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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2017-2018

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

October 17, 2017

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: D. Cooper-Bolinskey

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

Ex-Officio Absent: None

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Bradley
      1. This a busy week. The Board of Trustees (BoT) will meet Thursday as well as Friday morning. There are a couple of construction projects on the agenda, including: the Sycamore Dining project and the Fine Arts building. Mike is there anything else?
         1. M. Licari: The BoT will also discuss the slight adjustment in the handbook language about populating the grievance pool.
      2. The BoT’s Friday morning seminars will focus on graduate, transfer, and international enrollment. The transition committee [for the new president] will be discussing its plans. The committee has been vague so far because a lot will depend on the background of the person chosen.
      3. I am going to Fort Wayne on Friday for the State Budget Committee meeting. We have had no indication that there are any yellow or red flags related to the Hulman Center project.
      4. We are coming up on Homecoming weekend, there are a lot of activities planned. It looks like we will have good weather, I hope you will all attend.
   2. Provost M. Licari
      1. I had a good meeting with the College of Technology’s Faculty Affairs Committee. They provided some good recommendations to pass along to the search committee.
      2. I also met with Grad Council on Friday and tried my best to answer their questions about the policy changes. I have since been in touch with April [Hay] from the registrar’s office about keeping Grad Council (GC) in the loop as we roll out some of the changes. We are slowing things down for now.
2. Chair Report: L. Brown
   1. I went to the FAD [Faculty Activities Database] conference last week in Milwaukee. Two things came out of the conference that I think may be helpful to us. FAD provides the ability to generate workflow reports. If we adopted this for the Biennial Review (BR) and annual reviews we could do away with paper forms. I also learned that there is a vendor that can generate student evaluations through Blackboard and that would work with FAD so that we would not have to save and upload them all separately. We could keep the university-wide questions we are currently using.
   2. I am a little disappointed that we only have two presidential candidates but, that being said, congratulations Mike! It is my understanding that we had three candidates and one withdrew.
   3. The Honors College was a big item for discussion last week. According to the bylaws, CAAC needs to examine any proposed changes in governance and structure. I talked with Greg Bierly, he has submitted some changes to CAAC. I also talked with Kevin Ward and Kevin Bolinskey [CAAC]. The Honors College proposal is on CAAC’s agenda this upcoming week.
3. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of October 10, 2017
   1. Motion to approve (T. Hawkins/B. Roberts-Pittman); Vote 7-0-1.
4. Exec Item—White Paper Revisit
   1. L. Brown: Last year Brian Bunnett and David Nichols put together a report on how we might foster a positive faculty culture at Indiana State University. It was accepted by the Senate.
      1. B. Bunnett: How can we move on this? I think that we have three options: parcel the report’s recommendations out to the standing committees, create an ad hoc committee to examine the recommendations, or parcel the report out to the standing committees but have them deputize interested parties to work on it. My concern is that, if the report is given to committees all carved up, it will lose something, none of the committees will see it as a whole. The Senate is expecting action.
      2. L. Brown: It was accepted but that does not mean that the report’s recommendations are actionable.
      3. T. Hawkins: Acceptance does not necessarily mean action.
      4. B. Bunnett: It is basically an exercise in futility if we do not do anything with it.
      5. L. Brown: I think we are doing some of these things right now. For example, a campus wide department chair meeting has already happened that addressed some of the concerns raised in the white paper and another meeting is being planned. Some of the concerns raised are being addressed at the department level, specifically as departments revise their Promotion and Tenure (PT) documents to align with the new 305 [University handbook] guidelines. Workload expectations and professional development will be addressed. The reports “#2” is already happening.
         1. M. Licari: In the conflict resolution component, “#1,” we can work on that as part of our ongoing department chair professional development initiatives. We can take case studies and wrestle with them to provide learning opportunities. But, with some of the others, I worry that we cannot force people to be nice to each other. The Handbook provides disincentives for acting badly but we cannot legislate “niceness,” that is pretty tough. We need to make sure people have the tools to resolve interpersonal conflict. People tend to get along well if they are a “good fit” with their colleagues, which can be code for hiring and promoting people who are just like they are. The next step, then, is a reduction in diversity, we do not want that, we do not want to diminishing diversity under the guise of niceness.
      6. B. Bunnett: In reference to the end of #3 and collegiality, some of the specific suggestions include asking for a statement on collegiality as part of a job application and as one of the interview questions we ask. We could ask jobs candidates about their inclinations and for concrete suggestions about collegiality. Doing so would help us get a better idea about their understanding of collegiality and might be of use to us.
         1. L. Brown: I would really want to see examples of those questions.
         2. B. Bunnett: I do not have them off the top of my head, but I can get them.
         3. S. Stofferahn: As far as a concrete step to facilitate collegiality, a different way to approach it would be to develop a list of best practices. Is there some way, for example, of developing best practices regarding workload equity? It is difficult to find obvious best practices but that would be a different approach toward fostering collegiality.
         4. M. Licari: That is a good idea. We could bring that to the department chair workshops/meetings.
         5. L. Brown: This would be helpful for chairs.
         6. D. Bradley: A lot of it comes down to going down a rabbit hole. Some people do not view themselves as a part of a team and that makes it difficult. Some of the people the AAUP has defended we would not want within a mile of here. It is hard to put boxes around it because we all misbehave. We are not talking about someone who flies off the handle once every five years but people who are constantly in the way of an organization meeting its goals. I sympathize with this, but you might have to take every case one at a time. It comes down to trust, if people do not trust the organization then you get bad behavior.
         7. L. Brown: People also have to feel safe in reporting bad behavior.
         8. D. Bradley: You have to have confidence that the college will take care of it. We need to constantly remind people that we have a process in place to resolve issues. Also remember that every year about a third of those on campus are new and they are unfamiliar with how things are done.
         9. L. Brown: Perhaps we need to look at those processes. Especially those that have not been address or applied for a long time. Do they indeed do what they need to do? This is something for Student Conduct and the EEO office.
      7. A. Kummerow: The report says something really concrete, that more than half the people surveyed thought they would benefit from mentorship. The mentorship idea has waxed and waned. We do not see it equally throughout the system.
         1. D. Bradley: Not everyone wants one or wants to be one.
         2. M. Licari: We have to have it available.
         3. D. Bradley: The ones that do want it are usually the ones that need it the least, like tutoring.
         4. B. Roberts-Pittman: How many faculty does ISU have now?
         5. M. Licari: 750.
         6. B. Bunnett: What is the status of mentoring?
         7. M. Licari: It is uneven. Some departments identify a senior faculty member to help new hires, some colleges provide help. We have the new faculty orientation, but many people may not be experiencing the kind of mentor relationship that they are looking for. This lack is felt at institutions all over the country. Mandated mentorship programs do not work. I am content with a looser structure, but with the expectation that departments have something available to new faculty members.
         8. A. Kummerow: Or they get it in some other form. This was the most important concern of those surveyed in the document. About 40% thought that the environment at ISU was great, the other half thought it was poor.
         9. M. Licari: Yeah, that is why a mandated approach would not work. Those numbers would just flip.
         10. S. Stofferahn: This offers another best practices opportunity. New faculty could sit down with a member of their department’s R/T committee a month before their portfolios are due.
         11. D. Bradley: There is not a lot of social interaction in higher education these days. It is hard for faculty members to get to know each other. We live isolated lives. Everyone is so busy I am not sure how to change that, but that is the kind of mentoring that everyone probably wants. We do not have a robust Faculty Club.
         12. L. Brown: That would address “#2,” environment. Brian [Bunnett] has tried to create social events that get “new and old” faculty socializing beyond work. That could be something we could look at, but not as a charge to a Standing Committee.
         13. B. Bunnett: I guess I do not agree with the tenor of some these remarks. Some like mentoring, some do not; some take advantage of it, some do not. We are just going, then, with the status quo. The conclusion is to keep with what we are doing now.
         14. M. Licari: That was not the conclusion. We need departments that are hiring to have some mentorship in place.
         15. B. Bunnett: Is there some way we could beef that up?
         16. D. Bradley: We could have an in-service for chairs about how to bring new faculty on board. I am not sure who would be in charge of that, the Faculty Center or Mike’s office [Academic Affairs], but that would be something tangible to work on. We do not have anyone whose primary job it is to provide this kind of in-service training.
         17. T. Hawkins: We have said that for years.
         18. L. Brown: Maybe we need someone in Academic Affairs that does this as part of their job. As a chair, it is hard to do half-day sessions but having an hour here or there throughout the year would be great.
         19. S. Stofferahn: This is particularly true for those departments that have not hired anyone in a while. Right now HR just gives you a packet, more needs to be done.
         20. D. Bradley: In some sense it is related to the whole search process. We need to look at transition for faculty just like for presidents.
         21. T. Hawkins: The Senate is not really the place to drive these initiatives, our structure is not designed to address this. It is better to push the deans and chairs to ensure good mentorship of new faculty. We should make sure Academic Affairs has someone in place to develop best practices and ensure that deans and chairs are aware of them so they go down the chain.
         22. D. Bradley: This is a good example of why we need to revise the chair’s job description. I just met with staff council, they do things very differently. Some chairs over utilize, other chairs underutilize their administrative assistants. Right now, chairs do not have time for this strategic thinking, they are drowning in minutia. We need to remedy that. We need to have the chairs tell faculty in their departments that they will have to be okay with the admins doing certain things, such as making the schedule, which some chairs refuse to let their admins do.
         23. L. Brown: This is not just the chairs’ fault. Chairs can take this on but there has to be a shift in training. How do we provide professional development for the admins?
         24. D. Bradley: That is the easy part. We decide what we want to have them do, what skills are required, and how we hire. We have HR help. We can also put together a committee of our best admins and some chairs to develop a skills-list and some of the training.
         25. L. Brown: I have over 30 faculty, and only one admin. A department of 7 faculty has the same number of admins. Upgrading admin’s pay or classification is also really difficult.
         26. D. Bradley: We need one senior person from HR to change job descriptions, adjust salaries. Under the new criteria, unfortunately, some would not qualify for their current positions, we would help bring them along.
         27. S. Stofferahn: If we really want to help the chairs, we should allow them 2-3 new hires/year [laughter].
         28. M. Licari: I want to make sure I have my marching orders. Academic Affairs will be looking at: 1. Conflict resolution; 2. Best practices for getting a new TT faculty member or instructor off to a good start; 3. Mentoring: ensuring at least something is available to new faculty; 4. Community building among colleagues (setting up informal gatherings for faculty); 5. Designating a person in Academic Affairs to ensure in-services are happening, to help departments welcome a new faculty member and get them started in their first year (Susan) and maybe linking mentoring to the search process; 6. Ensuring deans set expectations for chairs in terms of hiring, resolving conflict, etc.; 7. Organizing a task force on chair and admin assistant workload 8. Emphasizing that personal integration is at least as important as professional integration.
         29. D. Bradley: AA should make sure people understand personal integration is at least as important as professional integration. If a person and their family do not feel comfortable, then they will not be happy here.
5. Standing Committee Reports
   1. AAC
      1. T. Hawkins: AAC has not met.
   2. AEC
      1. A. Kummerow: AEC will meet in November to go over applications.
   3. CAAC
      1. M. Hutchins: The changes to the dance minor were approved this morning. A new version of Greg’s [Honors College] proposal is being reviewed and will be discussed next week. They were wondering if there was any news on Pearson.
         1. D. Bradley: No, they will be back in November. There will be no action until February at a minimum.
   4. FAC
      1. S. Stofferahn: FAC has not met.
   5. FEBC
      1. B. Bunnett: FEBC has not met.
   6. GC
      1. B. Roberts-Pittman: Provost Licari came to GC and made everyone feel much more comfortable. We will wait for more clarity on changes and will continue with the current policies.
         1. M. Licari: Good, I reached out to Liz [O’Laughlin]. We have more clarity now and will adhere to the policies as written. We are working on new procedures with April Hayes and will bring a proposal back to GC. That is what I meant earlier when I said we were slowing down with any changes.
      2. B. Roberts-Pittman: The only other item was Pearson. Ken Brachule has answered some of GC’s questions. But the committee wondered, what is Pearson going to do for us?
   7. SAC
      1. D. Cooper-Bolinskey [absent]: No report
   8. URC
      1. L. Phillips: URC will be meeting on October 23rd to go over proposals.
6. 15 Minute Open Discussion
   1. None
7. Adjournment at 4:21p.m.