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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

May 2, 2017

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Approved Minutes

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

Members Absent: None

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

Ex-Officio Absent: none

Guests: B. Bunnett, K. Butwin, D. Nichols, N. Nichols-Pethick

1. Administrative Reports
	1. President D. Bradley: arrived late
	2. Provost M. Licari
		1. We are about to make an offer on the HHS dean. We had four good candidates. We should close soon on the CAS dean and we have more candidates coming for the BCOE dean.
			1. R. Guell: Is commencement a hard deadline for bringing in a dean candidate?
			2. M. Licari: No, but it is nice to have faculty and students around when we interview. My preference is to complete these before commencement. Was there a concern behind that question?
			3. R. Guell: Given what happened with the BCOE dean search, I am concerned that the same kind of thing could happen, and I’m more concerned about an interview process that doesn’t consult faculty.
		2. J. Conant: What wisdom would you have for us about stopping the VP search?
			1. M. Licari: Some of that is probably best answered by D. Bradley. My take is it is practically impossible to recruit a VP candidate in the situation we are in currently with top leadership up in the air. Suspending the search was a smart thing to do.
			2. D. Bradley: The thought now is it should start sometime in the fall. J. Beacon is available all the way through June of next year if necessary.
2. Chair Report: T. Hawkins
	1. Considering our Agenda today, I will be concise. This is the last formal Executive Committee meeting of 2016-17. I want you all to know that I am immensely grateful for your hard work and support over the year. We have a lot to be proud of. I am honored to have held this particular position on this particular committee.

For the record and on behalf of this Exec, let me also note that the news of the president’s decision to resign has hit hard. I have long appreciated his embrace of shared governance and his willingness (and often enthusiasm) to engage with us on our turf, so to speak. I hope you will think fondly of us as you try to find something to do on Tuesday afternoons next year.

Obviously, we have a bit more to do today. I will ask that we address the minor change language right after the Open Discussion. I will ask that we address the Transition Committee after our approval of the Search Committee slate. As I mentioned last week, discussion of the Student Success Report will be deferred until next year. Finally, I will ask that we move into Executive session before we adjourn.

1. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of April 18, 2017
	1. Motion to approve (B. Kilp, S. Lamb). Vote: 7-0-2.
2. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. L. Phillips: I met with the Graduate Council and there is a Ph.D. in Technology Management that has a consortium set up, but they don’t have any governing documents for how that is supposed to work. I don’t know what, if anything, can be done. There are questions about what is the responsibility of institutions and faculty.
		1. D. Bradley: I believe they existed, but then someone retired.
		2. B. Kilp: Is there someone who manages articulation agreements in each college?
		3. D. Bradley: No. Some colleges do and the registrar keeps track of some things. It needs to be at the college or department level.
		4. S. Lamb: I know that the program went through the Faculty Senate. There was documentation at that time.
	2. C. MacDonald: I brought a spreadsheet. This is a history of some of the staffing in my department, in particular in regard to a Full-time Lecturer situation which is complicated, but in 14-15, we had a tenure-track opening because we had a faculty member resign. We hired someone who backed out after signing her contract. We cobbled together a FT Lecturer for that year. Then we requested an Instructor and we were denied and told we could have the FT Lecturer whom we still had. We put in a request to keep her as a FT Lecturer and it was denied and we were told to replace her with PT Lecturers. This is a TT position that is being asked to be covered with PT Lecturers. We are scrambling to find enough qualified people.
		1. T. Hawkins: This needs to be considered because this is a more universal issue, not particular to one department.
		2. C. MacDonald: We are losing some faculty due to workload. I do site visits for the American Psychological Association. I have never seen an accredited program where the workload is 4-4.
		3. D. Hantzis: I recently had a conversation with C. Olsen about staffing needs in the Department of Communication. I was surprised when he said that the window to discuss staffing losses was only over the past nine months. Our department is out of whack in the 70-15-15 ratio.
		4. D. Bradley: The reality is, if a person leaves, you have to justify that you need that person.
		5. S. Lamb: If we have faith in D. Bradley’s data, the statistics show that they are 4.7 FTE understaffed. Why are there not requests coming forward that will be filled?
		6. M. Licari: The three TT that just resigned, I was made aware of that. The Chair and Dean are advocating. We are working on how to fill the open lines in a way that makes sense for the Department, College, and University. I can’t make decisions at only the department level. We have to make decisions taking everything into account.
3. Changing 246.6
	1. Motion to approve resolution of the discordant issue in 246.13 (C. MacDonald, D. Hantzis). Vote: 9-0-0.
	2. K. Butwin: I’m sending this to you to see if it is a minor change. I am not saying it is.
	3. R. Guell: The Handbook currently refers to the wrong section because we numbered it wrong. It is 246.13. If the argument is that the substance changed last year and a reference to it didn’t change in a proper fashion, a discordance was created that was not intended. I think the minor changes also deal with discordant situations. The intent was to be able to clean things up that were never intended.
	4. D. Hantzis: This makes no change to the actual process.
4. Promoting a Positive Faculty Culture
	1. Motion to endorse (S. Lamb, D. Hantzis). Vote: 9-0-0.
	2. D. Hantzis: I want to thank you for the clarity and eloquence. I appreciate that you reminded us of the COACHE data. L. Eberman dealt with this when she was in FAC with me. We have difficulty finding a vehicle to bring these things out for faculty discussion. I appreciated your bringing back the Key Question Committee and what they did. You recommended some education. I like the fullness of the definition. I think it is worth doing. I think I would like to see that be included as a recommendation should be endorse the report.
	3. S. Lamb: I found the information about the bottom 30% of satisfaction in some areas disturbing.
	4. D. Bradley: It is not good, but perhaps not as bad as what you might think since only 60% answered the survey.
	5. S. Lamb: Was it the chair?
	6. B. Bunnett: Yes. It was brought up in the exit interviews and Key Question survey.
	7. S. Lamb: Another thing I found insightful and interesting was the need for mentoring of new faculty is something that might slip our minds, especially the older chairs. But it is voiced and expressed in the surveys that younger faculty feel a lack of mentoring or guidance.
	8. D. Hantzis: This was also found in the COACHE data and there were gender markings in that data.
	9. R. Guell: Although I started as interim chairperson at a high level of experience, I did feel the noticeable lack of intentional support for new chairs. I know S. Powers put on workshops for the new four or five of us, but it was mostly technical. The other things were more important.
	10. B. Bunnett: The original impetus came from the workshop last fall. I read his book and in the section on promoting department collegiality he says he did a survey and one of the findings was that 96% of the respondents who were chairs had never had any formal training to be a chair. 87% had never had the chairs responsibilities specifically described to them. That and mentoring are two things that I think stand out that we might want to address.
	11. D. Hantzis: I have sympathy, but I think we should not focus on building collegiality just in the departments. I encourage my colleagues to get out of the department and interact with other colleagues. I think there is mentoring and socialization to have them do this. I think some of the recommendations can help us think about the faculty member’s daily life.
	12. L. Phillips: I appreciate this a lot. Thank you, B. Bunnett and D. Nichols. I think a lot of the problem is that we have a dearth of tenure track faculty. I would like to see data on lack of collegiality and the components of the department that reflect that.
	13. D. Bradley: I appreciate you putting time into this as well. One of the suggestions that M. Licari and I are knocking around is we have to convince people to not tolerate bad behavior. The other piece is we have to make the job of chair more desirable. We really need to look at job descriptions of administrative assistants in the departments and upgrade those positions so those people can have responsibility and authority to do things the chair does now. I think that is a key component. We need to have more discussion on how do we get more people wanting to be chairs.
	14. J. Conant: I think that we should recognize that when D. Bradley came 9 years ago, we were a low wage paid university with a fairly high faculty-student ratio and D. Bradley has addressed that. We have flipped to a point where wages are good, but now we hear about teaching load and the number of students. We need to reassess that in terms of numbers and salaries.
	15. S. Lamb: I think the workload of chairs is becoming detrimental to the health of the institution. We don’t have the time to interact with the faculty like we used to. The paperwork load associated with being a chair is immense. Accreditation also falls to chairs.
5. AAC Items
	1. Presidential Search Committee
		1. Motion to endorse Slate #1 (R. Guell, B. Kilp). Vote: 3-6-0.
		2. Motion to reject Slate #2 (R. Guell, B. Kilp). Vote: 8-1-0.
		3. Motion to propose Exec Slate of C. MacDonald, L. Eberman, J. Conant, A. McLeod, C. Chao (R. Guell, B. Kilp). Vote: 7-1-1.
			1. Motion to amend: substitute S. Aldrich for J. Conant (L. Brown, L. Phillips). Vote: 3-5-1.
	2. Proposed changes to Section 350—Academic Department Chairpersons
		1. Motion to approve (L. Phillips, D. Hantzis).
		2. Motion to table (C. MacDonald, R. Guell). Vote: 8-0-0.
		3. D. Hantzis: In 3501.5.1 there is an issue with the President making the decision. In terms of an Acting Interim Chairpersons, departments are expected to make a succession plan.
	3. Proposed changes to Section 360
		1. Motion to approve (L. Phillips, D. Hantzis). Vote: 8-0-0.
	4. Staffing Report
		1. Motion to accept the report (L. Phillips, D. Hantzis). Vote: 8-0-0.
6. SAC Items
	1. Policy 405, FERPA
		1. Motion to endorse (D. Hantzis, C. MacDonald). Vote: 9-0-0.
		2. R. Guell: I hope we are doing this: under this policy, if a student finds themselves under suspension or expelled for a nonacademic reason, will that go on the transcript?
		3. K. Butwin: Not on this policy, but we would like to do this.
		4. R. Guell: It is not in the language of this policy, but we want to move in the direction of discussing that. But we are moving toward a goal of answering questions about suspensions or expulsions from institutions?
		5. K. Butwin: We are doing that now and we want to make it clear. So if an institution calls the student conduct office, they can respond.
		6. R. Guell: What I am concerned about is that we ask a question of another institution and they don’t answer or lie to us.
		7. K. Butwin: We will say what the policy violation was. Currently it says to call the General Counsel’s Office. The Office of Registration and Records is responsible for the disclosure of student information, except that pertaining to student conduct.
		8. D. Bradley: I think our policies are good enough for us to make decisions. What I don’t want is other institutions substituting our decisions for their decisions.
		9. R. Guell: Part of ORR’s process is to create an adjudicative process where the notation can be removed if a student comes back with proof that they didn’t do it. I don’t want to be in the hypocritical situation where we can’t answer questions that we are asking.
		10. D. Bradley: I would be more comfortable with sharing the disciplinary file with student permission.
		11. K. Butwin: Let me give context. This is a national trend. We want a more standardized process. Some states are requiring their public institutions to put it on transcripts. Our sister institutions, with the exception of USI are doing this.
		12. R. Guell: Student Judicial should be able to disclose to other institutions.
		13. K. Butwin: The actual number of suspensions and expulsions is pretty low: 25-30 per year.
		14. B. Kilp: I’m curious, with the relative ease of finding information on the web, if the record doesn’t say anything, yet there is a news release?
		15. K. Butwin: Is that someone coming or going? For someone transferring out, we don’t need to provide any information that we don’t know to be true. If someone is convicted to a sex offense outside of the institution, we wouldn’t confirm information that wasn’t generated here.
		16. R. Guell: So if they aren’t going to jail, but they aren’t coming back here.
		17. K. Butwin: I would rather provide no information than the wrong information. It has come up in a Title IX context.
		18. S. Lamb: Let’s say a student was expelled for selling drugs on campus.
		19. K. Butwin: It would be the director of student conduct there calling our director of student conduct here. We would give a date and a reason.
		20. L. Phillips: The student couldn’t come back and sue us?
		21. D. Bradley: In the past, it may have been suspect, but the Department of Education says we can do it now.
	2. Admission/Scholarship Standards
		1. N. Nichols-Pethick: There was lots of debate on whether floors should be raised. We were convinced as a group if that were to happen there would be a precipitous drop in enrollments. We looked at the laptop scholarship. We had some issues in terms of wanting to be assured that that was a good way of recognizing merit and there was some concern that it wasn’t relevant. Students may be coming in with their own devices, but we’re recommending that it continue to be looked at. We don’t use any kind of non-cognitive measures and while we don’t recommend that, we do think it is worthwhile to look at something like that where we can help students who can get more aid.
		2. D. Hantzis: Do you know the last time when SAC recommended a change? I continue to have some real concerns. That committee is made up of a whole bunch of ex officio members. I am very concerned. I think that is something we have to say, especially when we are linking together GPA and SAT scores. While I’m not entirely uncomfortable with non-cognitive, I’m not a fan of this.
		3. D. Bradley: I’ve looked at the GPA distribution of our students and trying to move that metric would be hard. If you look at performance relative to high school GPA, we give them support and then they survive or they don’t. I’m not sure there is a much better way to do this. It’s a tough problem. I think our suspension policy for first time freshmen is a replacement for tougher admission standards.
7. Committees
	1. Senate Standing Committees
		1. Motion to approve (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips). Vote: 7-0-1.
	2. University Committees
		1. Motion to approve (L. Phillips, C. MacDonald). Vote: 8-0-0.
	3. PTOC 2017-2018
		1. Motion to approve (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips). Vote: 7-0-1.
8. Executive Session
	1. Motion to enter executive session (C. MacDonald, L. Phillips) 8-0-0.
	2. Motion to exit executive session (B. Guell, D. Hantzis). 8-0-0.
9. Adjournment 5:53 p.m.