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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

April 4, 2017

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Approved Minutes

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

Members Absent: B. Kilp

Ex-Officio Present: None

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

Guests: L. Eberman

1. Administrative Reports
   1. President D. Bradley: absent
   2. Provost M. Licari: absent
2. Chair Report
   1. Let me begin with a comment about the New Senate. The election wrapped up on Friday, and you all received the list of new senators from Liz. More than a year ago we began actively to encourage wider participation on Senate from our faculty colleagues. By this metric, we have succeeded. The 2017-18 Senate is composed overwhelmingly of members in their first or second year of service. I am now officially an old-timer. This will create a bit of a different dynamic next year, and the new leadership will have to adjust accordingly. On that related note, officer elections and EC nominations will take place on Thursday. Voting for Exec will conclude on 14 April.
   2. The Biennial Review training was unveiled to general applause this week. A reminder that on 13 April we will hold an unofficial Senate meeting devoted to further discussion of Section 305. Senate meets on 20 April, at which time I hope we can vote on the proposal. The Faculty Awards Banquet follows later that evening.
   3. Today we take up a FAC proposal for Section 305.7.6.1. And, we will then continue our discussion of the latest 305 draft.
3. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of March 21, 2017
   1. Motion to approve (L. Phillips, S. Lamb). Vote: 7-0-1.
4. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. R. Guell: This is something that may need attention next year: If you have faculty with a 12-month appointment, what is their summer teaching obligation? This is important in CHHS. The expectation is if you are a program director, you teach one. If you aren’t, what can be given to them without additional compensation – should they teach 6 or 9 hours?
      1. C. MacDonald: It depends on what else they are expected to do during the summer.
      2. R. Guell: There is a summer component to our graduate program that is required and inescapable, so when the program was established, the faculty got 12-month contracts.
      3. L. Eberman: This is pervasive in my department, and our practice is to look at teaching 30 credits across the year. So in a program with a heavy summer component, they might teach a majority in the summer and then have a lighter teaching load in the fall and spring.
      4. R. Guell: At some point there needs to be Handbook language that is parallel and unambiguous.
      5. L. Eberman: This probably isn’t affecting all the colleges. We should make that determination before creating new Handbook language.
   2. D. Hantzis: I see that the Strategic Plan Committees will report in April. The website has not been updated since January. Some of the initiatives do not have committees listed. The Goal Committees don’t have members. We should all know who is chairing the initiatives and who is chairing the subcommittees. If anything should be transparent, it is the strategic plan, those involved, and the budget flow.
   3. D. Hantzis: I am concerned about the letters that recently went out to Full-Time Lecturers. The letter is short and rude. It tells them that we have a policy that they cannot be hired as a Full-Time Lecturer again, then it says they are wonderful, and then it says that they may be eligible to be hired as a Part-Time Lecturer. The letter basically says they are fired. I am concerned that we do not have such a policy and we know there will be some Full-Time Lecturer positions available, but we don’t know who they will be or where they are.
      1. S. Lamb: My goodness, staffing is getting difficult.
      2. D. Hantzis: Even though there are only 27 Full-Time Lecturers, they are real people.
      3. S. Lamb: I wish some decisions would be made.
      4. J. Conant: This is the problem when faculty leave and don’t get replaced and you cobble together a position.
      5. D. Hantzis: D. Bradley also said that they are only placeholder positions, but sometimes there are other needs.
5. FAC Items
   1. Motion to approve Section 305.7.6.1 modification approved by FAC (S. Lamb, L. Phillips). Vote: 4-4-0.
      1. Motion to approve modification of 305.7.6.1.1, adding to the end: “for early consideration of promotion and tenure. The annual review process continues.” (R. Guell, C. MacDonald). Vote: 6-2-0.
      2. L. Eberman: This was one of our original charges. There had been discussions across campus about too many exceptions being considered. We reviewed the current language. The document that you see that was supported by FAC focused only on notification. My document uses the dean as a nominator, because I know of examples where there was a pre-tenure chairperson seeking an exception. My version has notification of the dean. The language is consistent with who initiates the process. FAC says they notify and my document recognizes the candidate’s exceptionality and notifies everyone, including Academic Affairs. It clarifies the notification.
      3. T. Hawkins: the FAC version takes away the chairperson nomination. What was the argument in favor of the FAC version?
      4. L. Eberman: There was concern about evaluation occurring before the process occurs. That was the concern with a nominator. My concern was if we didn’t have a nominator, there are a lot of people who might nominate themselves. I think notification from an administrator reduces that possibility.
      5. S. Lamb: I don’t believe it is a problem. The cases I’ve seen where the candidates inquire and seek the advice of their peers. I do not want to put this in the hands of the deans. I don’t want the process beginning at the top. It should come from the faculty.
      6. L. Phillips: I don’t care for the dean to be the person who nominates.
      7. C. MacDonald: I like some of the original wording that was changed by both parties. I do think it is helpful to notify Academic Affairs. I don’t like individuals determining that they are exceptional. If they are not, they are stopped, but it wastes a lot of people’s time.
      8. T. Hawkins: What is the purpose of having this option?
      9. D. Hantzis: It is a faculty recruiting and retention tool. This is a voluntary choice. Why shouldn’t a faculty member just decide and then consult with who they should?
      10. R. Guell: Another difference between FAC and L. Eberman’s documents is for a single individual to put up a stop sign. For example, if a faculty member wants to go up for early tenure and the chair says no, that’s the end of the story.
      11. L. Brown: It is the end of the story if any level of review says no.
      12. T. Hawkins: It became a concern in the fall that too many people were being approved for early tenure.
      13. D. Hantzis: Approval is a decision; the decision makers have the power to deny and they should do so if that is the appropriate decision based on the file.
      14. T. Hawkins: That is often the solution. Is that the solution here?
      15. D. Hantzis: Either we are doing a good job in hiring exceptional people, or our promotion and tenure guidelines should be reviewed.
   2. Discussion Item: Section 305

The Executive Committee read through the changes to 305 proposed from the Taskforce, FAC, the March Senate meeting, and communications from faculty to the Officers. Minor changes were suggested, some points were clarified, and redundant language was excised. In addition, T. Hawkins asked members with suggestions for additional changes in language to email them to C. MacDonald.

1. Standing Committee Liaison Reports:
   1. AAC (C. MacDonald): They met today.
   2. AEC (S. Lamb): No report.
   3. CAAC (B. Kilp): Absent.
   4. FAC (D. Hantzis): At the last meeting, S. Powers brought to FAC’s attention that in 2008, the Board of Trustees voted to give itself a non-approval role in P&T decisions. These have become an information-only item on the Board agenda. We need to remove that level from the Handbook. Also, Academic Affairs would like us to consider eliminating their role in the evaluation of Part-Time Lecturers, allowing the annual review to conclude with the respective dean.
   5. FEBC (J. Conant): They are considering a parking fee subsidy for Lecturers.
   6. GC (L. Phillips): They meet tomorrow.
   7. SAC (R. Guell): No report.
   8. URC (L. Brown): No report.
2. Adjournment 5:20 p.m.