

#11
Indiana State University
Faculty Senate, 2021-2022
Executive Committee
November 30, 2021
3:30 p.m. via Zoom

Members present: A. Arrington-Sirois, A. Arrington-Slocum, S. Arvin, A. Badar, L. Brown, J. Frost, J. Gustafson, K. Hinton, K. Yousif

Absent Members: *none*

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Curtis, Provost C. Olsen

Guest: K. Butwin

1) Administrative Reports

a) President D. Curtis

Thanks to everyone for their work delivering on our mission. A week from Friday we will once again have students walking across the stage at graduation.

Tomorrow I will join three other regional presidents for consideration of regional development awards. These awards will help develop higher education for childhood development. We were once known for our service in childhood development and would like to have that standing again. Last night C. Olsen and I had the opportunity to have dinner with the marching band. It was such a treat to be with them as they celebrated being back on the field.

b) Provost C. Olsen

I will be talking to the Faculty Senate about the Spring testing requirements.

We will be having commencement next Friday and faculty is once again invited. We will have safety measures in place.

2) Chair Report: K. Yousif

As you move through your duties and classes over the next two weeks, I want to ask you to do two things. The first is can you help remind students, faculty, and staff about the regulations that begin January 1st. We must continue to protect ourselves, our students, and our colleagues during the time of COVID-19. Second, in the times of low enrollment our jobs in the classroom is to maintain high academic standards. We must continue to do that extra work in order to keep up the standards even if we are wearing thin. I am grateful for all that you do and want to thank you. Next week will be meeting on Thursday December 9 at the Condit house.

3) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

a) Provost Search

K. Hinton: I was wondering when we will receive the information about the three candidates for Provost.

K. Yousif: That information will be released a couple days before the interviews, to help protect their privacy. It will most likely be a link that will expire after a couple of days. I believe the process starts next week. These will be held via Zoom sessions.

4) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes (November 16, 2021)

Motion to approve A. Arrington-Sirois, M. Badar: 9-0-0

5) Revisions to Policy 912

Motion to approve J. Gustafson, A. Arrington-Slocum: 9-0-0

Motion to approve amendments J. Gustafson, J. Frost: 9-0-0

K. Yousif: Exec members have in hand the FAC document and current policy along with Katie Butwin's input.

K. Butwin: Staff Council is aware of this document. After it is approved it will need to be presented to them so they are aware of the changes. If it is approved it will need to go in front of the Board of Trustees in February as an informational item.

K. Yousif: This a substantial change from the current policy about external employment. Policy 912.6 doesn't currently exist.

J. Frost: I would like to have some clarification on a word choice in 912.3.3. Grieve is used in one part but appeal is used in another. Shouldn't it be consistent? Is the whole paragraph about external teaching? The description and the title are inconsistent to me.

K. Butwin: As long as you are comfortable with using the grievance process to appeal something. I think that it will be perfectly fine.

C. Olsen: "Faculty consulting" might not be a conflict of interest, but there may be situations for staff where consulting might be considered a conflict so it needs to be covered.

S. Arvin: I know of librarians at other intuitions that take side work in cataloging. As long it isn't done on company time I think that would be acceptable side work.

K. Yousif: In the past the reason we have had some problems with this policy. The main abuse we are trying to address is teaching at another colleges that directly infringes on work at ISU.

J. Gustafson: I think changing involving to including would help solve that interpretation problem. This way it just gives an example for something that is problematic but leaves it open to interpretation.

K. Yousif: If these changes get too weighty then we will have to vote on them as an amendment.

S. Arvin: Does this include adjuncts? It is not fair to include them especially if they are only teaching one or two classes and need to teach at other colleges to have enough income to support themselves.

K. Yousif: This only covers regular faculty.

L. Brown: Could we have regular faculty in the section title so we don't have to keep repeating it in all of the subsections?

J. Gustafson: This won't preclude someone from teaching somewhere else, they will just have to report it.

K. Yousif: Just a reminder of what we did for section 912.3 we added regular to the main heading. We put including teaching and we are going to change grieve to appeal.

J. Gustafson: There was a small picky thing in 912.3.5 the final line has a typo. It says 'faculty members' when it should be 'faculty member'.

J. Frost: I noticed that in section 912.6.2 it says employees multiple times before it changes to faculty. I wonder if it should stay employee.

J. Gustafson: "Known to them" would be better. The list of things extends to beyond faculty work.

K. Butwin: There is also the 'thus consistent with above' that can be removed.

K. Yousif makes typographical changes.

L. Brown: 912.6.1 says 'on individual' when it should be 'an individual'.

K. Yousif: In the past these sexually, physically, or romantic relationship policies were hard to write and approve, but the culture has shifted in these past few years and more universities have them. The original policy if you remember has something there about predicting if a person would ever be a student. L. Brown, A. Arrington-Sirois and I agreed to take all of the predictive language out. It seemed to get quite complicated. Expect it to come back up at the Faculty Senate meeting.

M. Badar: Is 6.3 and 6.4 something different since they are almost word for word the same thing that is in number 6.2?

K. Yousif: The idea was that this policy would be used for both faculty and employees.

B. Butwin: Are you say that 6.2 is redundant when considering 6.3 and 6.4?

M. Badar: Most of the points are covered under 6.2.

J. Frost: You might read 6.2 and not think advisors because they don't have supervision or evaluation roles. I am not completely okay with us eliminating them but we might be able to add language to 6.2.

M. Badar: 6.2 line 3 says employment, supervision, or evaluation. If you look at 6.3 it says the same thing.

J. Frost: 6.3 goes a little bit too far because it says faculty can't have a relationship with a student.

B. Butwin: If you like 6.3 and 6.4 better you can just take out 6.2.

J. Frost: I think 6.2 is more general and could cover more people.

K. Yousif: The idea is that universally applies to all employees. Are we suggesting that 6.3 and 6.4 be removed and then we renumber?

J. Gustafson: I think the argument could be made that any time there is a physical relationship between a faculty member and a student regardless if they are responsible for that student there will be a power dynamic that should be recognized. I know that there were some in Senate pushing for a broader policy that wouldn't have any romantic relationships between faculty and student regardless of status, period. I was wondering why there was so much limitation on this?

K. Butwin: What was originally proposed was to have a standalone policy as related to faculty and to remove this from conflict of interest. FAC actually pulled back on that language to have it based on their roles. There is no legal reason we can't put a prohibition on it as other institutions have. Certainly anything is better than what we have which is you are supposed to disclose when you have those types of relationships.

K. Yousif: By making it supervisory or evaluative does it solve enough of the issues or does it need to be broader. L. Brown, A. Arrington-Sirois, and I wanted something very specific when you are in that kind of position that holds authority but we didn't want to go as far as to regulate romance.

J. Frost: I would have to agree with J. Gustafson. I don't see where an undergraduate student and faculty member can have a relationship that doesn't have a power dynamic.

L. Brown: We have talked about some possibilities. Maybe it is an older student that might be an undergraduate and they know each other from the community. I could imagine some scenarios where it could be fine.

J. Frost: Isn't that what the pre-existing clause is for?

L. Brown: Maybe it isn't pre-existing and they happen to be a student in a different program but run into each other on campus. Is there really a good reason to say no you can enter into this relationship?

J. Frost: I would have to say yes, there is, because faculty members have inherent powers over the students.

S. Arvin: I can see an older student that could be in Health and Human Services starts up a relationship with a faculty member that is in Education so they are not likely to be taking classes or even see between themselves any sort of power relationship going on there. Before I was in academia I remember working in hospitality and they had a rule that managers couldn't date the employees. Some of the employees saw that as intrusive, but I can think of examples where it blew up on them. I can see times where there isn't a perceived power dynamic so I would be careful that you didn't go too far.

J. Frost: I would like to say that I come from a university where we allowed for these kinds of things. It appeared that there was no power differential but when things went bad the faculty member wound up shooting her, himself, and several other people. Upon further inspection there had been a power differential. We regretted that we had that policy at that time.

K. Yousif: Any other thoughts, comments, or revisions.

J. Gustafson: Clean up 912.6.5; it repeats the title and 'relationships' should be singular.

K. Yousif: It has taken 4 or 5 years to get to this point. This might not be the idea policy but it is better than what we currently have. It is designed to protect the student and the employee.

6) Standing Committee reports

AAC: Arrington-Slocum: No Report.

AEC: Gustafson: Met yesterday. I was unable to attend.

CAAC: Arrington-Sirois: Met with SAC today about the pass/fail classes. A. Nettrouer from SGA was there and the students seem to be in favor of this. They wanted to know if there was a timeline in which this needed to be completed and I told them as long as it keeps moving forward. We suspended the recreational youth management degree. We reviewed a professional development degree. Anna Viviani will be on sabbatical next term so Melissa Gustafson will be the new secretary.

K. Yousif: Are you any closer to a vote?

A. Arrington-Sirois: They should be voting next week. They also want to meet over Winter break.

K. Yousif: I would believe if you meet next week and vote then there should be no need to meet over Winter break.

FAC: Brown: No Report.

FEBC: Hinton: No Report.

GC: Frost: We met today, approved courses. Admission requirements for the graduate programs were reviewed. It was strongly suggested that programs have a one-step admission process. This would mean that they would have all of the requirements as part of a check list to be approved at one step and not have a next step that requires more/additional information. CIMT PH wanted to do a two-step process so this discussion was tabled. Meetings are going to be Wednesdays from 1pm to 2pm next semester. They are going to have to have a substitute again. There is going to be a call from Dean Collins for faculty to volunteer to work on the interdisciplinary Master's program. The call will go out through Graduate Faculty email or through daily announcements. It was not on the agenda and we are not going to have Graduate Council endorse the idea. R. Gonser asked that the slate have at least one representative from each academic college and that the slate be reviewed by graduate council. That was not a binding agreement and Dean Collins did not acknowledge one way or the other.

SAC: Badar: Had a joint meeting with CAAC. Nothing else to report.

URC: Arvin: Met on November 17 and reviewed the Fall submissions. They reviewed and changed the rubric for the review process. The changes will take effect next Fall.

7) Adjournment 4:23pm