

#17

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2018-2019

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

February 12, 2019

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Approved

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

Ex-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari and President D. Curtis

Guests: Virgil Sheet, Susan Powers

1) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of February 5, 2019 (File #1)

a) Motion to approve (R. Peters/K. Games); **Vote 7-0-1**

2) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Curtis

i) We made rounds in the statehouse yesterday, there was supposed to be a decision made, but they are postponing that until next week. I try not to get too excited, but there were lots of positive comments from legislators. I keep saying “modest requests,” because we are being so much more modest than our peers.

ii) Thank you to Bob and Susan Guell for their commitment to bridge the gap scholarships and I hope everyone matches their challenge for Give to Blue.

b) Provost M. Licari

i) Founder’s Day was well attended even though it was a rescheduled event. I think we all need to say thank you to Bob and Susan Guell for their generosity and the challenge.

(1) B. Guell: If you go to the advancement website, you see will see the link for the day of giving. We have pledged \$15,000 to bridge the gap scholarships. There is a challenge specifically for faculty and staff; some of you will get a call from Andrea Angel, myself, or somebody else about donating. We want to raise money to show that faculty are serious about devoting ourselves to the ongoing success of our students.

(2) M. Licari: Yes, thank you. It is very important for the university. I have tossed around these numbers before, but we had around 2,500 students who did not return and almost half of them are not registered because of a financial hold on

their record. We can offer the best tutoring, advising, student life, faculty, etc., but if they cannot afford it none of it matters. This is an important initiative. We want to make sure we can live up to access, and that means access to the graduation stage. Some students are doing everything they can do academically and cannot afford to be here.

- ii) Last week on Friday, I met with the co-chairs of the higher learning sub-committees. They are on track to having evidence to demonstrate we have the criteria. Teaching, learning, and demonstrating improvements in student learning outcomes as well as assessing academic outcomes, particularly in FS, is where the work needs to be done. So there is a bit of work to do, but we know what that work is. We are moving in the right direction.
- iii) The board will be on campus Thursday and Friday. Thursday, there will be two seminar sessions. The first will focus on student success initiatives related to academic and financial aid. Linda Maule and Donna Simmons will be mostly in charge of that one. The second is again on student success, but from a student affairs perspective. Students need to have the ability to persist and be successful when dealing with food insecurity, student life, and mental health.
- iv) I confirmed recent handbook material passed through the senate would be forwarded to the BoT for a decision at their February meeting.

### 3) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) First, I would like to take this opportunity, one that I will repeat at Senate, to urge the deans to confirm that robust chairperson evaluation procedures are in place in the colleges. Our faculty need to be able to count on a regular review schedule—this is a Handbook requirement. When done correctly, this ensures chairperson accountability. It allows faculty to express concerns, as well as confidence, critical feedback that our chairpersons need in order to reinforce positive performance and correct mistakes.
- b) Second, I hope to be able to announce to Senate next week an updated email retention policy. The officers have asked the provost to direct Lisa Spence to prepare a draft in time for our meeting. Hopefully, I can give you advanced notice next Tuesday.
- c) Third, the deadline set by FAC for departments to complete merit-pay procedures is approaching. I have asked the provost to tell the deans to collect the approved documents. We can then establish who still needs more time. Hopefully, that number will be zero.
- d) Fourth, we have had a great deal of informal and formal discussions regarding Senate action items and the Board agenda. The Board meets on the 22<sup>nd</sup>. Early last week I forwarded to Katie the three items that I consider ready for a Board vote: 1. The constitutional language approved last month by the Senate and faculty; 2. The revised language for the Teacher Education Committee; and, 3. The TFA language. I do not expect any controversy here. I do expect that Senate will have much more for the Board

to approve at its next meeting. Hopefully, by then we can have a process in place that will allow for quick approval of noncontroversial items as well as immediate identification of anything that might require extra deliberation.

- e) After our open discussion we can turn to consideration of FACs revisions to the Deficient Performance language and then a check of the BR/FAD interface.

#### 4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) M. Chambers: This is related to multifactor authentication, there are rumors about new phones and that we will not have access to email after March 15. There is a rumor that the university will force us all to have an iPhone. Has there been any information anywhere? What is going to happen with the phones?
  - i) B. Guell: The university is slowly getting new office phones. There are a whole series of features that are enabled. You can talk through your computer through your webcam or use it the old fashioned way. Voicemail and missed calls will come to your email.
  - ii) M. Licari: That is true that it is happening, but that is completely independent from multifactor authentication.
  - iii) B. Guell: We live in a world of valuable, protected data, when we screw up it puts us and all of our students in some significant jeopardy. We not alone in using multifactor authentication. It remains an important thing we need to do. It really is nothing. If you use a university owned device you will have to do it once, or every time you change your password. Take it seriously and get it done.
  - iv) M. Licari: I have been set up since Christmas time. You do it once and you are in. I use lots of different tech platforms.
  - v) L. Brown: I am concerned because I teach in the Root Hall basement and there is no cell service. I do not use my laptop, but instead the university computer in the room. Is that going to be an issue? I will not get cell signal for my code.
  - vi) B. Guell: I would suggest we talk to Yancy [Phillips] and Lisa [Spence-Bunnett] about what is considered a trusted device. For example, if you are in the Vigo County library you will not be able to log on to Office 365 unless you have your phone.
  - vii) M. Chambers: I am being locked out of my laptop. They say to use ISU-SECURE, but I cannot connect to it. I am fine when I leave my office, and then ten minutes later I am locked out. There might be more of those kinds of issues.
- b) C. Ball: I have a series of questions about merit pay.
  - i) First, we need a clarification about timing. At the Senate meeting, it seemed like it was going to be attached to biennium—is it every two years or every year.
    - (1) M. Licari: The intention was change as little as possible of current practice other than to not have it tied to the outcomes of the BR.
    - (2) B. Guell: Except if you are not acceptable in the BR, you are not eligible.
    - (3) M. Licari: Yes, but there are no other timelines.

- (4) C. Ball: So it is every other year.
- (5) B. Guell: I imagine, we would do the BR regardless and then the administration would make the decision on if money were available at that time.
- (6) M. Licari: Yes, we would see if there is room in budget for it. There is some flow with the BR because passing it creates eligibility.
- (7) V. Sheets: FAC did not assume it would happen every year.
- ii) C. Ball: Is it acceptable to do in conjunction with the BR and, if money is not available, to hold funding until the next time it is?
  - (1) M. Licari: Yes, that seems reasonable. If that is how they want to start that is fine.
- iii) C. Ball: What is the likelihood on money?
  - (1) M. Licari: I am not going there.
  - (2) T. Hawkins: We do not want to give anyone a reason to not have guidelines in place.
  - (3) M. Licari: Focus on guidelines, the budget will be what it is.
- iv) C. Ball: Given the challenges, is there still no stopping the deadline of Feb 15?
  - (1) B. Guell: Deans and provost will be mad.
  - (2) M. Licari: We will be frustrated.
  - (3) B. Guell: If money were available, it would make your department ineligible if they do not have approved documents in place.
  - (4) M. Licari: Maybe Feb 15 was arbitrary, but faculty need to understand what expectations are so they can modify behavior if need be. You cannot wait too long.
  - (5) T. Hawkins: The original expectation was that departments would have until the end of 2018, but we extended the deadline.
  - (6) L. Brown: These guidelines that departments create are also not set in stone. You can modify them later.
  - (7) M. Licari: When you establish guidelines for the first time, it is unlikely that you get it perfect. I encourage all departments to try to get these procedures done as quickly as possible.
- v) C. Ball: Sticking with merit pay in general, merit pay does not seem to make faculty more productive. The effort does not equal the benefit, there are inherent inequities, differing productivity, unpredictability of funds and amount. Is there a possibility or benefit of reexamining our system to reward truly exemplary work?
  - (1) M. Licari: We really did have those conversations, the officers and I last year. We went around the table a lot and so did the Senate. We came down on the side that this merit process makes sense. Inequities in departments, I do not know about that, because there is an evaluation mechanism within each department. I would like to give the benefit of the doubt to departments that they would be able to identify merit-worthy work. That is why we started it at the department level.

- (2) L. Brown: Departments have different missions too; they can tailor this to their missions.
  - (3) M. Licari: I do not have those concerns. The current approach is reasonable.
  - (4) B. Guell: This is the latest in what will be many attempts. It iterates every two years and will continue to do so. We are coming up with new ways all the time. I have been at the center of conversations since 1997, when FEBC first drafted pay for performance, which no one liked, but then no one liked it when there were no raises. No one liked the BR, and everyone still hates it. In reality, it is not enough money to worry about. It can be a waste of our time, but the administration needs to be able to tell the legislature we have one and so we got into it.
  - (5) C. Ball: Merit pay is legislative?
  - (6) B. Guell: No, evaluations are.
  - (7) C. Ball: So then, why are we doing it?
  - (8) B. Guell: We can get rid of it.
  - (9) M. Licari: It is not perfect, but I like the idea to be able to differentiate from faculty who are doing a good job and those who are doing the bare minimum. It wears on the morale of highly productive faculty if they are not acknowledged in some way. I think that is important, I really do. It might not affect their morale in two or four years, but after ten or twelve it wears thin.
  - (10) T. Hawkins: It certainly is not on our agenda for the rest of the year. A review of process will take place next spring. If there is a critical mass of opponents, you will see the change. Arguments against merit pay are not weak, but I think those in favor are strong enough to keep it going in its current form for now. We will keep it going until we are at the point we decide it is not doing any good.
  - (11) B. Guell: If there is no money for an extended period, people will forget about it, but we do not want to live in that world.
- 5) FAC Item: 350 Revisions, V. Sheets (File #4)
- a) Motion to approve (M. Chambers/B. Guell); **Vote 9-0-0**
    - i) B. Guell: I move to add working days and de-italicize ordinarily, L. Brown seconded—**unanimous**.
  - b) V. Sheets: It is better this time, last time you all saw some sloppiness that you wanted cleaned up. We added specification of a 5-day period for chairpersons to notify a faculty member that they were going to do something formal. That was not in there before and it left it open. The written admonishment was tricky and there was a lot of conversation about if personnel committees need to be notified or not. We tried to craft this so that a chair has flexibility, as well as the faculty member. If you request it not to be shared because you are embarrassed, and promise not do it again, there is no reason to notify the personnel committee. We have that in there, but it can be overruled. It gives chairs some

discretion there. If a resolution was reached, the committee does not have to be notified. This makes it clear that stuff in the personnel file may be available during the BR, but does not have to be provided. Stuff does not have to get out when it should not.

- i) M. Chambers: So a chair should notify a faculty member within 5 working days or calendar days.
  - (1) B. Guell: In the underlined section, it should be “5 working days.”
  - (2) V. Sheets: Yes, we can change that for clarification.
- ii) B. Guell: Giving discretion hardens decisions if chairs were compelled to call a faculty member out. I am satisfied.
- iii) T. Hawkins: Should ordinarily be in italics, what are you trying to say there.
  - (1) V. Sheets: That was a track change that might not have been changed back.
  - (2) M. Licari: Yeah I thought there was some special emphasis.
  - (3) V. Sheets: No, I did not take that out. It should not be italicized.
- iv) K. Games: The chair has discretion, only if a faculty member initiates a request not to share, then the chair has to make that decision. If the faculty member does not request that then the chair shall provide it.
  - (1) T. Hawkins: Yes, and based on whether or not the behavior is ongoing.
  - (2) B. Guell: Chair is broadly described. It is based in something important to departments that screw-ups not happen.
  - (3) V. Sheets: That is what FAC wanted as a condition. If a chairperson thought this was likely to resolve the matter.
  - (4) B. Guell: The chairperson has a part in the decision.
  - (5) L. Brown: It is still reported to the dean.
  - (6) M. Licari: It can also still show up in files later.
- v) R. Peters: The phrase “not resolved” actually has meaning, it states that informal process has or has not concluded.
  - (1) B. Guell: The sentence intends to preclude chairpersons from aggregating grievances over time and encourage them to deal with them as they arise. What you are talking about is something that you deal with as soon as you find out. The faculty member says I am going to continue to do that or he/she is remorseful. It is done and at that point, if he/she repeats then the rest of the policy flows. We do not want department chairs writing notes to smack down on someone all at the same time. That is not the way that the process should work.
- vi) T. Hawkins: Those of you who have been department chairs, does this work?
  - (1) B. Guell: I have written letters and this is an improvement.
  - (2) M. Licari: Yes, it will resolve issues informally or more quickly.
- vii) M. Chambers: After this goes through Senate, will chairs get this?
  - (1) B. Guell: I think we need to build into the function of the Senate Chairperson duties to alert everyone of policy changes at the beginning of every year. He/she

can say here is what we passed last year, be educated about it. It can be done in the opening August meeting.

- (2) M. Licari: It can be shared at department meetings, and by the deans through chair's councils.
- (3) M. Chambers: I just want to make sure they see it.
- (4) B. Guell: One of the critical problems with faculty governance is to not worry about implementation. I am imagining that somebody is going to communicate it, perhaps as a regular part of chair orientation during the first week in August.

6) BR Form Update: S. Powers, L. Brown (Files #2 & 3)

- a) L. Brown: The most important change is the second report that has university data that people cannot tamper with, such as grade distribution or if you did not submit 3-week attendance, it will show up here.
  - i) S. Powers: It will require me to add to the screen the missing 3-week attendance and missing interim grades, but thankfully most terms there are not many so it is not difficult. We cannot upload from Banner, but there are not so many people that between myself, and Pam, we cannot go in and update it. I have a missing data folder. I have every single item of missing data so we can add those. One piece is syllabus and student ratings, if people have them. As a reviewer, you do not have to look at every line of every syllabus, but instead have everybody spot check them. For student evaluations and course ratings, it is two years' worth.
    - (1) K. Games: Are student course ratings auto populated?
    - (2) S. Powers: No.
    - (3) K. Games: So faculty members download and upload them into FAD, some just keep the numbers, but delete comments.
    - (4) S. Powers: If no students ever comment, that is a red flag. That shows there is something you should investigate.
    - (5) K. Games: Some are not downloading whole blue report. Better mentorship from the chair level would help.
    - (6) L. Brown: If they suspect that, the chair could go back in to check. They have access.
    - (7) B. Guell: That is an immediately fire-able offense. That is a de-tenuring thing. Falsifying academic record is a de-tenurable offense.
    - (8) L. Brown: You can see outliers.
    - (9) K. Games: That calls for guidance from chairpersons and the faculty reviewers.
    - (10) S. Powers: The absence of data is a data point. There is a concern that they do not want to share it.
    - (11) B. Guell: Unless it was stripped out, the BR said any university data can be considered in BR whether it is in a BR doc or not.
    - (12) S. Powers: Course reviews are in there.

- (13) M. Licari: Some course evaluations are not engaged until time it is to submit. Some go years without contemplating how they are doing in a classroom.
  - (14) C. Ball: Some are not looking at it and not putting it in the FAD. Prior to this, there was one course per semester that you had to evaluate.
  - (15) S. Powers: For the last two years, they have been like this.
  - (16) C. Ball: It is a change.
  - (17) L. Brown: For newer faculty, it has always been this way.
  - ii) S. Powers: There is better workflow, you can refresh the report and it will run it before they submit it. The other part is the one they can then work on. There are two parts and this one runs automatically. The other stuff they could tweak and change, and get down to page minimums. I just hope they do it for the right two-year period.
    - (1) C. Ball: The first file is the one that is automatically run, the other is page limits.
    - (2) S. Powers: Yes, they create and upload it. The goal is we want it in FAD and not create it, we run the same data for HLC. I am manually inputting fixes before HLC.
    - (3) T. Hawkins: Is this satisfying for everyone?
    - (4) S. Powers: There have been some screen revisions—syllabus, peer evaluations, course ratings are all together at the top. I put in teaching boxes where you can put high impact practices, which are check boxes, but you can add documents. You can also add career outcomes to say they are doing these in classes as well. We will figure out where in reports we put those for faculty who chose to add them.
- 7) Standing Committee Liaison Reports:
- a) AAC (M. Cohen): Meeting as we speak and I am about to join them.
  - b) AEC (R. Peters): No report—done.
  - c) CAAC (L. Brown): Approved Forensic Science Minor, and Entertainment Design and Tech Minor. They also approve minor changes to the History Major/Minor, but those will not need to come here.
  - d) FAC (B. Guell): Other than 350, they are meeting next Tuesday to discuss the issue on whether end of appointments are PTOC issues. They will also be discussing whether or not deans need to be doing instructor evaluations, or if they should just end at the chair level. Soon they will be taking up the outside employment/consultant services sections.
  - e) FEBC (K. Games): No report; meeting Monday.
  - f) GC (C. Ball): No report.
  - g) SAC (M. Chambers): No report.
  - h) URC (S. Phillips): No report.
- 8) Adjournment at 4:39pm.