

#19

Indiana State University

Faculty Senate, 2021-2022

Executive Committee

March 22, 2022

3:30 p.m. via Zoom

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

Absent Members: M. Badar

Ex-Officio Present: Provost C. Olsen

Ex-Officio absent: President D. Curtis

Guest: E. Southard, K. Butwin

1) **Administrative Reports**

a) President D. Curtis: No report

b) Provost C. Olsen: Welcome back from Spring Break. Just a quick update on surveys. I know it is Spring which means there are a lot of surveys going around and that we get survey fatigue. I hope that you will take part in the FSSE survey. We also have a “healthy minds” survey out there for students right now which comes from Student Affairs. We are participating in the first cohort for EAB [formerly “Education Advisory Board”], which has launched leadership teams and is advancing innovations across the country. We have a small group including members of the cabinet and others who are giving feedback to EAB and let us know where we are in terms of some of our peers around the country. The first cohort has about twenty institutions involved. Basically, it is a survey that looks at the resources that we have available for vice-presidents, associate vice-presidents, and deans that should help them advance some of our DEI goals or what we are not making available. The survey will give us some insight into the kinds of support that leadership needs to address our DEI goals, especially within the strategic plan.

2) **Chair Report: K. Yousif**

FEBC has spent countless hours revising the summer compensation policy. I want to thank all of the members of FEBC and E. Southard for his leadership this semester. As you may remember if you were on the Senate last year, FEBC proposed revisions to summer compensation and it passed at Exec but fail at the full Senate. FEBC has picked up the work again this semester and are proposing a policy of fixed and transparent salary for summer instruction based on credit hours and rank. FEBC worked against many deadlines with very short notice in order to address the issue with the budget, enrollment, and the long-standing culture of summer compensation. I understand that these revisions may be contentious but we most move toward a more open and equitable system for summer compensation that prioritizes student needs. Many faculty rely on summer compensation for a variety of reasons and changing the culture of summer compensation will be difficult. I hold firm that through policy revisions, we should make such decisions rather

than wait for administrators to make cuts due to budget realities. I appreciate your attention and critical discussion that will follow today.

3) Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion

No discussion.

4) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes (March 15, 2022)

Motion to Approve A. Arrington-Sirois, A. Arrington-Slocum: 8-0-0

5) FEBC: Revisions to Summer Pay (505.12)

Motion to Approve A. Arrington-Sirois, K. Hinton: 7-0-1

Motion to Approve Amendment K. Yousif, J. Gustafson: 6-2-0

E. Southard: This has been a lot of work, over two years, to try to get something done. We have felt a real need to engage on this. We didn't want to take heat for cutting faculty pay as that is not something we wanted to do, but given the institutional climate and some of the challenges we are facing we felt like it was imperative to us to show some flexibility and a willingness to engage on this subject and move something forward. I fear that doing otherwise would have put the administration in a bind. The dollars just aren't there and we are going to have to act unilaterally. I think what we moved forward is a fair compromise that simplifies the calculation and will go a long way in what I feel could reduce some of the gamesmanship around summer pay while making it more open and transparent. I think this would go a long way in helping streamline things and help with the budget issues.

A. Arrington-Slocum: I have a question on the independent study as it say up to a maximum of \$2500. Is that the per student amount or is that per course?

E. Southard: That would be the per course rate. What I was told is that there were some courses where a single instructor would be taking up to twenty students through an internship course and getting the rate of \$500 per student. That was something that we added into the language on the day we voted. We set a cap to try to fix that issue.

K. Yousif: I read it as the total amount that you can make from independent study in a single summer. Am I explaining that correctly Eric?

E. Southard: Yes, for a single course.

A. Arrington-Sirois: How is the range determined? Is that by department or college to determine since it is \$300 to \$400 range for independent study? Is it based on rank or something else?

E. Southard: That is a good question Andrea. We went around and around about that. Some felt there should be some latitude there. A lot of the independent study courses may not be all that much work in terms of instruction. It is mostly someone checking in with the professor. There is not a lot of one on one or classroom time. We feel that there should be a range because there some classes during the summer that are very labor intensive. This provides faculty and the chair to have a discussion around what the work load actually is and what the compensation should be. Ultimately it should be up to pedagogy, the discipline, and the workload that is involved.

S. Arvin: I would like some clarification on 505.12.3 where it is describing summer session course, which are subject to meeting minimum enrollment guidelines of the university. What number is listed there, it is not clear on my copy?

E. Southard: It was underscored because the strikeout on the four doesn't show up that well. It is actually six. That is assuming that people are paying the tuition. We have learned that many of our students are on a discounted rate. Let's assume that they are paying the full rate. The minimum

number would cover the cost of what would be paid out to faculty. It is not a huge increase in the minimum numbers but it was created to try to cover the cost of the faculty.

A. Arrington-Sirois: I wonder if C. Olsen can weigh in as to whether this would take some of the budget pressure off. I know there have been a lot of discussions going around to help find ways to preserve summer teaching. Does this satisfy your needs?

C. Olsen: It obviously helps. There aren't going to be any magical solutions to this and that changing the pay structure won't satisfy everyone that wants to teach during the summer. This change would generate at least \$100,000 in savings that wouldn't necessitate further budget cuts for the summer at this point. In theory that could open up more sessions that people could teach. This is going to save a significant amount of money. I would have to run the numbers more carefully than I have to verify that. This is a significant change and it much appreciated as it is a good proposal. The only other comment I had was on the minimum enrollment numbers was that we have been running way over those for quite some time. That has been through the adjustments of schedules, so the minimums have not been as critical. We have not been running courses that small in the vast majority of cases. Just like during the year. We try to combine sections or make tougher choices.

J. Gustafson: First of all, this is so much better than what we have in the Handbook right now. For some it may reflect a pay cut but for many others this is not. This will be a more equitable system for people on the lower end of the salary scale. I wanted to thank you for all of the effort that was put into doing this. With the original charge there was a suggestion that was forwarded about not using nominal figures in the Handbook, because if we put something like \$1500 per credit into the Handbook it can't be easily adjusted without an active senate process and Board of Trustees action. Was that something that was discussed at FEBC, and if so why did they decide to go with a nominal number anyway?

E. Southard: We did have minimal discussion around that and we do have an aversion of putting those types of figures in the Handbook, but we decided that as of late we change the handbook quite frequently and easily anyway. If an adjustment needs to be made that could happen. We could put language in there that would auto correct the numbers if need be. Your point is well taken and we can make a correction in two years once we see what the financial climate is.

K. Yousif: I am going to make an amendment. What we did was have a long discussion about the enrollment guidelines and since we don't typically run courses that low. We just didn't want it to be so prescriptive. [The FEBC draft language says] if [enrollment] is forty or less, we will no longer let people divide the course into multiple sections. My amendment says 'Enrollment guidelines. Enrollment for summer session courses must follow best pedagogical practices and are determined by the instructor, with oversight by the program director or department chair, and the college.'

J. Frost: I am concerned that by taking away the minimums it would be easy to take advantage of faculty that feel like they can't speak up by unethical chairs or dean. The faculty then have a whole bunch of students for independent study at a minimum rate.

K. Yousif: Instead of running a full course?

J. Frost: Yes. I worry about predatory practices on faculty that are less likely to speak up.

K. Yousif: FEBC made one adjustment to the upping the minimum requirement that used to be five and four. So are you more comfortable with actual numbers being in the handbook?

J. Frost: I would say that I am uncomfortable without the minimums so I would vote against this.

A. Arrington-Slocum: I was concerned with removing the language of “forty or less” not to be divided into separate sections because I have watched chairs that were not ethical use that strategy to get everyone more pay. If we have chairs that are ethical in all of the colleges, then this is great.
K Yousif: Our thinking was that the College of Arts and Sciences is not going to run a class for eight. There minimums are closer to fifteen. I am not sure what those numbers are in other colleges.

A. Arrington-Slocum: Would the College of Arts and Sciences run a course of seven if seven students need it to graduate? I am also with you. I don’t know how many courses would have ran at the prior minimum number of five that had seven people in them. I don’t have as big a problem with that as I do with the larger number being divided as I have seen this happen. When you think of those online programs and you change some of those to have more sections.

J. Gustafson: I understand the point but I am more concerned with the other end of it. There is always a check against faculty abuse of the system. There is a whole administrative hierarchy to deal with those things. It was the other end with a lack of a cap that concerned me. What is to stop an overloaded class to go through to save money? I do however think this language is an improvement because it allows a place for the instructor in that conversation about a cap. The upper end is more of a problem than the lower because there is already a system in practice for all of these processes to make sure that faculty are not teaching a course of three or four people and getting \$10,000 for it. If that is happening then that is failure of administration.

K. Yousif: If we leave the minimum numbers in, they’re meaningless for some colleges since many courses with less than fifteen get cancelled. Nowhere in the current document does it say that it is this collective decision.

J. Gustafson: If there is a class that has to absolutely run because you have five or six people that have to graduate that takes it out of the hands of the instructor, chair, dean, and even the college. I could see how that would create problems.

L. Brown: Things will happen below the minimum if there is a compelling reason for them to happen.

J. Frost: I am concerned about a new faculty being told that they have to teach this course over the summer and it is treated as an independent study but requires the full amount of work for nine students.

J. Gustafson: I don’t think anyone can be compelled to teach over the summer.

J. Frost: I think there are faculty that feel if the chair would say that they have to teach over the summer they would feel obligated to do so.

K. Yousif: Nine people is not an independent study.

J. Frost: If there are no minimum why couldn’t it be treated that way?

K. Yousif: The faculty could make a case that independent study indicates two, three, or the original meaning of one.

J. Frost: That is assuming that everyone is reasonable and I have seen a lot of evidence that in some of the colleges and some of the situations not everyone is reasonable.

S. Arvin: I know of faculty that will say that they are compelled when their chair asks them to do such things.

J. Frost: That is why we have faculty Ombud’s person because people were getting taken advantage of.

K. Yousif: I think our argument was that those minimums should be set in an ideal world where people are acting ethically and policy is set with best pedagogical practices in mind by the college, departments, chairs, or program directors. But if we leave in eight and six we are leaving in

numbers that don't reflect the reality of summer. We could then have faculty that say in the Handbook that it has eight people so it has to run. These numbers sort of puts us up against each other in a certain way. I understand the concern about the second part with the maximums. It states that unless you have forty or more you shouldn't be dividing. So does that mean you can divide if it has forty-two? I mean we shouldn't be dividing unless it has two sections. If pedagogy says I can teach my class comfortably with forty-eight then why should I divide? They both seem superficial but both E. Southard and A. Arrington-Slocum have mentioned examples of gaming the system by dividing courses artificially. I think a lot of that has been shut down at the college level and they just aren't accepting it. We need to rely on them to do the work they are supposed to do which is to not allow and tolerate that.

C. Olsen: All of this is very logical and these are great points. I will say following K. Yousif's point a lot of this relies on the college and the departments to be responsible. Obviously the budget is the limiting factor and that is what has been the driving factor over the last couple of years. Which is why this proposal from FEBC is so welcome. It gives some breathing room for colleges to make that type of decision. Those aren't just driven by the budget but by what students need. In terms of the concern over dividing courses, this has been problematic in past years. Starting last year we tried to force the rule that you could not teach two sections of the same course during the same summer session. No one should be doing that. We have had cases in the last couple years where faculty have taught two sections of the same course over different sessions of the summer. Teaching two courses during the same summer session and merging them into one Blackboard discussion should have never been happening and really better not have been happening the last year. We are reliant on the colleges to police this and they have to do that within the budget that they have.

K. Yousif: We will be voting the amendment that will replace the FEBC modified up minimum numbers of students per course. It will be replacing 505.12.3 and eliminating 505.12.3.1 and replacing that with a single statement that says 'Enrollment guidelines. Enrollment for summer session courses must follow best pedagogical practices and are determined by the instructor, with oversight by the program director or department chair, and the college.' After the vote it will take us back to an amended FEBC document or the original.

The amendment passed.

Back to the amended FEBC document. L. Brown, J. Gustafson and I believe that FEBC should have a standing charge to review the data on summer compensation. How many classes are run, who is making what, how many sections, and simply just do some sort of audit so if inflation or wages go up they can propose increases to the rates that exist. That will hopefully be a standing charge. We talked about the floors yesterday. Some people will clearly get a raise and other people will clearly not. Not everyone will be happy.

E. Southard: I can bow out after this and we can get off of the call. On other question. What kind of action needs to be taken to ensure that this could be utilized for summer 2022 since it is handbook language and needs to go to the Board of Trustees? I just wanted to make sure that you didn't look over that piece.

K. Yousif: We are asking for special permission to put for action on the May meeting of the Board of Trustees which means it would go into effect immediately. That is if it passes here and at the full senate meeting.

J. Gustafson: K. Yousif suggested I agree with that point of having an annual charge to FEBC, but I do not. I remain concerned about an annual charge to FEBC to renegotiate salary every year. There is nothing compelling the administration to ever do that if they decide they don't want to. It

will become a Board of Trustee required change if we want to increase summer pay every year. It seems like we are creating an unnecessary problem. I received data from C. Olsen on data floors and believe those should be used for setting an adjustable rate.

K. Yousif: I don't see that as an issue. I think E. Southard stated quite articulately that we change the handbook all of the time. We gave them the charge in February and if it goes through it will have been changed within two months. If they have a standing charge to revisit this starting in August they will have the data from the last summer. They could easily recommend a change in the early in the fall semester and have applicable for the summer. As Eric said it is an issue of looking at the budget situation in a year or two not every year.

L. Brown: It would be just a standing charge to FEBC just like the staffing report is for AAC. It is just something that ever year you take a look at.

J. Frost: There is nothing to obligating anyone to do anything with it once it is complete. I would agree with J. Gustafson's concern. Of course the administration is supportive of something like this, which reduces the cost, but if in the future we wanted to recommend an increase that probably wouldn't have the same unequivocal support that a decrease does. A charge would be them presenting the data, but there is nothing that would require the administration or Board to take action.

L. Brown: That is true but I would say that is always true with anything we present. Ultimately everything we do is a recommendation. The Board of Trustees is God and actually gets to decide. They could also just change the handbook anytime they want but hopefully they wouldn't. Part of why they don't is they are acting in good faith with shared governance.

S. Arvin: Are you suggesting that we don't ask for raises? I am in favor of asking and making them tell us no rather than do nothing at all. Otherwise it is giving up.

J. Frost: I think J. Gustafson is just reluctant for it to be a flat fee in the Handbook.

J. Gustafson: I think it is bad practice to put nominal figures in the handbook period. We then have to adjust them every year instead of them just adjusting with salaries. If we set the flat rates as a percentage of salary floors, that gets us to these numbers and they will automatically adjust with raises. We made this suggestion last year and it failed. We made that suggestion this year and FEBC went another direction and I respect that. I still remained concerned that it is bad practice to put nominal figures in the Handbook.

K. Hinton: I agree with J. Gustafson.

6) Standing Committee reports

AAC: Arrington-Slocum: Meeting Friday.

AEC: Gustafson: No Report.

CAAC: Arrington-Sirois: No report.

FAC: Brown: Sub-Committee meet with Susan Powers and Katie Butwin. There was a request for additional items about how or why a faulty member would wind up in Discipline and Dismissal Since the sub-committee was only working on procedure changes it was decided to add the charge to next year's agenda. The language that has been used so far should be good still.

FEBC: Hinton: FEBC voted on summer pay.

GC: Frost: No Report.

SAC: Badar No Report.

URC: Arvin: Meeting on April 8th.

Adjournment: 4:14 pm