

#7

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

February 16, 2017

3:30 p.m., DEDE III

Approved Minutes

Members Present: K. Berlin, L. Brown, B. Bunnett, S. Buchanan, M. Cohen, D. Cooper-Bolinsky, B. Corcoran, E. Gallatin, N. Goswami, R. Guell, J. Gustafson, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins, M. Hutchins, B. Kilp, J. Kinne, A. Kummerow, S. Lamb, K. Lee, C. MacDonald, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, A. Payne, L. Phillips, A. Solesky, F. Stewart, S. Stofferahn, K. Yousif

Members Absent: J. Conant, M. Howard-Hamilton, N. Nichols-Pethick, H. Tapley

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

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: S. Barton, E. Glendening, M. Ketner, S. Kopaczewski, D. Israel, R. Peters, B. Phillips, B. Pittman, J. Powers, L. Reynolds, A. Rider, T. Roberson, L. Rosenhein, D. Woods

1) Memorial Resolutions:

a) Dr. Myong-Ku Ahn, read by E. Glendening. Vote: 29-0-0.

The Faculty Senate has received notice of the passing of Dr. Myong-Ku Ahn, Professor Emeritus of Chemistry at Indiana State University. Dr. Ahn passed away on October 15, 2016.

Dr. Ahn was born in Seoul, Korea where he lost both of his parents in the Korean War. After serving in the Korean Air Force, he came to the US where he earned a B.A. in Chemistry from Williams College in 1963 and a Ph.D. in Physical Chemistry from Yale University in 1968. After serving as a post-doctoral fellow at UCLA he came to ISU where he remained until his retirement in 2003.

Professor Ahn was a dedicated educator and researcher. He collaborated with scientists at both NASA and Argonne National Laboratories. He was awarded ISU's Research Creativity Award in 1996. Myong's colleagues considered him to be the go-to person when a piece of electronic equipment needed to be repaired.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Dr. Ahn's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its

appreciation for the years of service and dedication to his students, his department, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

b) Dr. Torsten Alveger, read by E. Glendening. Vote: 29-0-0.

The Faculty Senate has received notice of the passing of Dr. Torsten Alvager, Professor Emeritus of Physics and Life Sciences at Indiana State University. Dr. Alvager passed away on September 28, 2016.

Dr. Alvager was born in Sweden. He earned a Ph.D. in Physics from the University of Stockholm in 1960. While at the University of Stockholm, he performed research at Argonne National Laboratory (1961-1962) and at CERN in Geneva, Switzerland (1963-1964). He moved to Princeton University in 1966 and came to Indiana State University in 1968 on a joint appointment in the Departments of Physics and Life Sciences. Dr. Alvager remained at ISU until his retirement in 2002.

Dr. Alvager's early research work centered on problems related to relativity and the structure of the atomic nucleus. Results of his work were cited in standard physics textbooks, including Jackson's Classical Electrodynamics and Goldstein's Classical Mechanics. Dr. Alvager's name appeared in the Guinness Book of World Records in 1975 for research to prove the existence of tachyons, particles with a vacuum speed greater than the speed of light.

Dr. Alvager's later work concentrated on biophysical problems with special emphasis on optical methods and genetic code problems. Dr. Alvager was a dedicated researcher and educator. He served as chairperson of the Physics Department from 1998 to 2001.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Dr. Alvager's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to his students, his department, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family

c) Dr. Lewis P. Segó, read by B. Phillips. Vote: 29-0-0.

Dr. Lewis P. Segó joined the faculty at Indiana State in 1965 as an instructor in the Department of English. He completed the Ph.D. in English, Educational Psychology and Instructional Systems Technology from Indiana University in 1974 and attained the rank of associate professor in 1978. Upon his retirement from the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics in 2004, Dr. Segó was the longest-term faculty member of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Dr. Segó taught literature and writing courses in the Department of English. His love was supporting student learning and writing. In the 1980s he developed some of the earliest computer-assisted learning programs to develop students' English writing skills. He also served on several university-wide committees related to computer-assisted instruction.

In the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, Dr. Segó developed and taught a course entitled 'Exploring Language' for non-majors who wanted to gain a deeper understanding of human communication. Dr. Segó spoke several languages and taught beginning Spanish, French and Chinese, as well as English as a Second Language for international students and a course in cognitive linguistics. In order to help initiate ISU's partnership with Liaoning Normal University in Dalian, Dr. Segó also taught for a semester in China. Dr. Segó earned the appreciation of his students for his attention to their learning.

Throughout his career, Dr. Segó's scholarly interests spanned across disciplines from creative writing and literature to cognitive linguistics, and he presented papers at conferences of organizations such as the International Congress of Cognitive Linguistics. In 1997 he founded the Pedagogical Quarterly of Cognitive Linguistics as an on-line journal at ISU. Dr. Segó was also a member of the review board of the International Cognitive Linguistics Association for several years.

In his retirement, Dr. Segó and his wife, Kathleen, moved to Minnesota to be nearer to their children's families. He continued to write and present papers for a number of years. On his many travels, often involving bicycling, Dr. Segó developed the ability to converse in French, German, Spanish and Chinese. In addition to his love of language, Lewis also played several musical instruments and sang in a barbershop quartet.

Dr. Segó is survived by his wife of 55 years, Kathleen S. Brown Segó, their five children and 12 grandchildren as well as his sister, Dianne Snyder, and a nephew.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which he gave to his students, the Department of English, the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

2) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley

- i) The House Ways and Means budget came out yesterday. You might know this is the 3rd or 4th step in about 8 steps to get appropriations. It is similar to the Governor's budget, a \$500K cut over the biennium; \$400K the first year and \$100K the second year. The good news is they are proposing funding for the Fine Arts Building, so we can move forward with that. The Senate budget will be in late March, early April. It will be May before the Governor signs.
- ii) Promotion letters will be in the mail tomorrow.

- b) Provost M. Licari: As many of you know, we have candidates for the BCOE dean on campus this week and through next. Please participate, engage with the candidates, and provide your feedback as we go through this process. There will be candidates for other positions as we go through the semester. Your feedback is crucial. Please engage in these searches. We need your input.
- 3) Support Staff Report: None.
- 4) SGA Report: A. Velazquez
 - a) The Office of Student Affairs is seeking nominations for the President's Medal. Candidates must be a senior graduating in 2017 and have a GPA of 3.0 or higher. The award is for leadership, scholarship, and service. I encourage you to think of students to nominate for this award.
- 5) Temporary Faculty Advocate: M. Muyumba
 - a) We are still working with L. Spence to discuss a delay of the 90 day email deletion for temporary faculty. This is a problem if they have a summer or other semester between appointments.
 - b) I have had a lot of emails from people regarding the 70-15-15 goal for the make-up of the faculty. Shockingly, they have not heard of this before. We've had the difficult conversation about knowing they are temporary faculty, or people who were temporary faculty that weren't before.
- 6) Chair Report: T. Hawkins
 - a) We have one or two things to work through today on our Agenda. I ask for your help to make sure that our deliberations are both efficient and effective. Following open discussion, J. Powers and L. Reynolds will present their Inclusive Excellence Report. Multiple CAAC items follow. We will then consider four FAC items that moved on from Exec.
 - b) I have a couple of statements to make before we get down to business: The P&T Taskforce has now officially sent its proposed 305 language to FAC. This will be FACs primary focus for the rest of the month. I have already received some expressions of concern from some faculty members who fear the worst. I acknowledge that there is concern among the faculty, and I hope the faculty feels comfortable expressing itself to its representatives. However, right now that concern is fueled by rumor, much of which is simply inaccurate. This does not help the process that we need to follow. We should all welcome inquiries at this point. In response, we should tell our colleagues that FACs deliberations will not be secret. We should repeat that the FAC-approved language will be presented to the campus community when it is forwarded to Exec—most likely by early March. We should encourage our colleagues to review that language and then discuss it, based on its merits or lack thereof, when the time comes and, finally, to make their sentiments known to their senators. If my optimistic timeline holds, Senate will formally receive the Exec-approved 305 language in March and begin its deliberations then. As this is a matter of considerable import, we will continue debate at a Special Senate meeting on 13 April and, if possible, proceed to a vote.

c) On to number two: this is a challenging time for the campus community as we are now beginning to identify the personal costs associated with the budget constraints that the Administration is asking us to accept. The argument for cuts that has been made is still being met by a fairly consistent level of incredulity—along the lines of “are things that bad?” Budgetary matters fall under the advisory authority of the Senate. But, as the Handbook notes “The University Faculty is properly concerned with and should actively participate in decisions made on...matters that may affect the educational policies for which it is primarily responsible.” With regard to the budget, we have and will continue to give advice to the president—in my experience this advice has been very consistent in that it has long resisted cuts that target the faculty, cuts that invariably have a direct and significant impact on the academic mission of the university. I know the president has listened to us in good faith; and I know he will continue to do so. As the budget picture for the next two years comes more sharply into focus, I ask that he be as transparent as possible with us about the reasons that underpin his decisions to seek the elimination of certain lecturer and instructor positions. I ask that he be as flexible as possible with these cuts and that he consider the disproportionately negative impact they may have on particular programs if they are implemented too quickly. And I ask that he do everything within his power to ensure that our dedicated faculty feel fully supported as they continue their work. It is relatively easy to monetize these positions; but for students and faculty alike the campus climate, while perhaps impossible to “cost out” in a comparable way on a spreadsheet, is perhaps the most valuable resource we have. We need to be sure we are protecting these intangibles, too, as we continue to shield the institution from future budgetary threats.

7) Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes

a) Approve as amended (B. Kilp, J. Gustafson). Vote: 28-0-1.

8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

a) S. Lamb: T. Hawkins, I very much appreciate your opening comments and concerns. I think they are right on the mark.

Beginning next year A&S will add an Associate Dean. In 2017 we will have more Associate Deans, more Deans, more Associate VPs, and more VPs that we had when you began your term. We will also have more students, by 3000. We will have a financial reserve of 178 million, which I suspect is an all-time high. The only thing we will have fewer of, is faculty.

President Bradley, we spent about two years altering the handbook so that faculty with multi-year contract could be categorized as regular faculty, you championed this. We bought into the concept that these faculty should not be considered second class citizens, that their value was remarkable. We changed the handbook so that they would have voting rights, and would be allowed to become members of the faculty senate, with full participation rights. We made change after change to the handbook to facilitate this change in our philosophy.

We then went further with your encouragement to create a category of these instructors called senior instructors, again recognizing the tremendous contribution that they make to the well-being of our institution. We placed them on personnel committees, and again emphasized their value.

Now the deans have been instructed to fire them and replace them with adjunct faculty (or more properly; to not rehire them) We have been told that this number of instructors are too much of a financial burden, that their marginal value is not worth 1.7 million, that we have to reduce their numbers by 28 in two years, and 14 this year, and replace them with adjunct faculty. This is a change that is most unhealthy for our institution, for both faculty morale and student success, and is in direct conflict with so much of your previous philosophy. This is on top of the constant FTE pressures that Deans have been enduring. I do not understand. I do not have any idea of what is being accomplished here. You are not gaining flexibility. You are losing loyalty. You are losing expertise. You are castigating the category of instructors. You have changed the message from one of recognized value, with greater security to one of little value and minimum security. I do not understand why the Deans and the faculty are not objecting in mass. I think the fact that this has gone unchallenged is a failure .

President Bradley, you have consistently earned the institutions respect, but in this domain, you are damaging the institution. You are wrong. You are not listening to your academic council. This is not shared governance. This should not be your legacy.

- i) D. Bradley: Let me start with the latter part on instructors. We've had a goal for a number of years to have 70% be Tenured/Tenure Track, 15% Instructors, 15% Part-time Lecturers. For reasons that I have not fully comprehended, we ended up substantially out of that balance in terms of instructors. I would blame that on the rotating provosts over the past few years. The goal is not to reduce the number of faculty, but bring balance back to the ratio of Instructors. Our reserves aren't as big as you think.
 - ii) S. Lamb: If I may follow up a little bit. I certainly recall when we went to the 70% tenure track. At that point, there was no such thing as regular faculty. But at that time we spent little to no time discussing the make-up of the 15%.
 - iii) D. Bradley: I'd be happy to have continuing discussion.
 - iv) S. Lamb: I do not criticize, but I see no value in replacing these instructors who may carry 10 courses a year with 2-10 adjuncts. In general, they do not have the loyalty, the vote, the identity to the institutions that our instructors have. I have had instructors weeping today and they may not be the chosen ones, but what they were weeping about was how poorly the institution was thinking of them.
- b) R. Guell: It is with profound sorrow that I speak today with S. Lamb. Frequently we are opposed to one another. This is not personal. I have never known of a university president more self-effacing, hardworking and who puts the shoulder to the grindstone as D. Bradley. When the cuts of 2010 were made, associate deans were moved back to faculty, there were cuts in business affairs, cuts across the institution. As a result, the cuts in faculty were easier to stomach because we were sharing that burden. But when S. Lamb shared the stats on administrators, with more being created this week and this

month, it was really hard to not think we were on opposite sides. We were on the same team when we absorbed those cuts. We were on the same team when we changed 305 and made Instructors and Senior Instructors. I get the “we are substantially out of balance” part of it. Some of this was a result of making Full-time Lecturers appear as though they were Instructors. If they count with Instructors, we are out of balance. If you count them as lecturers then we are far closer to the model. I understand that FT Lecturers require health care and retirement. I object now and like I did six months ago to the moving of the goal posts. I don’t think it’s the fault of the provosts. It was your fault because you said on repeated occasions to chairs and deans that FT Lecturers should not exist beyond the one year they were hired for and if you want to continue with them you need to turn them into instructors. Of course, in the world where they are being offered resources, they say yes sir. I fully get that we are out of the 70-15-15 model. If we had been at our previous number of freshmen and if we had met the enrollment projections, we would not be out of our projections. I only ask that we respect the long term projection of the 70-15-15 goal and adjust slowly. In HHS, we are down to 12. If we could get it into single digits it would be a recognition of the financial reality.

- i) D. Bradley: I would be happy to sit down with Exec or any group to talk about administrative positions. I know we’ve talked to them individually over time. As far as the full-time lecturers, that’s a separate issue and is not part of the overstaffing in regard to instructors. I didn’t mean to imply that it was the provosts’ fault, but we do need to bring some balance. One of the things we’ve done as a collective is we’ve made sure that FT get benefits, get retirement, get health insurance. But we have a budget that we have to balance and that needs to be flexible based on curriculum and enrollment. I am very unhappy with what’s going on and I know it doesn’t have to be fixed in a year, but we have to move relatively quickly to bring balance back.
- c) K. Yousif: I never side with R. Guell and S. Lamb, so this will be rare. I worry that you hear from administrators and chairs, but not regular faculty. We worked very hard to recruit these instructors and we recruit good people with the promise of stability. They have become a part of our departments, they are on personnel committees and they serve on Senate. Qualified adjuncts are very difficult to find. And I worry that this shift will affect student success. I would invite you to visit some of the classes. These are wonderful teachers. They have heavy teaching requirements and additional service. I think if you could see some of the more personal aspects of the role that these people play on campus it would soften or slow the approach. I don’t have a solution or criticism or blame, but I would like you to see how the rest of the faculty see it.
- d) A. Kummerow: At our November meeting I brought up the culture of instructors and you asked me to follow up with an email and I want to read the words that you replied with: “70% Tenure and Tenure Track; 15% Instructors; 15% part-time Lecturers. I think that with discipline, in the Provost’s and Deans’ offices, we can correct most if not all of the imbalance through normal attrition. Certainly, we want to accomplish our goal without disrupting the academic work of the departments.” Is that still true?
 - i) D. Bradley: That is absolutely how I feel. I think that we will have some turnover and unfortunately you don’t know when that is or if it is when you want. I think balance can happen through attrition.
- e) S. Stofferahn: To follow up on Steve Lamb’s earlier statement, I wanted to be sure that the voices of our Instructors are heard in this discussion. My comment comes in the form

of asking advice of both Provost Licari and President Bradley. As you know, I am filling in as Interim Chair of History this year. Yesterday I felt it my duty to have a forthright conversation with an Instructor who is likely to be directly affected if these cuts go through as currently envisioned. It was not an incendiary conversation, and I was very impressed with the candor and stoicism with which this colleague received such unwelcome news. After he had had a day to think about it, however, he very appropriately sent me a series of pointed questions, and I want to share one of them in this forum: “Mid-February is a terrible time to convey this decision. My retention and promotion had been unanimously approved at all levels. I was encouraged to apply for a new rank of senior instructor. These were all signs that I would be hired to stay at the university. It is devastating to find out in mid-February that the exact opposite will happen. This is way too late in the academic hiring cycle to start an effective job search.” My question to you is, how should I, or any Chairperson, respond to this questions?

- i) D. Bradley: I don't have a good answer today. Clearly one of the things we are trying to do is the timeline—one of the things we didn't do when we set up the instructor position is the same notification timeline for tenured faculty. That change will be up for approval today. I need to talk to the provost about what we can do retrospectively with those timelines. What is in your pack for approval today would require notification of first year in March and second year in December, and in the summer for third and beyond. But that is not the language by which they were hired.
- ii) S. Stofferahn: Thank you. I want to make sure, though, that the core element of my colleague's question is clearly recognized. Particularly in his case, where many years of dedicated teaching and service appeared to be culminating in a well-deserved promotion to Senior Instructor, with universally positive indications all down the line, he was left confused and disheartened (as we all were), since the University seemed to be pulling the rug out from beneath him, with no warning. This is a serious problem, and I really think the campus is going to need a detailed explanation to help us make better sense of it
- iii) D. Bradley: Where we ended up is we are over our target of 26. I'm not looking for reasons why it happened or who approved the hiring, but my understanding of what I approve, we should have 15-20 fewer instructors than we have. We could dig into every hire and see what happened, but I don't see value in that. Like I told R. Guell, I am willing to say I screwed up because I wasn't watching well enough. I feel that instructors are a critical part of our institution. But we have to get back to where we need to be as well. This is not something that I and the Provost are happy to do.
- f) A. Solesky: I had something prepared, but others said it well. I'm an instructor who has been here for 19 years. I've had different titles, but now it is Instructor. Since 2011 when we had the task force, there was finally some stability and it is feeling like it's gone. The way the notifications came out was unsettling. The letter said I was up for promotion, but the next sentence said your contract is up. Could those not come in the same letter? That was very disheartening. I will say that all the comments I got from my colleagues were very supportive and meaningful.
- g) L. Phillips: I will say the same thing as A. Solesky, which is we realize you have to think about numbers. But morale is something you need to consider. If our colleagues are going to be let go, it will have an effect on the institution in the long term.

- h) L. Brown: I want to emphasize that these are people who are teaching our most vulnerable students. I think about instructors and FT lecturers in my department. They are going above and beyond what you can reasonably expect from faculty. They take time to help the students. For example, I have one Instructor who spends two hours two evenings per week meeting with any MATH 115 student who needs help. Many of our tenured and tenure track faculty don't necessarily teach large numbers of freshmen, their disciplinary expertise is essential for the upper level courses. Morale, as L. Phillips and A. Solesky have expressed, makes a huge difference in an institution. It's going to disproportionately affect our Instructors and Lecturers, but it will affect the entire faculty.
- i) J. Kinne: I think that's something we would not have with adjuncts. They will not be invested as much. How much control do the deans have? Is the blame all on the President, or do the deans play a role?
 - i) D. Bradley: I think creative solutions to help buy time is always helpful. I think any way people can help with solving this problem through various ways would be considered.
- j) R. Guell: Can we at least say that those who got promotion letters this week are not going to be fired next week?
 - i) D. Bradley: I think we need to have that conversation later.
 - ii) R. Guell: I asked the question why the language of the letters was so tortured, and now I do know.
 - iii) D. Bradley: There will be more clarity in March.
- k) S. Lamb: There are few times the Senate has been as eloquent as today and that's because of humanity and respect. There are alternatives. This is a campus with a budget with close to \$200 million. This will be devastating. This is not helping. Right now, despite all the trimming we have done, we are a very efficient organization. We are getting so much out of faculty. This is a horrible time to rock this boat. We are doing well. I plead.
- l) D. Malooley: I agree with much I have heard today. I understand the angst for all of this. I look at this from the students' perspective. I hear one-year contracts will not be renewed and at the same time three-year contracts cannot be provided. I know it is virtually impossible to find qualified adjuncts and you cannot just go to Starbucks to hire someone to teach these classes. We will severely hurt the quality of students' education and the reputation of the institution as a whole.
 - i) D. Bradley: We are not going back to the Stone Age. It will be what we were two or three years ago. The imbalance happened in the last two years. As far as FT Lecturers, I have said the whole time I've been here, FT Lecturers are temporary positions. The only reason we have them is to fill slots that are temporary such as sabbatical replacements or when a retirement or resignation happens at the last minute and we can't do a full search. There's no change in this, they are temporary positions. We need to tell them when we hire them that it is a one or two year position so there is no lack of transparency. The only way they can stay is if they transition into a different position. If they do transition into an instructor or tenure-track, and if that person is successful, that is wonderful because it means you have time to evaluate and see if you want them.
 - ii) M. Muyumba: The support from everyone, no matter your title is very heartfelt and appreciated. You may have a misguided notion of what an adjunct is. I myself work

harder than a lot of people as an adjunct and I am teaching 6 classes. I am involved in a lot. To think every adjunct comes from Starbucks is ignorant. I know somebody in my department who worked for at least 18 years in a “temporary” position. When you keep someone in a temporary position as an adjunct for 18 years, at some point they are thought of as someone permanent. At some point, that person believes they are part of an organization that wants them. In my department alone, the majority of COMM 101 is covered by adjuncts, so if we’re not that great and student success is number one, you have a bigger problem. We are not just “adjuncts.” We are committed faculty and we do a good job.

iii) D. Malooley: I’m not disparaging adjuncts, I’m saying it is hard to find them.

9) Inclusive Excellence Report Update: J. Powers and L. Reynolds

a) <http://www.indstate.edu/about/diversity/council>. Click on “annual reports” and “Trustee Presentations”

b) R. Guell: Of the 9 racial complains, how many were adjudicated by your office as legitimate?

(1) L. Reynolds: Out of the 9 complaints, we do not count student-on-student numbers. We count staff/faculty as being accused. Out of the nine, I want to say all nine were full investigations. Out of that 3 had a full finding. There are far less discriminatory actions taken on campus. But since we’ve doubled the numbers, is there a perception issue? Or is there something else? When I came, we did not have a fully functioning office. My visibility may have contributed to an increase in complaints. We have a fully functioning office.

(2) D. Bradley: Those are complaints, not individuals complaining? So 16 individuals?

(3) L. Reynolds: We’ve had one individual who made several complaints, but I factored that in.

c) D. Hantzis: I wanted to check with the data. The F16 data is included with the 16-17 data?

i) L. Reynolds: Yes, you are correct.

10) CAAC Items

a) Traffic Engineering Technology Minor Revision

i) Motion to amend according to the revisions (A. Kummerow, D. Malooley). Vote: 28-0-1.

ii) R. Peters: I took it back to the faculty and discussed what the prerequisites should be. What you see is going back to the exact prerequisites.

b) Criminology and Criminal Justice: Corrections Minor, Forensic Investigations Minor, Law and Administration Minor, Law Enforcement and Evidence Minor

i) Motion to approve the four minors (S. Lamb, D. Hantzis). Vote: 29-0-0.

ii) S. Barton: What you have in front of you is the result of a two-year process. Last year we proposed to modify our major in response to the assessment plan to have our students have more writing, but the increase in hours and the addition of concentrations was not approved. We decided to create these minors in response to the Administration’s concerns.

c) Criminology and Criminal Justice: BS in Intelligence Analysis

- i) Motion to approve (J. Kuhlman, J. Kinne). Vote: 28-1-0.
 - ii) D. Woods: This started about three years ago now. I was contacted by one of our alums, Bob Casey who was at that time retiring from the FBI and then security at Lilly. Because this is home he asked if he could make a presentation to our faculty members. He gave us a nice presentation of his view from being in the FBI that the number one thing missing was more formal education and a degree in intelligence analysis. It became apparent that we couldn't do this in our current degree. So I began working with our faculty, dean's office, COT, and had meetings about this. There was a lot of favorable reaction. What I didn't know at that time is there is a very large military market for people doing intelligence analysis and they don't have degrees. I knew from my own experience that this is one of the fastest growing fields in criminal justice. We found out what others are doing and there aren't many programs in this area. We studied the programs we could find, continued talking to our constituent groups, and we developed the program. Last spring, we vetted it with constituent groups, including a retired alum from NCIS, another alum who was an NCIS agent and intelligence officer for the navy, a police chief, other police officers, former CIA agents who all supported and gave insight into the program. What you have before you now is the result. We anticipate that this will be principally an online program. Campus students can take it, but 90% of the classes will be delivered online. We've had conversations with EES who will teach some classes, SCOB, and we are reaching out to other potential partners. So far, we have had a lot of encouragement.
 - iii) D. Malooley: Could you direct us to the number of new faculty needed?
 - iv) D. Woods: This program has some crossover with our current faculty. We are prepared to launch without any additional faculty. We will need additional resources if we have the numbers of students, 300 majors anticipated within five years. In that case, we would need five full time faculty members.
- d) BA in Communication
- i) Motion to approve (D. Hantzis, A. Payne). Vote: 12-16-0.
 - ii) T. Hawkins: I will begin by noting that this proposal has come to Senate in a rather unorthodox manner. However, I also need to note that all due process was followed. CAACs vote on the proposal was 2-2-3. This technically meant that the proposal failed in committee. As was their right under Section 245.4.5, the Department of Communication voted to appeal to the next highest authority. Exec considered the proposal and voted unanimously to approve it and send it forward to Senate. We are now, assuming we have a motion to approve, considering the proposal on its merits. The process that brought the proposal to this point should not be up for debate. I ask that Senators limit their remarks to the merits of the program as it stands before you.

I also need to note that the proposal approved by Exec includes language (not currently in Curriculog—to be fixed later) that codifies Communication's vote to revise the major to allow students “to satisfy one major elective course requirement by completing a course outside the department, in consultation with her/his academic advisor.”

- iii) D. Israel: As you see from the unanimously-approved statement from the Department of Communication in your handouts, the Communication faculty is excited to give

Communication majors the opportunity to choose a concentration in Health Communication. With the health industry a growing part of the economy, nationally, as well as in Indiana, this is an expansion of the curriculum that is expected to attract prospective students to ISU, as well as increasing the options available to current Communication majors.

The proposal adds a fifth concentration in Health Communication as a possible choice for Communication majors. It is designed to be parallel in construction with the other four existing concentrations in the major – it requires 5 courses (15 credits) of course work, three of which are specifically Health Communication courses. This structure of the major is designed to contribute to student success and graduation, allowing students to pursue one or more concentrations within the major, and to switch to a different concentration, if their interests change.

The Department of Communication asks the Faculty Senate to support this proposal which will allow Communication majors the opportunity to choose a concentration in Health Communication.

- iv) S. Kopaczewski: I would like to start by saying I appreciate the opportunity to present my department's proposal for a health communication concentration to the senate. As the department's curriculum committee chair and one of two current faculty members who have studied health communication at the doctoral level, I have eagerly anticipated the concentration in health communication which the department has been working on since the fall of 2010. Our commitment to offering communication students a concentration in health communication is bolstered by research showing that health communication is a growth area for both student interest and opportunity. The department has worked diligently to maintain disciplinary recommendations and standards for delivering a *communication degree* with a 15 credit *concentration* in health communication. Departments which follow our structure for a degree in communication based on a core set of classes with smaller more contextually specific concentrations and elective options are common, and many of those programs which also offer health communication as a concentration provide similar course offerings to ours, and do not require courses from outside the major.

The department strongly believes we are well situated to train students as experts in communication with a health communication concentration designed to provide students the courses that best prepare them to apply their expertise in communication to various health communication contexts. The proposed concentration is comprised of 3 health communication courses that have already been approved and regularly offered, in addition to the organizational communication and campaign courses. These courses when combined with the core and guided electives prepare students in key knowledge and skill areas identified as important skills for working in health communication by a 2014 state of the field report. We ask that our proposal be given due consideration for these reasons.

- v) K. Berlin: Faculty in the Department of Applied Health Sciences discussed the Health Communication concentration and would like to make a statement concerning

the program proposal for the Communication Major. While we do not have any problem with the proposal allowing students to declare multiple majors or excluding COMM 101 from counting as a major elective, we are, as D. Israel stated in the Exec meeting on Feb. 7th, opposed to the Health Communication concentration because the offering does not require an “outside course”.

We agree that a Health Communication concentration is a good addition given the growth in the health industry. However, given this growth and focus on health issues, we believe it is critical that health communication students have, at minimum, a course in public health or healthcare that provides those students with the foundational knowledge, health literacy, and understanding of the players, organizations, issues, and policies in the healthcare field. We are not asking that students take a “health” course, nor are we “claiming ownership of words or phrases” related to health. We are simply stating that not providing communication students with a solid foundation in public health or healthcare issues is setting those students up for failure. The two health foundational studies courses offered at ISU are focused on personal health and wellness and not an overview of the healthcare industry.

To say that health communication faculty are trained to teach the health aspects of communication undermines those faculty who have spent upwards of 10 years achieving doctorates in a health field. If all that is required to teach certain courses is a background in that field, then we, in Health Sciences, are well poised to teach business administration courses for our students given that three of us have a background and formal education in business, with one of those faculty having an MBA.

Further, there was a statement made at Exec that other institutions, such as Harvard and John Hopkins, offer a Health Communication concentration similar to the one being proposed here. We do not understand the rationale for wanting to replicate other university offerings without understanding when their curriculum was last revised or why they structured their program as listed. Our understanding is that programs should be offered to ISU students that address current industry trends and issues relevant to employment for our students, not programs that are offered at Ivy League Tier 1 institutions.

While we understand that this proposal may indeed be approved and move forward, faculty in the Department of Applied Health Sciences, unanimously, want to state for the minutes that we feel this is a disservice to communication students; we think an amendment should be added to the proposal that includes a minimum of one outside course focused on public health or healthcare in addition to the concentration courses.

- vi) C. MacDonald: Since I made the statement in Exec to which K. Berlin refers, it turns out that I and J. Conant did independent research prior to receiving the appeal from the department to see what the curriculum looks like. There were others from other universities. In the programs we looked at, the curriculum comprised courses from Communication only.

- vii) K. Yousif: I understand process is off the table, but I do ask why we received a handout containing a memo like this?
- (1) T. Hawkins: The department requested that the Senators have that available today.
- viii) J. Gustafson: We've been given a memo for a process we're not allowed to debate, right?
- (1) T. Hawkins: You can decide how you want to vote based on any reason you feel. I made my opening statement, because I do not think that this conversation should become a debate about the process that brought the proposal here. The correct process was followed. CAAC voted on the proposal. It was 2-2-3. That means it was not approved by CAAC. The department had the right to go to the next authority, which they chose to do. It came to Exec and then was sent here. I was simply hoping to make it clear that there is not a problem with the process as I see it. We should instead focus on the merits of the proposal.
- ix) K. Berlin: This major transcends colleges. We are saying they should have to take an outside course. Seven of the nine Exec members are in CAS. Where is the CHHS or any other college voice in that vote?
- (1) T. Hawkins: We do not serve our Colleges on Exec. We were considering the proposal in our roles as university representatives.
- x) S. Kopaczewski: There are 3 Health Communication courses proposed as part of this concentration and in those courses we do cover basic health issues. For a minor, students should have courses in health. For a concentration in Communication, what we have is sufficient, and we are trained to teach our students those basic health concepts.
- xi) K. Berlin: I would counter that and say that this is my second career. My first career is in journalism and I don't think that made me "health." It was not until I got my doctorate that I understood the complexities. All we are asking is for one course in the field. I'm not saying that course has to be in our department, it could be in another department. We believe the students need some kind of basic knowledge.
- xii) T. Hawkins: I think we understand the two sides of this debate. To a certain degree the vote is if you agree that Communication has made its case or if, as written, the curriculum is not sufficient.
- xiii) L. Phillips: Normally when you are developing a program and if we have people who are experts in health we might encourage our students to take courses there. We should be willing to seek out the expertise we have on campus. However, we can't tell programs how to construct their majors.
- xiv) D. Israel: I am sorry if I did confuse things by asking T. Hawkins to give you our motion. I thought it was important to see the motion that was approved by the Department of Communication after CAAC had the 2-2-3 vote. If we hadn't requested it, it would have stayed there and that's why I requested that you see that. The Department of Communication is willing and anxious to have the students take an outside course should it fit what their goals are, whether a course in public health, biomedical ethics, etc. We have many experts across our university that have pieces of information that are very relevant, so allowing them to take a course outside is a way to try to address those concerns.

- xv) D. Cooper-Bolinsky: If you wouldn't mind, could you tell me a couple of careers that this would prepare students to go do in the health care field?
- xvi) S. Kopaczewski: We envision health communication students going to careers where they would play roles in health campaigns, as trainers for doctors to teach them how to interact better with patients, etc.

11) FAC Items

- a) Section 305 Clarification: Timeline for Notification of Instructor Reappointment
 - i) Motion to approve (K. Yousif, B. Kilp). Vote: 25-0-0.
 - ii) K. Yousif: In the File 7 timeline: Is there the assumption that the dates are tied to first year evaluation, second year evaluation?
 - iii) T. Hawkins: FAC brought this with extra language that included calendar dates. Following discussion in Exec it was noted that this was redundant, so Exec stripped it before we voted the proposed language.
 - iv) R. Guell: The dates are 305.6.6 for tenure track/tenured faculty members and previously 305.1.2 refers not to the number but to the process, so it is redundant.
- b) Interpretation Announcement Process
 - i) Motion to approve (K. Yousif, L. Phillips). Vote: 25-0-0.
- c) Changes to Section 305.3.2.1.1 Prior Service Credit
 - i) Motion to approve (B. Kilp, J. Kinne). Vote: 25-0-0.

12) Adjournment: 5:22 p.m.