issues, e.g. official starting dates. Should any specific situation (special circumstances) require more flexibility than exists here, the Handbook language allows Exec to make necessary adjustments.

1. Last week I made a brief mention of the need to sign up for the annual Health screenings. Let me add this week, operating under the presumption that the screening process will remain a part of our lives for the near future, that in at least two areas the process can and should be improved. First, the times are too restrictive for those (usually family members) who cannot come to campus in the mornings. Second, it should be clearer to faculty and their families that a valid alternative to the screening is a signed form (which you can request from Candy Barton) from their doctor.
2. B. Guell: Regarding 246.14.4.1.1, does that apply to the entire Handbook?
   * 1. T. Hawkins: It is in the bylaws.
     2. B. Guell: So it is in 246.14, but not anything else. Where it needs to apply is student grievance and 305.
     3. T. Hawkins: I agree. This is where we stand now.There may be reason to move or adjust the definition.
     4. B. Guell: I am over the moon about applying it to the entire Handbook, I am stunned that Katie [Butwin] agrees.
     5. T. Hawkins: I did not talk to Katie Butwin. I am speaking for myself. I talked to the provost in our meeting yesterday, and that kind of language seems reasonable to me. In terms of “working day,” there are dangers about being more precise. This takes us to a place where faculty do not want to go. I wanted to respond to your comment from last Tuesday, which was important enough to give attention to. This is my response and where I find myself right now. We will be going forward with a better understanding of what we want to do.
     6. B. Guell: If this is the starting point about extending to other areas that is perfect. If there is going to be an understanding between the officers and admin until it is settled, that is good too. I am surprised.
     7. M. Licari: It is a matter of using the existing definition in terms of resolving grievances.
     8. B. Guell: For personnel and grievance exceptions, I am comfortable with the definition. Going down that road do not charge FAC. We can tweak it out so the president or provost can create a definition, this covers it for now.
3. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. BG: With regard to FAC’s understanding of the BR related charge, FAC is planning to recommend a university wide, bare bones policy for merit pay, specifically akin to the relationship between allocation and merit.
      1. M. Licari: I like that approach, if you do not mind, the deans have talked about a statement as well.
      2. B. Guell: FAC’s intention is to make it to the October senate meeting. This will not be in the Handbook, but attached to the BR process. It will not preclude behavior that is genuine. Departments can decide on their own method. They could do groups, or a star/points system, but it is to ban disingenuous behavior.
      3. T. Hawkins: It is my understanding that the point of revision was to devolve to departments; I do not want FAC to do anything contrary to the spirit.
      4. B. Guell: This will be nothing other than that kind of statement.
      5. M. Licari: With guidance from admin and faculty governance.
      6. B. Guell: Was it the intention of last year’s Senate or admin to allocate per capita amounts to departments or percent of salary? In the old method it was $1,500 to who ever got it, which is per capita-ish. What you will be doing with that?
      7. M. Licari: I have not given it thought.
      8. B. Guell: There are a few issues with FAD that Tim mentioned and I would like to expand upon:
         1. Issue #1: The report is locked once a faculty member produces it. In an order that Susan [Powers] created. It does not follow individual department stipulations in order or format. This is one of the issues where the tech is dictating a policy. I believe Susan made an effort to affect the process as little as possible, but it is affecting departments that have a presentation order. Also, including advising creates a fourth category of activity even though we have said it is not a fourth category…I have a concern in that regard that the report is locked.
         2. Issue #2: In regard to letters of rejoinder, the handbook language has those going forward in a package and basically says that once a faculty member writes a letter for a level it gets matched with the underlying documents and moves to the next level. Those mentioned in the letter do not get to see it unless they are on the personnel committee again next year. It was written the way it was in response to the bad behavior of a chairperson who is no longer here who filed a rejoinder to a rejoinder and was vindictive. The current technology will allow letters to be opened up contemporaneously by those against whom they have been filed. Under current software it will be able to be viewed and read by those being criticized. This is an example of technology creating policy and practice change.
         3. Issue #3: It is potentially possible that a faculty member’s committee will learn of his or her outcome before the faculty member does, and will see what the next levels do as part of this process. This has never been the case. The people to find out first have always been the candidates themselves.
         4. Issue #4: The practice of the university when reconciliation happens in the provost’s office has been that lower levels of recommendations are not privy to what upper levels have said. This has been a purposeful blind spot for those representing department committees. At the provost’s reconciliation meeting they are asked to comment and reiterate the argument for their recommendation, not to debate rejoinders. My overarching concern is that the technology has generated four changes to policy and practice.
      9. T. Hawkins: Now you have an idea of what the FAD concerns are, sooner rather than later. The rest we will be talking about together. Understanding them all will make it easier to participate in the discussion.
   2. K. Games: [Handbook sections 305.4 and 305.16.1.1 were read aloud for context]. A question that has come up at the college level in HHS is, can we utilize pre-tenure faculty to evaluate P & T promotions or was that only for instructors and senior instructors?
      1. B. Guell: It was added to allow senior instructors to evaluate instructors, assistant professors to evaluate senior instructors, and so on. There is an interpretation and a footnote on one of those. It was settled in that footnote.
      2. M. Licari: Yes, we are all in agreement.
   3. B. Guell: I wanted to correct myself from last week; the Textbook Advisory Committee has met. Susan Powers just sent an email on that subject. They are meeting under handbook language passed by us, but not the BoT.
      1. K. Butwin: It was passed by the BoT, but fell out of the Handbook.
      2. B. Guell: So to clarify, it is meeting.
   4. M. Cohen: In regards to the enrollment status, when will the budget come out?
      1. M. Licari: It has been a topic of discussion, but no movement. With what Diane [McKee] has evaluated we will have sufficient reserves to operate without cuts, so this fiscal year we are okay. We will start having to prep for the fiscal year 2020 budget. As we build in the fact that enrollment fell we will have to budget accordingly. Those conversations will be starting this fall as we prepare for the next fiscal year. That is the timeline for getting through the next 18 months.
4. CAAC replacement appointment
   1. Motion to approve appointing Dan Clark to CAAC (K. Games/M. Chambers); Vote 8-0-0
   2. T. Hawkins: It appears that it is getting harder to keep committees at full strength; we are losing more faculty members early on in the year. At a minimum, the best practice for this upcoming spring is to have more people in the alternate pool when we approve the slate. Two per committee is simply not enough. Scheduling is becoming a real challenge. If you only have two alternates where CAAC and AAC are right now then you are not at full strength.
      1. M. Cohen: Could there be more of an effort to place instructors and senior instructors on committees next year?
      2. T. Hawkins: This issue was raised at a Senate meeting in the spring. We slate in response to the survey. There is more than one area we tend to not see interest. If faculty show interest they are more likely to be placed on a committee. We can only encourage and tell them to express interest.
      3. M. Cohen: When having to recruit we should consider this as well.
   3. B. Guell: In regards to elections that were not elections, there was low voter turnout and low volunteer level in colleges where there were no contests for senate seats. I think it would be valuable to disassociate the volunteer request from the election. In addition, assistant professors receive their recommendations for promotion from the provost at the same time as elections. Pushing the request for volunteers into April might help those assistants moving to associate looking to boost their service record.
      1. T. Hawkins: That is not a bad idea.
      2. B. Guell: It usually goes Senate election, meeting of elected senators, officer elections, executive committee elections, and finally the new/old officers create the slate. Could we push back the survey to perhaps the 10th of April?
      3. M. Brown: I just wanted to remind everyone that according to the Handbook, the election process timeline corresponds with Spring Break, but this upcoming semester Spring Break is two weeks later than it usually is (to line up with VCSC). We may have to do something about that.
      4. B. Guell: Yes, we should look at that and maybe consider making the deadline something such as March 15 instead of corresponding to Spring Break, especially if we are going to keep scheduling it with VCSC.
      5. T. Hawkins: I will talk to Virgil [Sheets].
5. TFA Review & Recommendation (Files 2 & 3)
   1. Motion to recommend both nominees (K. Games/C. Ball); Vote 8-0-0
   2. T. Hawkins: After mentioning how we only had one nomination last week, the next day I received another so we do now have two people. Because we sent the survey out on Thursday morning, it closes tonight after our meeting. According to the Handbook, we are supposed to look at results first, but I do not think it is a problem to look at these statements of intent and discuss them with the survey results pending. Hopefully, I can give Provost Licari a name by tomorrow or Thursday and the position can be filled by Monday. Also, I am happy to suggest that we recommend both and let him choose.
      1. M. Licari: That is not unusual. Sometimes we have just one name forwarded for an appointment. It is all good.
6. Standing Committee Liaison Reports:
   1. AAC
      1. M. Cohen: Met Friday, September 7. Membership of the committee is in the process of being finalized. Two members were not able to make the scheduled monthly meetings. Subsequently the two members submitted their resignation and alternates have been contacted about joining the committee.
      2. The staffing report was discussed and various resources have been contacted about supplying information to start preparing the report.
      3. The past Administrative Liaison to the committee has been contacted about attending the committee meetings. There is an inquiry going out to Lisa [Spence] about where things are with that. It was helpful last year because you could get real time information from the admin which helped dial in discussion.
   2. AEC
      1. R. Peters: Met and selected officers: Chair-Whitney Boling, Vice Chair-Emily Cannon, and Secretary-Nancy Nichols-Pethick. Scheduled a meeting in early November when apps are due.
   3. CAAC
      1. L. Brown: No report (absent).
   4. FAC
      1. B. Guell: FAC is working on assembling pools for grievances and the various awards committees, etc. Those will come out of the next meeting. Will also take up specific language on the creation of an ombudsperson, along the lines of models used at other institutions. It will separate out the advisor from mediator/adv. It will put the advisor function in play here. Following that, they will be looking to establish the position and selection process for the Handbook, but not overly describe, type, or amount for doing it other than it be a faculty member. They will use experience for the guide for compensation. Perhaps a quarter or half, of hourly stipend to compensate the advisor. Several universities like us have this and that is the path that FAC is following. The next meeting will take a stab at simple paragraph for the BR merit pay discussion.
   5. FEBC
      1. K. Games: Convening on Thursday, September 13 at 3pm in Holmstedt 280.
   6. GC
      1. C. Ball: Met last Wednesday, and plan to meet every other Wednesday at noon. Elected officers: Chair-Liz O’Laughlin, Vice Chair-Bridget Roberts Pittman (they will switch in the spring), and Secretary-Mehran Shahhosseini. They are working on putting together a subcommittee list. One question was the GC charge to review program review; are they to look at the procedures and make recommends on whether they are working. What is the intent of program review as they go about that task? Should GC provide formative feedback or evaluative?
         1. B. Guell: There was a department that did not do grad review 3 years ago and the grad school threatened shutting it down. Without that hammer I do not know that programs will do a conscious job if they are in that group that does not have a professional accreditation body that holds them to a standard. GC should not loosen up.
         2. K. Games: From my experience serving on GC, one of the challenges was if there was a program that had one or two students and it comes up for review how is the material unusable without being personally identifiable.
         3. B. Guell: If there is only one student then it should not be a program.
         4. K. Games: What is the process?
         5. B. Guell: If reporting affects privacy, maybe you should not have students.
         6. K. Games: The process was followed, and the program indicated they wanted to recruit. In those situations it is serious, only to have one student that has to trigger frank conversations about what is going on. First is can this be reversed, if yes, than is there a concrete plan that we agree to. If not we need to have conversations about how to shut it down or redo.
         7. T. Hawkins: These reviews are best if they have some teeth.
         8. M. Licari: Yes, or no they have no meaning. External accreditors are heavy handed and there are real consequences.
         9. C. Ball: It sounds like GC’s roll is make sure the programs do a review and make sure conversations happen.
         10. M. Licari: It is a backstop, a type of credibility. If a program is fine and doing well with sufficient enrollment then it is useful feedback to continue to improve. There has to be closing of the loop. Assessment, feedback, doing something with it. It gives some oversight after the review and asks to the program have you done anything?
   7. SAC
      1. M. Chambers: Met last week, officers: Chair-Missy Malone, Vice Chair-Steve Stofferahn, Secretary-Steve Hardin, and SGA rep-Kim Bodey. FAC scholarship subcommittee chair is John Liu. John also had a question about students being able to use financial aid for the summer and why that is not allowed. I told him I could bring it up here.
         1. M. Licari: For many students it is a non-starter. As much as we realize students engage in year round activity towards degrees the federal system has not caught up. Pell has managed to leak into the summer, but it is not enough to sustain summer tuition coverage. No, but because federal rules do not allow for it.
         2. M. Cohen: Will we be going back to 3 for 2 (for summer credits/pricing)?
         3. M. Licari: No, the new decision is ongoing.
         4. B. Guell: That was a money-losing endeavor. Not enough students were taking the third class to make a difference.
         5. M. Licari: With the new route, demand did not go down, but revenue went up.
   8. URC
      1. S. Phillips: No report.
7. Adjournment at 4:32pm.