

#8

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

March 23, 2017

3:30 p.m., DEDE III

Approved Minutes

Members Present: K. Berlin, L. Brown, S. Buchanan, B. Bunnett, M. Cohen, J. Conant, D. Cooper-Bolinskey, B. Corcoran, E. Gallatin, R. Guell, J. Gustafson, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins, M. Howard-Hamilton, M. Hutchins, B. Kilp, J. Kuhlman, A. Kummerow, S. Lamb, K. Lee, C. MacDonald, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, N. Nichols-Pethick, A. Payne, L. Phillips, A. Solesky, F. Stewart, S. Stofferahn, H. Tapley, K. Yousif

Members Absent: N. Goswami, J. Kinne

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

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: L. Eberman, M. Hare, D. Israel, R. Perrin, S. Powers, D. Woods

1) Memorial Resolutions

a) Read by T. Hawkins. Motion to Approve: Vote: 31-0-0

The Faculty Senate has received notice of the passing of Dr. David Kim, Professor Emeritus of Finance at Indiana State University. Dr. Kim passed away on June 11, 2014.

Dr. Kim was Chief Editor & Founder of the journal *Global Business and Finance Review*. A loving and caring husband, father and grandfather, he was an avid golfer and traveler and was regarded as a gentleman and scholar.

The Faculty Senate acknowledges Dr. Kim's dedication to enriching the lives of many and bringing out the best in those whose lives he touched.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Dr. Kim'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) Read by S. Stofferahn. Motion to Approve, Vote: 31-0-0.

Dr. Herbert J. (Herb) Rissler passed away on January 1, 2017 in Brazil, Indiana. Rissler, whose family had deep roots in Clay County, was born to Herbert and Sarah (Burton) Rissler in Brazil on July 24, 1932. He graduated from Van Buren High School in 1950 and earned his BS (1953) at Indiana State Teachers' College with a major in Social Studies and minors in Geography and Commerce. Rissler's undergraduate days were marked by heavy involvement in several academic societies, including Blue Key (Honors), Pi Gamma Mu (Social Studies), Phi Delta Kappa (Education), Kappa Delta Pi (Education Honors), and Phi Alpha Theta (History), and he later recalled spending many inspiring hours studying in the Normal Hall library. After serving in the U.S. Army in Germany from 1954 to 1956, he began graduate work at the Teachers' College before transferring to Indiana University. There he received his MA (1956) and PhD (1961) in History, writing his dissertation on Charles W. Fairbanks, one of Indiana's most notable Vice Presidents. After working as a Lecturer in History at IU's South Bend campus from 1959 to 1962, Rissler returned to Terre Haute to join the faculty of the newly configured Indiana State College. His subsequent thirty-seven years of service both witnessed and shaped the transformation of the institution into Indiana State University. He quickly became a bastion of the History faculty, achieving tenure in 1966 and promotion to Full Professor and Chair in 1970, a post he held until 1989. After serving as graduate advisor for the following decade, Rissler retired to his family's farm near Harmony, Indiana in 1999. He is survived by his wife, Carolyn (Smith) Rissler (married in 1966), two daughters, four grandchildren, a brother, and a sister.

A tireless advocate for faculty governance, Rissler was a faithful and dedicated member of the university's Administrative Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Student Affairs, Legislative Relations, Bicentennial, and Budget and Revenue Committees, and was especially proud of chairing the Faculty Council that wrote a new constitution in 1969. He was also devoted to effective teaching, publishing several articles in pedagogical journals, serving as a consultant for the Wabash Valley Supplementary Education Center, directing a National Endowment for the Humanities summer institute for teachers, advising Phi Alpha Theta, and coordinating the regional Indiana History Day contest for fourteen years, for which he received a special commendation from Governor Evan Bayh in 1995. He was likewise active outside the university, particularly in the Indiana Academy of Social Sciences, Indiana Council of Social Studies, Indiana Historical Society, Organization of American Historians, United Way, Kiwanis Club, and his church.

Rissler's personal ties to Indiana State University ran deep. It was not only his *alma mater*, but that of his father and daughters as well. Having spent much of his career researching the institution, he was eager to convey the university's proud history to posterity, whether through articles for the alumni magazine (including a biography of George Pliny Brown, the Normal School's little-known second president) or by compiling a treasure-trove of archival material. This was accompanied by his consistent advocacy for the preservation of Normal Hall. Seeing the building fall into ever more dire disrepair, he and a colleague famously salvaged several

panels of the original stained glass dome, and after seeing to their restoration, installed them on the north side of Cunningham Library's ground floor, where they may still be admired today. It is heartening to consider that Rissler's longstanding hopes were finally fulfilled by the recently completed renovation of Normal Hall. Passing under the building's glorious dome today, we may well remind ourselves of the debt we all owe to true believers like Herb Rissler.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to the Rissler family its sincere sympathy and condolence, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication that Herbert J. (Herb) Rissler gave to his students, the faculty, 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) Read by D. Malooley. Motion to Approve, Vote: 31-0-0.

Dr. Leland B. Moore, 94, of Terre Haute passed away on Friday, January 20, 2017 in Union Hospital. He was born April 19, 1922 in Terre Haute. He was preceded in death by his loving wife of 62 years, Lila Ruth Trask Moore who passed away in 2011. He is survived by two children, Ann Van Sandt and her husband John of Marshall, IL; and Gary Moore and his wife Diana of Springfield, IL.

Dr. Moore received his B.S. in 1962 from Indiana State University and both his M.S. and in 1968, his PhD. from Southern Illinois University. His education also included Diplomas from Coyne Electrical School, the U.S. Army Specialized Training Program, the U.S. Army Signal Corps School, IBM Customer Engineering School, and the Dale Carnegie course.

Dr. Moore's work experience was extraordinary providing him with the real-world expertise that set the foundation for a successful career in education. His industrial career spanned from 1943 until he came to Indiana State in 1968 as an Associate Professor. He worked for the U.S. Army, Stran Steel, IBM Corporation, and Allis Chalmers working with radio communications, electrical power generation, industrial welding, computer systems, and high power and high voltage systems to 161,000 Volts.

Upon joining the Faculty in 1968, he was promoted to serve as the Chair of the newly formed Electronics and Computer Technology Department in the then School of Technology in 1979. He served with distinction as Chair until December, 1985 and retired in 1986. During this time, he was instrumental in the creation and advancement of the National Association of Industrial Technology, (NAIT), now The Association of Technology Management and Engineering, (ATMAE) serving as National President, on the Executive Committee, and Associate Director of the National Board of Accreditation.

As the ECT Department chair, he created a curriculum that became the model for many other universities nation - wide. Starting with a handful of students, the department now has over 430 majors with graduates in successful careers with almost every major company including Hewlett-Packard, IBM, Ford, Corning Glass, Honda, Duke, Indiana-Michigan Electric, Allen-Bradley,

Rockwell, McDonald-Douglass, Collins, Toyota, and Endress+Hauser, to name a few. Without the motivation, drive, and expertise of Lee Moore, the programs at Indiana State most likely would have never attained such renowned and successful status. He was also highly influential in launching the professional careers in Higher Education of many ISU faculty including Dean Robert English and professors Gerald Cockrell, William Croft, and David Malooley. Upon retirement he created the Leland B. and Ruth Trask Moore Scholarship for the ECT Department which continues to this day.

Even in retirement, he continued to consult and work full time doing research and development of electronic and computer automated systems some of which became such successful main line products that garnered the attention of a major company that bought his company outright to attain the product rights. He was a member of the Terre Haute Exchange Club and Phi Delta Kappa. A man of great Faith, his love for God and his church were very important to him. He taught Sunday school for decades and was first deacon at Terre Haute First Baptist Church. He also taught Adult Sunday School at North Baptist Church.

Dr. Leland B. Moore was a man of great knowledge, expertise, skill, compassion, and wisdom. A gentle man that all who knew him, respected him, and were better people because of his friendship and example.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Dr. Moore's family its sincere sympathy and condolence, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication that Dr. Leland B. Moore gave to his students, the faculty, the university, and the field of Industrial Technology.

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) First, I have a legislative update. My last testimony was given about two weeks ago to the Senate. The Fine Arts Building is on our budget.
- ii) An alumnus named Michael Simmons who graduated in 1963 and started the trike race with one of his friends has donated \$3.6 million to support student team activities. So University Engagement will have about \$100,000 per year to support those activities.
- iii) We have hired Tom Recker as AVP for Development. He has a long, successful career in fundraising.

### b) Provost M. Licari

- i) I spent the first two days of this week talking to seven candidates to narrow down finalists for campus visits for the VP of Enrollment Management, Communication, and Marketing. The BCOE dean is at the offer stage. Likewise, deans for HHS and CAS are having airport interviews in the next week or so. Information on candidate schedules will come out in the next day or so. Please interact with the candidates. There will be open session for the entire campus and you should provide feedback.

- 3) Support Staff Report: Barry Overpeck  
Thursday, March 9<sup>th</sup>.
  - a) Lori Elkins, Public Safety Assistant Director of Parking Traffic,
    - i) Discussed Parking on campus and the different services provided to and from the different lots
  - b) Wil Downs, Associate Vice President of Human Resources,
    - i) Worked with the Benefits committee on performance review process
    - ii) Will update us at our next meeting as to what they might be able to implement
    - iii) Wellness Coordinator has resigned
      - (1) Position will not be filled immediately
    - iv) FLSA
      - (1) Should know more about it moving forward by May 2<sup>nd</sup>
      - (2) Unsure what ISU will do if the amendment does not pass
    - v) State Budget appropriations
      - (1) Reallocations of funds are being worked on so that the university can absorb the loss of income without any faculty/staff losing their jobs
      - (2) Way and Means committee – Should have a better idea by April 22<sup>nd</sup>
  - c) Executive Report
    - i) May 18<sup>th</sup> tentative date for the Annual Meeting from 10-12pm
    - ii) Finished our t-shirt campaign
    - iii) Faculty and Staff campaign challenge
      - (1) Roxanne Torrence, Staff Council Chair, will wear the Sycamore Sam outfit and shake hands at the fountain
      - (2) At least \$5 donation to whatever Foundation account each representative chooses
  - d) New Business
    - i) By Laws Updates
      - (1) Grammatical errors
        - (a) Elections coordinator had “s” left off
        - (b) Extra “and” under definition of staff
      - (2) Changes
        - (a) Combined University Development (15 people) and University Engagement (40 people) together PASSED
        - (b) Added new non-exempt professional category definition PASSED
        - (c) Removed Rep Session requirement PASSED
        - (d) Election Committee changed to Elections Coordinator PASSED
          - (i) Parliamentarian as backup for Elections Coordinator
      - (3) Abolish terms of membership that you have to sit out 1 year after you have served 2 consecutive terms and allow individuals to continue if they wish PASSED
    - ii) Approve full document at next meeting
    - iii) Staff Council General Election
      - (1) Nominations are being finalized
      - (2) Division Elections will begin next week
      - (3) New terms will begin on June 1<sup>st</sup>.
    - iv) Staff Council Officer Elections
      - (1) Nominations for officer will begin next month
      - (2) Officer elections will be held during our regular May meeting

- e) Committee Reports
    - i) Employee Relations
      - (1) Moving Rep Sessions towards 5 -20 minute talks through video
      - (2) Reviewed their charges
    - ii) Public Relations
      - (1) Chair massages will be on March 31<sup>st</sup>
      - (2) Earth Day Booth – April 19<sup>th</sup> from 11-2 on the quad
        - (a) They will be helping people make bags out of recycled ISU shirts
    - iii) Staff Benefits
      - (1) Discussed FLSA
      - (2) Discussed performance evaluation recommendations
      - (3) Express Scripts
        - (a) Sent out letters to some employees notifying them that they can purchase prescriptions at only one specific location
        - (b) Notifications will stop. Employees are able to get prescriptions at any location
          - (i) If you continue receiving this notification, contact Joey Newport
  - f) Martha – One Million Stars Against Violence campaign
    - (1) Raise awareness about violence around the world
    - (2) Global initiative
    - (3) 10,000 stars by ISU
    - (4) Community service time might be able to be used – must be approved by Community Engagement
    - (5) Hope to be done by May 1<sup>st</sup> – shipped out first part of July
  - g) Next meeting April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2017
- 4) SGA Report: A. Velazquez
- a) We want to mention that the student position on the Board of Trustees has opened up and we would like for you to encourage students to apply. Please spread the word.
  - b) I want to congratulate Tanner Smith, our new SGA president.
- 5) Temporary Faculty Advocate: M. Muyumba
- a) I am still working with OIT regarding temporary faculty and their email. We don't want their email account eliminated if they have a gap of a semester in teaching.
- 6) Chair Report: T. Hawkins
- a) Welcome back. We have a rather full agenda today. Let me begin with an update regarding Senate elections:
    - i) SCOB: 2 nominations for 2 positions – no election
    - ii) Library: 0 nominations for 0 positions – no election
    - iii) COT: 3 nominations for 3 positions – no election
    - iv) BCOE: 2 nominations for 1 position
    - v) CHHS: 7 nominations for 3 positions
    - vi) A&S: 11 nominations for 10 positions

- b) I would like to thank all those who decided to run. V. Sheets, our electioneer, has the ballot ready to go and will distribute it tomorrow along with a link to the form for university and standing committee preferences. Voting will close one week later on the 31<sup>st</sup>.
- c) We will hold a New Senate Gathering at 4:00 on the following Monday, 3 April, on the 9<sup>th</sup> floor of HMSU. This means that everyone entering their second year and the newly elected senators (whether they be brand-new or slightly used) will meet each other. Those interested in an officer position or an Executive Committee seat will have the opportunity to identify themselves.
- d) On Thursday, 6 April, the New Senate will meet again, choose officers, and solicit nominations for the incoming Executive committee. An Executive Committee ballot will be prepared and voting will take place from 7 to 14 April. It is very important that the members of the 2017-18 Senate attend this meeting. Location: HMSU 421.
- e) Other dates to save: on 30 March, we have the Biennial Review Town Hall, including the unveiling of the online training, (DEDE III @ 3:30). Two weeks later, on 13 April, we plan a Special Senate meeting (DEDE III @3:30) to consider a final proposal for Section 305. Senate meets again on its regular schedule on 20 April. When we finish our work we can move to the Faculty Awards Banquet later that evening.
- f) Our Agenda items today begin with the Academic Calendar and include two CAAC proposals (Cyber & Security Studies and Physics). We follow that with two GC items. FAC has brought us proposed language for Section 210. And, we will end with our preliminary discussion of Section 305.
- g) As I mentioned in my email to you, when we get to this point in the agenda, I will ask L. Eberman to take us through the process that led to the drafting of the FAC proposal. I will then ask C. MacDonald to take us through the thinking behind the second proposal: the MacGuell. We can then open the floor to comments and questions. I would like everyone to have the opportunity to speak once before we come back to a second round, if time permits. I will then ask the Senate to instruct the Executive committee to build on whichever proposal has the most support. The officers will then work from that draft, along with the comments we receive, to move the most viable proposal forward.

7) Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes of February 16, 2017

- a) Motion to approve as amended (S. Lamb, J. Kuhlman). Vote: 28-0-3.

8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) D. Israel reading letter from B. Frank:

On behalf of the Jewish community in Terre Haute, I would like to express in the strongest possible terms the Jewish community's alarm and condemnation of the threats made to Muslim faculty at Indiana State University.

In the Jewish community, we know all too well what can happen when a particular group is singled out for stereotyping and scapegoating. Expressions of hatred like this are a direct affront to American and Jewish values of inclusivity and pluralism, and to our belief that all human beings are created in the image of God. Respect for diversity is at the very core of our national identity, is vital for our democracy to thrive, and is among our most cherished values as Americans and as Jews. And, the University is one place, among others, that faculty, students,

and the public should feel safe in a climate which promotes diversity, including religious identification.

Please express our alarm at such threats to the Faculty Senate and the entire University Community. The Jewish community of Terre Haute stands in support of our Muslim brothers and sisters.

Thank you.

b) R. Perrin:

I would like to make four specific observations about the proposed revision of Section 305 in the *University Handbook*:

#### **OBSERVATION 1. ACTIVITY DOES NOT EQUAL SCHOLARSHIP**

I am troubled by the softening of the meaning of *scholarship*—especially by the statements that suggest that community engagement, in and of itself, can be considered scholarship.

Let me make it clear that I have always valued community engagement. In fact, at the request of the Vigo County School Corporation, I worked an entire year with teachers in *every* Vigo County elementary, middle, and high school to develop writing activities. I accrued approximately one-hundred and twenty hours worth of work in the schools, often in collaboration with students from my classes.

I reported these activities as service in my performance evaluations, where I believe they rightly belong.

What subsequently transformed these service activities into scholarship was reflection . . . and writing that was peer reviewed and shared with broader audiences through presentations at professional meetings and in articles in refereed journals and chapters in edited books.

I am troubled that the revised document suggests that engagement activities alone can be deemed scholarship. Although not explicitly stated, the revised document implies that the standard of peer review will no longer be the benchmark for evaluating scholarship. That runs counter to everything I believe.

#### **OBSERVATION 2. DISPROPORTIONAL EMPHASIS**

The proposed language changes under the category of teaching highlight elements in disturbingly disproportionate ways. For example, in section 305.2.1.1 [or 305.2.1, 305.2.2.2, and 305.2.2.4 in the March 22 document], a mere six lines are devoted to classroom instruction of the kind that most of us complete every day, while eight lines are devoted to advising and nine to experiential learning. Such language deemphasizes our most important activity: classroom teaching.

In response to those who would observe that advising and experiential learning require special definition, I contend that the vague opening statement on teaching deserves greater clarity and certainly proportional discussion.

Let me quote from Section 305.2.1.1.1 [305.2.2.1 in the March 22 document]:

Academic advising is central to student success. The advisor is a humanizing agent of the institution [who] serves to guide students through curriculum, academic policy[,] and procedure, and helps to improve student success by encouraging problem solving, critical thinking, and decision making.

I find it both ironic and depressing that such language is applied, by its placement in the document, to advisors only.

To highlight academic advising and experiential learning through expanded treatment—while at the same time treating classroom teaching with a few opening lines about “student learning and articulated outcomes”—is inappropriate and, in my judgment, unacceptable.

### **OBSERVATION 3. “WHERE APPROPRIATE”**

Throughout Section 305, the phrase “where appropriate” appears as a softly edged qualifier. In the substantially expanded sections on advising, experiential learning, and community engagement, the phrase briefly acknowledges—but does not fully clarify—that all faculty may not have the available opportunities, professional connections, disciplinary expertise, personal skills, or professional interests in these areas. I presume that the phrase is intended to acknowledge that all disciplines do not lend themselves to these newly emphasized domains and that *all* faculty should not be expected to meet these criteria.

However, I worry that the conditions that define “appropriate” will be wrested from departments. Further, I worry that through not-so-subtle pressure (implicit in these substantially expanded sections), faculty will feel coerced into doing work to meet leveraged standards, rather than pursue their individual work within their individual departments.

### **OBSERVATION 4. GRADUATE MENTORING DOES NOT EQUAL SCHOLARSHIP**

When I read Section 305.2.1.2.1 [omitted in the March 22 document], I was quite surprised by the statement that Graduate Student Advising/Mentoring “may be most often categorized as scholarship.”

Yes, scholarship is involved: a faculty member’s previous and current scholarship (peer-reviewed, I hope) makes him or her qualified to direct graduate students through their developing scholarly endeavors. We can all agree that such work is a complex mix of teaching, critiquing, encouraging, modeling, cajoling, and guiding. But I don’t understand the premise that advising or mentoring can be equated with scholarship. Scholarship is the foundation of the work, of course, but the work itself *serves* the student, *serves* the program, *serves* the University, and *serves* the profession. To call it scholarship is disingenuous.

## FINAL OBSERVATION

I realize that creating policy documents is a complicated process, one that requires careful definition of principles and clarity in expression. It takes time—lots of time.

But the documents that ultimately emerge should reflect who we are, the principles we value, and the direction we want to go. I may stand apart from others in this room, but the four distinct areas contained in the revised document do not reflect who I am or who I want to be, they do not represent the principles I value, nor do they represent the direction I want the University to go.

Thank you.

c) R. Guell:

There have been times when I have been highly proud of the Senate and what we accomplish. We are an effective body...most of the time. During our February meeting, we did not live up to that standard. On the subject of the Health Communication concentration, people who are otherwise counted upon to provide necessary context were either absent, left before the vote, or remained silent. I was one of the latter, and I regret it.

In post-mortem discussions, it is plain that some Senators chose to vote against the motion on procedural grounds. I am going to take a moment to say what I wish I had said last month and to inform Senators that I will be reaching out to you in the coming week. If I can get sufficient support in those private conversations, I will, in April's new business, make a motion to take up the Health Communication program once again. If I get the clear impression from you that you want this to stay where it is, buried, then I will respect that.

Now, for contextual purposes I will say this: Curriculum belongs to the entire faculty. A department doesn't have the authority to alter its own concentration on its own. The Senate, not CAAC, is the body with the authority to represent the faculty. CAAC acts only as the designated body to offer advice to the Senate. To be clear, CAAC is authorized by the Senate to make decisions on existing program revisions but those decisions are not final unless allowed to stand by the Senate. Typically, that is what happens. However, at any time any Senator could ask for a proposal to be brought to the full Senate for consideration, without regard to the outcome of the CAAC vote. Moreover, a department has the right to request that level of review should the CAAC vote be unfavorable. As Senate Chair, I called the Foundational Studies program change to full Senate review when such an action was not required by the CAPS manual. When CAAC's 2-2-3 vote left the matter in limbo, I was prepared to offer a motion at Exec to bring it to the full Senate. The Department of Communication made my plans moot when it exercised its explicit right to ask for full Senate review. At no stage did Exec or the officers violate proper process. They simply followed it. For those not steeped in Senate processes it may have appeared inappropriate, but it was actually exactly how the process is supposed to work.

Unfortunately, by not explaining this, the debate continued under an unwarranted procedural cloud. The Senate did not hear that Health Communication was a sub-discipline of Communication before it was a sub-discipline of Health. What the Senate did not hear was that

Health Communication exists as a concentration in Departments of Communication (and without explicit health course requirements) at Coastal Carolina University, Montclair State University, Kent State University, Missouri State University, the University of South Florida, and James Madison University. What the Senate did not hear is that the Department of Communication allocated its precious tenure-track hire to filling this role. What the Senate did not fully understand is that students have gotten internships at Riley Children's Foundation and Union Hospital, and graduates have gone on to work with hospital chaplains and PR departments. These students are hired for their expertise in communication and the department's ability to offer a concentration in health communication will only increase student opportunities in these areas.

My doctor has been telling me to lose weight and exercise since I first breached the dreaded 200 pound mark. As well-trained as he is in his discipline, he failed to get through to me. I knew the impact of excess weight and high blood pressure. I knew the health differences between chicken wings and grilled chicken. What I needed was a form of communication that would sink in. That is the type of professional the Department of Communication hopes to create.

When I call, if you voted on principles articulated by Senator Berlin last month, I will absolutely respect that and not attempt to move you off that position. However, if you voted on other grounds, please accept my call, because all I want is for the Senate to make the decision based solely on the merits.

- i) K. Berlin: So we make a decision and we're allowed to come back later and call everyone individually to change their mind?
  - ii) K. Yousif: There have been cases where the Senate reversed a vote.
  - iii) F. Stewart: I think since it was a secret ballot, we don't have to tell how we voted.
  - iv) R. Guell: You don't have to take my call.
- d) S. Lamb: It is so important that we understand that this is another opportunity. That we have to receive input in the P&T document. I appreciate R. Perrin's comment on "where it is appropriate." I'm very pleased that this document doesn't establish four categories. I'm pleased with the effort to make it flexible.
- e) A. Kummerow: I'd like to thank the President for his current position on Instructors. Back in November 2016 in your response to my email regarding the status of Instructors, you indicated that we can correct most, if not all, of the imbalance in the 70-15-15 through normal attrition. Then we appeared to have gone into a full-blown crisis that culminated in a rather vocal response here in the Senate. Having gone through this crisis, there is now a sense of unease and instability that did not exist before and there is increased anxiety amongst Instructors. Regardless of whether it is real or perceived, it is not my concern that there may be Instructors who may leave, but will be considered normal attrition.
- i) M. Licari: Obviously we didn't intend to create any anxiety. As you say, it was an unintended consequence. I am mindful of morale and so we did not of course intend to damage the morale of any group of faculty and so I will apologize for creating that anxiety. We have Instructors coming to the end dates in their appointments and the letters reflected that. Earlier, I spoke to the deans reminding them that for instructors

who are coming to the end of their year to make sure reappointment letters go out quickly.

- 9) Endorsement of Academic Calendar Proposal
- a) Motion to endorse (L. Phillips, S. Lamb).
  - b) Motion to endorse through Summer 2019 (R. Guell, S. Lamb). Vote: 30-1-0.
  - c) K. Yousif: In the Fall of 2019, we have a week off for Thanksgiving and it is study week again. I want to remind everyone that there was a lot of complaint from students about that schedule. It was detrimental in the past. The long-standing inability to coordinate spring break with Vigo County School Corporation is problematic for faculty, staff, and students who have children.
  - d) R. Guell: It would be extraordinarily stupid for us to, on the fly, alter this calendar. Can we pass through the Summer of 2019 now and postpone consideration of any alterations later. I will offer an amendment to divide this calendar and ask that the administration take that up again.
  - e) K. Yousif: I would further note about spring break. It never seems to be seriously taken into consideration.
    - i) S. Powers: We have to set our dates before they have theirs. They always tie it to Easter and snow days.
    - ii) K. Yousif: It seems that for all these years we could have come up with a better collaboration.
    - iii) L. Maule: Just to give a historical perspective. Fifteen years ago, this issue was raised, and it's been raised every year. Our friends and IU Bloomington have figured it out. It is a matter of will, not logistics.
    - iv) J. Gustafson: In AAC, we asked for this.
    - v) D. Bradley: Who is it in VCSC?
    - vi) S. Powers: The Union and the Administration. The Union asks that snow days be around spring break.
    - vii) D. Bradley: From an administrative point of view, we don't care when we have spring break. I ask Exec to make a connection to the VCSC Union. It's more likely to be successful if it is faculty to faculty.
    - viii) D. Malooley: Years ago, we simply called them and were able to coordinate for one year.

10) CAAC Items

- a) Motion to approve CRIM BS in Cyber Security (A. Kummerow, B. Kilp). Vote: 28-2-0.
  - i) D. Woods: We are taking an innovative approach to cyber-security using a social science/behavioral analysis method. This program has been described as a good, high quality program by our constituents who represent agencies at the federal, state, local level and in the private sector. It is a two-track program with cyber dealing with the protection of data and security dealing with the protection of physical facilities. It is a relatively short major that will be inexpensive to deliver and like all our programs will generate revenues beyond its cost. We can launch using existing faculty and resources. There is a high demand for graduates in the field. The ISU partners who will teach some of the courses in the major are SCOB, Math and Computer Science, and Political Science.

- ii) K. Yousif: Last month we approved the BS in Intelligence Analysis and you asked for 7 faculty FTE and this one has 7 faculty FTE. Are they the same faculty?
  - (1) D. Woods: Essentially, no. Although there is some overlap, they are separate proposals. The FTE listed are for other departments, not just CRIM. These are general estimates.
  - (2) C. Olsen: Those are estimates and we aren't asking for anything up front. I asked D. Woods to estimate this in theory for the total increase of faculty FTE in the whole university.
  - (3) C. Lamb: We were assured that they weren't coming from healthy programs. We felt good about two things, that there were sufficient resources to start this program and that resources would only follow if demand warranted. We have to have some faith that there will be rational behavior. I know that the President and Provost have yet to cut programs, but they have paid attention to student-faculty ratios.
  - (4) D. Hantzis: I see you've said it can be met with existing faculty. So should that box have been checked in curriculog?
  - (5) D. Woods: We can launch without additional faculty, but it cannot be sustained without it.
- iii) J. Conant: In the key question committee, this is one of the highest priorities in the state. If we want new resources, we have to attract new students.
- iv) D. Malooley: This is a distance program?
  - (1) D. Woods: 90% of course delivery will be through distance.
- b) Motion to approve BA in Physics (A. Payne, S. Buchanan). Vote: 29-0-0.
  - i) C. Olsen: It is a similar proposal to the BA in Chemistry, which is a non-research oriented track, not geared to those going to graduate school or a heavy laboratory career. It is for those who want some background in physics, but do not want to do research.

#### 11) GC Items

- a) Motion to approve revisions to Handbook Sections 310 and 315 (L. Phillips, J. Conant). Vote: 29-0-0.
  - i) S. Aldrich: We were charged by Senate to revise the language on graduate committees. We then went on a hunt and found 315. We have suggested revisions to both sections given their binary focus on theses and dissertations. We have added creative projects. It opens this and brings it in line with non-thesis/dissertation culminating experiences. We think we should require responsible conduct of research training for supervisors of graduate committees. We think we should have some kind of professional development for chairs/supervisors of these sorts of committees.
- b) Motion to endorse Proposal for Accelerated Graduate Programs (L. Phillips, D. Hantzis). Vote: 30-0-0.
  - i) S. Aldrich: This needed to be developed. Grad Council heard that we would be facing some proposals for an accelerated master's program. We developed the policy from draft proposals. We talked to the registrar, financial aid, other administrative offices to make sure it would work. We see this as a valuable recruitment tool to grow graduate enrollments and strengthen program. It may even serve as a

recruitment tool for undergraduates. It is something that many smaller masters degree programs can use.

(1) S. Lamb: It has been a positive program for the SCOB. We have been able to strengthen our MBA program. It's been a benefit to the strong students. I am pleased that they may take two 600 level courses while they are an undergraduate that will count toward the graduate degree only.

## 12) FAC Items

a) Motion to approve proposals for Sections 210.2.1, 210.2.2, 210.2.3 (E. Gallatin, K. Yousif). Vote: 28-2-0.

i) L. Eberman: We did a lot of research, we consulted with N. Rogers, H. Miklozek, and the Career Ready Taskforce.

ii) K. Yousif: I am just curious about the experiential learning.

(1) D. Bradley: As the student progresses, the experiential learning becomes more professional.

(2) K. Yousif: So it is developmental. Thank you.

iii) S. Lamb: I apologize for asking this. Is this the entirety of our vision statement?

(1) T. Hawkins: Yes.

iv) B. Corcoran: Those other terms are so thoroughly defined, why isn't inclusive excellence similarly defined? Why is scholarship not defined?

(1) T. Hawkins: Our task was to define those three things. Inclusive excellence should be defined.

(2) S. Lamb: It is awfully narrow.

(3) T. Hawkins: The vision statement has been decided and is there. All we are doing is debating the definition of those terms that are in the statement.

b) Discussion Item: Revision to Section 305

i) T. Hawkins: You have two files before you: the one from FAC and the one that came from R. Guell and C. MacDonald. L. Eberman will give us the history of the FAC version and then C. MacDonald will give the other and then we'll open to questions and discussion.

ii) L. Eberman: I would like to take us back to the inception of the work within the Provost's taskforce. Our intent, and I think it is important that we all recognize the intent, was to celebrate and recognize community engagement and experiential learning. We believe it needed to be acknowledge and valued so that the guidelines could appropriately align with the mission and vision of the institution. We also sought to promote excellence at our institution. The FAC group further developed the guidelines trying to acknowledge community engagement and experiential learning without requiring it. We wanted to make sure that we used consistent language that focused on effectiveness, substantial contributions, and excellence.

iii) C. MacDonald: We do have the advantage that this new draft was written yesterday. I want to say that L. Eberman correctly presented much of our intent from the beginning. In both drafts there was not intent to create a fourth domain. The point was to demonstrate those mission-based activities in the three traditional domains. We realize that this is an ongoing process. Everybody doesn't have to do everything. We realize that if you are teaching all sections of Math 101, there may not be a lot of experiential learning and that is OK. I want to mention that one of the things we have

- not done away with is that departments will continue to have the right and the responsibility to create more specific guidelines than are at the university level. So do colleges. The most obvious is that FAC tried to move the mission based activities into the traditional domains. So in the MacDonald-Guell document they are pulled out and we hope you integrate these in the traditional domains as it makes sense in your field. It doesn't mean community engagement is automatically scholarship, but it should count if my department values it as appropriate. The mission-based activities are not intended that everyone has to do it all, it is the faculty as a whole that carries out the activities. And it will change over a faculty member's career.
- iv) S. Stofferahn: I'm a member of FAC and I have read every word many times. I spent a couple hours looking at the new one. Thanks L. Eberman for doing this at FAC. I can assure everyone that it was a careful discussion that took a long time. Having looked at it carefully, it is significant for me to say this. I would support your version over the FAC version. I think it is more eloquent. I would support it with the following nine points:
- (1) 305.2.1.1. The words "active and engaged" are potentially coercive, penalizing those colleagues who might prefer a traditional lecture format in the classroom. Of course I think most students flourish with more active pedagogical techniques, but that does not rule out the possibility (and reality) that some of our colleagues are masters of the art of giving a wonderful lecture. I would therefore suggest replacing those words with "**effective**."
  - (2) 305.2.2. I would suggest starting the second sentence with, "The faculty as a whole are **therefore highly encouraged** to contribute..."
  - (3) 305.2.2. Changing the last word of the second sentence from "performed" to "**valued, particularly with regard to promotion and tenure**" allows the Chairperson to be a champion rather than, unnecessarily, an enforcer. It also solves the implicit impasse set up by the subsections' allowances that "not all faculty may be assigned..." I think that latter language should certainly be retained; it's just that if those allowances are there, then how can the Chairperson be expected to enforce the performance of these duties? I know that one answer will be to tighten things up and get rid of those allowances, but I think that would take us in an unproductive direction.
  - (4) 305.2.2. The third sentence appears to be incomplete. I would suggest adding "**develop over time**" at the end.
  - (5) 305.2.2. Similar to #2 above, replacing "should" with "**highly encouraged to**" will achieve the corrective and avoid the coercive.
  - (6) 305.2.2.2. "**Service**" could easily be added to the domains enumerated here.
  - (7) 305.5. I would suggest different language for the title, since "excellence" is a qualitative term used later in the document. Perhaps something like "**Criteria for Appropriate Achievement** in ..."?
  - (8) 305.5.4.4 and 305.5.4.5. Adding "**peer-reviewed**" to the language about scholarship would solve a lot of problems. This is probably where we're going to have the big debate, which is fine. If, as Chris began to spell out yesterday, the COE has a distinctive approach to this issue, it's within the realm of possibility that such distinction could be enshrined in Handbook language, but that is dangerous terrain, not least because of the fear that this will present an opening to

further de-value research. I think a good number of moderate, sensible folks will cast their vote based on this one issue...but you hardly need me to tell you that. At least some language should be added to strengthen the institution's commitment to solid, respectable scholarly achievement that qualifies us to be professors.

- (9) 305.5.4.5. For scholarship, "sustained efforts" is probably too weak. Perhaps we could replace it with "**a continued record of peer-reviewed**"?
- v) K. Yousif: Last time when we revised parts of 305, we had a general discussion and then went piece by piece. How can we get the most out of everyone?
- (1) T. Hawkins: The reason I released it to the campus before spring break is I wanted everyone to have it. But, as a consequence of that, we got a substantive alternative and I decided that it was important for you to see that there is a significant alternative way of organizing this section so that we could decide which version we are inclined to follow. Hopefully, this will give us a sense of where to go from here and we can set one aside. We will have a dedicated Senate meeting for this section where we can go line by line.
- vi) D. Hantzis: L. Eberman did a wonderful job. If we feel the need to add peer-reviewed, if we want the Handbook to include it, we should insert it where scholarship is defined in 305.2.1.2 and after that, it is referring to peer-reviewed scholarship. Let's not repeat it endlessly.
- vii) L. Phillips: I want to thank S. Stofferahn for suggesting peer-reviewed in there. This helps me support these changes if peer-review appears somewhere.
- viii) A. Kummerow: I do support the MacDonald-Guell version. I have an issue with the acknowledgement of scholarship being there, but no talk of compensation for instructors. It's great to be assigned scholarship, but should be compensated.
- ix) B. Bunnett: Do we wish to apply Occam's razor to the document? Why do we have to "celebrate"? Why do we have to talk about it as a celebratory document? Can we get rid of the coercive parts?
- (1) C. MacDonald: I don't find it coercive.
- (2) B. Bunnett: What purpose do celebratory elements serve?
- (3) L. Eberman: I think it's important to go back to look at where community engagement is in the documents. When we talk about stripping it down, some documents don't align with the mission and vision of the institution. Although, right now, I can't come up with a specific example, the intention is to align these concepts with what we believe is important as an institution.
- (4) T. Hawkins: That is the driving force behind why we are doing it.
- x) B. Corcoran:

I appreciate the caveats and qualifications offered by C. MacDonald and L. Eberman, but I want to comment about my sense of the big picture. I can understand the desire to correct perceived limitations and exclusions in the current P&T policy language, but the current documents before us represent, in my view, a massive over-correction.

To whit, for a number of years now, I have tried to follow the bread-crumbs that might lead to a clear vision of precisely where our administration is taking this university. Now, in the documents before us, I have the clearest articulation yet of our administration's vision for this

university. I believe that the spirit and letter of this current document risk our devolution from a *university* to a glorified community college. This view stems from the following concerns I have about the document.

1. The document begins with mention that “**These policies are guided by AAUP Policy Documents and Reports.**” Really? I see little evidence here that academic freedom is recognized or that peer-review is valued.
2. **305.2** establishes the need for faculty members’ professional lives to mesh with the missions and values of the university. It states: “Activities concordant with the mission, vision, and values of the University are expected of all regular faculty.” This domineering language about Mission/Vision/Values is both heavy-handed and potentially arbitrary when entered into the actual review process. Having been involved in crafting some Mission/Vision/Values statements, I know that with time and leadership changes, the language of Missions, Visions, and Values also changes.
3. **305.2.1.2 Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity:** I am gravely concerned about what the insertion of “**and/or scholarship of engagement**” into this section signifies. A cursory search for this term of art reveals that it is, at least in Earnest Boyer’s 1990 redefinition of academic scholarship, a synonym for applied scholarship—“scholarship of application.” The first problem is that our original policy language already uses Boyer’s formulation of four kinds of scholarship explicitly. [We already talk about the scholarship of *discovery*, the scholarship of *integration*, the scholarship of *teaching and learning*, and scholarship of *application*.] Our only deviation from Boyer’s quartet is that we use the word “applies”; we also link, for some reason, the scholarship of discovery and integration.

Thus, at best, “scholarship of engagement” is redundant and should be struck for that reason alone. However, this redundancy is also a tell in that it puts extra emphasis on “engagement” as a practice as opposed to “scholarship” as a production. What results is institutional affirmation that *activities-even scholarly activities—are equated with conventional modes of peer reviewed scholarship. This is a false equivalence: a difference remains between that which might be termed “scholarly” and that which is scholarship.*

Here is the thin edge of the wedge. The rest of the document should be read through this term’s insertion.

4. **305.2.2 Mission-Based Activities.** The document states: “The faculty as a whole are also expected to contribute in the specific mission-based areas listed below, and it is the responsibility of the chairperson to ensure that these tasks are performed.” This is unbelievably authoritarian. While pedagogical/service activities like advising and mentoring are assumed in the profile of the professoriate, mandating community engagement and experiential learning *activities* for faculty in each of the three conventional domains is an effort to end academic freedom as we know it. Beyond the offensive infantilizing of these sections, I strongly suspect that as future tenure and

promotion denials are adjudicated in court this language will face significant legal scrutiny if these “standards” are implemented alongside the lip service to AAUP’s statements on academic freedom. You can’t have it both ways: affirmation of academic freedom AND mandates on what faculty must do/teach/be.

Despite promises by the executive committee to the contrary, 305.2.2 *IS* the imposition of either a covert 4<sup>th</sup> category of evaluation or, perhaps worse, an overarching filter through which teaching, scholarship, and service will be evaluated. The transformation of mission-ideals into work-life mandates is profoundly disconcerting.

5. **305.5.4.3:** The repeated mantra of “*Evidence of efforts in student advising and mentoring, experiential learning, and/or of effective community engagement, may be used as evidence of efforts in any of the three domains of faculty work*” removes any pretense that we are a university—and should thereby be struck. Again, “activity” is not a substitute for writing published after a peer review process.
6. **To conclude**, the idea of “traditional scholarship” (a misnomer itself)—which this document appears to confront—is *already opened up, in our P&T guidelines*. In watering down the idea of measurable scholarship this document makes the dissertation itself—that thing required for a PhD—meaningless. (The obvious long term hiring issues as the basis of the terminal degree is devalued are frightening.) The fact remains that ***writing for peer review publication*** is damned hard work. It is what most of us did—in the production of dissertations—to get here. This document appears to make an end-run around peer review itself (let alone the documents produced for the peer review process). The creative substitution of ephemeral *activities* for lasting *objects* that can be directly considered—publications—will, as I said at an earlier meeting, ensure that the P&T process is even more ad hoc, more personal, and more prejudicial than it already is.
  - xi) S. Lamb: These are good comments by both of these gentlemen. B. Bunnett’s comment on removing the celebratory nature might put this new possible domain in the appropriate light. I would not mind receiving modifications to the creators, perhaps the MacDonald-Guell document. B. Bunnett, if you would be willing to draft those and send them forward...
  - xii) T. Hawkins: I don’t want anyone to think that what we are commenting on here is what we will vote on.
  - xiii) L. Phillips: I think the motivation for encouraging and celebrating the scholarship of engagement or service is that women faculty do a lot more of that kind of work. They should be celebrated. But if we do that and that means that women can continue to do that more gendered work, that is problematic. There’s study of the difficulty of women going from Associate to Full Professor for this very reason. I don’t want to have this substitute for women having the time to produce scholarship.
  - xiv) C. MacDonald: It’s not only gendered, but consider your colleagues in BCOE with a 4-4 load and say how you can maintain that.
  - xv) B. Kilp: I put it all in black and mailed it to a colleague and what do you think about that? The first thing they said was you’re adding another category. They are all larger than teaching, research and service descriptions and they appear to be more

- important. It's on included in one of the three areas. It is a fourth area. You're creating a fourth area, but I wouldn't want to put it in place of research and traditional service. If you don't have four areas, we have to put it in service.
- xvi) T. Hawkins: There was a unanimous sense that we are not trying to create a fourth domain. As far as the language, we are not creating a fourth domain either overtly or covertly.
- xvii) K. Yousif: I prefer the FAC document. The FAC document places those things in the three existing categories. I don't feel the apocalyptic nature of this document. It is not unreasonable that my employer could ask me to do something. I don't see a weakening of scholarship in any way. You have to have a national or regional reputation. I find this call to arms to be exaggerated.
- xviii) R. Guell: I think it is unfair to C. MacDonald to call it anything other than hers. I authored a much clumsier version of this in a late night discussion in my head, but it was mostly regarding the basic category. Departments would decide how the work fits in with what they value. Departments can be mandated to have it align with the mission, but how that is developed at the individual level is different. The individual doesn't have to meet the assignment, but the department does. The primary authority, the filters with which they are viewed is at the department level. I'm an example of someone who was promoted for nontraditional means in a nontraditional way and I value that more than many. There are faculty members who should be promoted. They are models of behavior at this institution, but using currently defined processes they are unpromotable. We are a generation into this. The only way we will value it is if it is here. What they are doing in regard to experiential learning and community engagement needs to show up in their title and in their paycheck.
- xix) J. Gustafson: I'm glad we are having this conversation before a final draft. There's a shifting of balance in the MacDonald document. Creating this entire section, there is some fairly authoritarian language. Given that the faculty are subordinate to the administration, I feel there's an overwhelming emphasis on mission-based activities. This heavily emphasizes experiential learning and things outside of our traditional three categories. A final note, in 305.5.4.5 we see the shift of balance. So now, I don't know the standard for every department on campus. International or national reputation is something expected of a full professor. While shifting emphasis towards these service activities, it diminished the Professor and Librarian who has a minimum of scholarship with a regional reputation. When we do get to the final revision, I would like to discuss this.
- xx) Motion to direct Exec to work from the MacDonald-Guell document (L. Phillips, D. Cooper-Bolinsky). Vote: 18-8-0.

13) Adjournment 5:40 p.m.