

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

January 21, 2016

3:30pm, HMSU Dede III

Final Minutes

Members Present: A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, P. Bro, L. Brown, B. Bunnett, N. Goswami, J. Kinne, H. Tapley, K. Lee, J. Conant, E. Hampton, C. Ball, V. Sheets, K. Berlin, A. Kummerow, I. Land, E. Gallatin, M. Harmon, L. Phillips, B. Corcoran, R. Guell, S. McCaskey, D. Malooley, S. Stofferahn, T. Hawkins, C. MacDonald, J. Kuhlmann, J. Pommier

Members Absent: D. Hantzis, S. Lamb, C. Paterson, M. Schafer, E. Southard

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

Ex-Officio Absent:

Guests: Malissa Muyumba, R. Perrin, B. Whitaker, M. Hare, Y. Peterson, E. Bermudez, D. Israel, J. Powers, S. Gambill

1) Memorial Resolutions

- a) Approval of Memorial Resolution for Jessie McCune: 28-0-0
- b) R. Perrin:

Jessie McCune completed a BS in English at Indiana State Teachers College in 1946 and an MS in 1956, as well as additional graduate studies at the University of Colorado and Southern Illinois University.

McCune served as an instructor at McMurray College for Women (1948–1950), managed the secretarial pool at the US Corp of Engineers (1950–1952), and taught English and business at Fairbanks High School (1953–1954). McCune then joined the Indiana State University faculty in 1956 and taught in the Department of English until her retirement in 1990.

During her thirty-four years at ISU, McCune served at the University level on the Academic Affairs, Program Review, and Convocation Committees. But her interests and contributions extended beyond standing committees to include serving as Secretary of the Faculty, President of the Faculty Women's Club, President of the ISU chapter of the American Association of University Women (for which President Landini appointed her University representative for

national meetings). In the community, she served as a board member of the Women's Symphony Society and Big-Brother/Big-Sister of Vigo County, as well as served as a docent at the Sheldon Swope Art Museum. In the Department, she served on a wide range of committees, including the Staff Relations and Personnel Committees. Further, she served as the initial chair of the Schick Lecture Committee, which, since fall 1988, has brought over two-hundred scholars to ISU's campus to speak about literature and language.

McCune's special interest, however, was students, and the range of her student-related work is impressive. She taught courses in composition, poetry, short fiction, and drama, but her specialty was Children's Literature. She was Director of Awards in the department, and, from its inception until her retirement, chaired the Hazel Tesh Pfennig Scholarship. At the University level, she was the advisor of Pamarista, a senior honor society, which, under her guidance, became the local chapter of Mortar Board. McCune's love of teaching and her commitment to students was recognized in 1984, when she received the Caleb Mills Distinguished Teaching Award.

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

2) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley:

- i) I was in Florida last week with the Alumni Association and the Foundation. We had a number of good alumni meetings. The Foundation meeting also went well. The Foundation and the Board and Foundation have agreed to bring in an outside reviewer in February to assess the performance of the Foundation.
- ii) The Hulman Center project is moving forward. We have now asked nine architectural firms to submit proposals. We will conduct interviews in February. Our hope is to get all our state approvals before the end of this year and begin construction after the end of the basketball season in 2017.
- iii) Regarding the Strategic Plan, we have a Town Hall meeting on the 25th to begin the review process and get input on the work of the committees. A follow-up meeting will take place on February 9th and will focus on goals and benchmarks.
- iv) We are also moving forward with a facilities master planning project. We will be reviewing what needs to be done over the next five to ten years. In particular, we will need to determine which projects we need to do in house and which must be funded by the legislature. With small projects of a few million dollars, we have to figure out how to do them ourselves. We need to be forward thinking when we go to the legislature. This will be a good process, and I look forward to the report.

- v) I've been reading the key question committee reports for the Strategic Plan. Several comments have been made about our salaries not being up to speed. I would counter that at any time in comparison to our peers and invite anyone to have a conversation about the progress we have made. I think our compensation overall is competitive.
- b) Provost M. Licari
 - i) I will follow up with more detail on the key planning events for the Strategic Plan. We do have a Town Hall meeting this coming Monday in Dede I from 2-5pm. There will be presentations and overviews of the reports. Most of the time will be dedicated to participant comments and feedback. If you can't attend all of it, don't feel bad. There will be breaks to allow people to arrive and leave when necessary.
 - ii) There is a Steering Committee meeting on Thursday. If something from the Town Hall meeting is not addressed, you can contact me, C. MacDonald, or T. Hawkins. We are looking for as much participation as possible. Please encourage your colleagues to attend.
 - iii) Regarding the relatively new position of Special Assistant to the Provost for Inclusive Excellence, N. Davis has resigned his position for a new opportunity. In the interim, I have named J. Powers to take over that position in addition to his other duties. I will launch a national search for a permanent replacement later this semester.
- 3) Chair Report: C. MacDonald
 - a) We will begin our discussion about the Student Grievance Policy today. We found out this week we are not in as much of a rush as we thought. As a result, the Special Senate Meeting on February 11th is cancelled.
 - b) The recent constitutional vote passed. It will hopefully go to the Board in February.
 - c) I want to provide notification for minor changes to the constitution made at Exec: in 245.8 we updated the name of the College of Health and Human Services and the date of the approval of its constitution. A similar revision was made for 323.64. Regarding 246.14, the Executive Committee decided that this was also a minor change. As a result, it won't be a voting item today.
- 4) Support Staff Report: R. Torrence
- 5) SGA Report: V. Cheeks
- 6) Temporary Faculty Advocate: M. Muyumba
No report.
- 7) Approval of December 3, 2015 Minutes
 - a) Motion: (A. Anderson, A. Kummerow) Vote: 25-0-3.

8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) R. Guell: Is the anti-bullying/retaliation policy that passed in the fall going to the Board in February?
- i) M.Licari: Yes.
- b) R. Guell: In the fall I and everybody else who had a supplemental instructor got an email expressing what appeared to be concerns with students being where they were supposed to be. The way the email was phrased, as well as the outcome of it, was insulting. It told us to do things that were not true—e.g., attendance in an SI session was required. It was problematic in that I know from my SI and my training that there were half the number of SIs and SI sections as there had been in the past. This subject is near and dear to my heart. Could you address whether we will have an ongoing commitment to the SI budget?
- i) M. Licari: Yes, thanks R. Guell. In general, yes. The commitment will remain. I'm less familiar with the program here than at my previous institution, but when the SIs are deployed appropriately the program works great. I suspect we are talking about the details of implementation. One of the things about such initiatives is that often times they are expensive because they are time consuming and people-power intensive. The university, as a result of its investment, would like students to take advantage of this resource. It would like faculty to be supportive as well. I apologize on behalf of the division if the email was insulting. Nevertheless, I hope we can have good conversations moving forward about it.
- c) L. Brown: I have been hearing from several faculty across several programs that students are having lots of requirements waived so that they can graduate in May within a six-year period. For example, this has meant waiving upwards of ten to fifteen credit hours. I actually got a request to waive a requirement for a student that failed a course twice. I know I would say no in such a situation, but I wanted to check the stories. I am pretty concerned about the possibility that our students are not being held to the graduation requirements. I think it hurts the students that graduate from ISU.
- i) M. Licari: These exceptions have most certainly come out of the completion specialist initiative cohort that was launched last fall. Some exceptions were granted, but these targeted students who have been around for a long time. Concerns were raised to me via the associate deans, and so tomorrow I will be meeting with them to go over this particular issue to understand what exceptions are reasonable—some are. We need to agree on how much room there is. We do want to strike a balance between being reasonable and protecting the integrity of our degree. We also need to be more communicative.
- d) S. Stofferahn: I was surprised and disheartened by the notice from Admissions that they do not have enough faculty to participate in the Presidential Scholarship interviews. Does this body have any role in this? These interviews are a joy; I have participated many times. I think we are still seventeen volunteers shy for this Saturday.

- i) C. MacDonald: We can send out an e-mail.
- ii) R. Guell: We had the similar issue last year when I was chair.
- iii) C. MacDonald: Also, each of you please lean on your colleagues.
- iv) S. Stofferahn: I understand it's the weekend and people are busy with family, but it's in our best interest to show up.

9) CAAC Items:

- a) Computer Science Major and Mathematics Major
- b) Motion to approve the elimination of the B.A. degree for the Computer Science and Mathematics majors: (A. Anderson, V. Sheets) Vote: 28-0-0
 - i) C. MacDonald: Each of these majors intends to eliminate the option of the B.A. degree.
 - ii) R. Guell: A student who chooses either of those and get a minor in Spanish cannot choose a B. A.?
 - (1) L. Brown: That's changed now. We approved that last fall. They would get a B.S. They wouldn't have the option.
- c) Health Sciences Major
 - i) Motion to approve proposed changes to the Health Science Major: (L. Brown, A. Anderson) Vote: 28-1-2
 - ii) E. Bermudez: We are proposing some changes to the Health Science major. We will be making minor changes to enable students to finish their degree sooner, including adding an internship in the spring and summer. We are also adding a Health Communication concentration.
 - (1) R. Guell: I would like to address D. Israel as the chair of Communication. My understanding is that the input from Communication was not so much from the department as from the chair. Until recently, the department did not have full participation in the development of this proposal. Is that correct?
 - (2) D. Israel: We held a meeting of the curriculum committee on January 15th. We now have a statement in support of the proposal. I think the discussions about the Health Communication concentration have been going on for a long time. At different stages, however, communication between the interested groups broke down. At this time, the Department has voted to support the proposal—considered separately from the issue of resources. There are six COMM courses included. The Department did have some concerns with staffing. Our hope is that we will be able to staff the Health Communication courses, but this is hard to predict. We recognize that this is an important area of growth.

10) GC item: Virtual Instruction Certificate Program

- a) Motion to approve: (A. Anderson, V. Sheets) Vote: 28-0-0

C. MacDonald: I have a statement from Tim Boileau. Specific points that he hopes would be considered by in deliberation on this matter include that it: supports Indiana school corporation partners, aligns with Indiana DOE standards for teacher licensure, serves Indiana students and their families by offering alternative education options, serves Indiana communities by investment in public education, and increase enrollments in ISU Distance Education

11) FAC item: Revision to 246.14

a) C. MacDonald: This was addressed by the Executive Committee as a minor change.

12) Facilitating Challenging Conversations in the Classroom

a) Motion to endorse Faculty Senate participation as a joint sponsor of this workshop : (A. Kummerow, M. Harmon) Vote: 28-0-0

b) C. MacDonald: Let me provide some background. The organizers of this workshop decided that they would like to have Senate's endorsement. This would be jointly sponsored with the Senate, the FCTE, the Office of Student Success, and the Library. It is designed to help faculty have these difficult conversations and not to avoid them. Such conversations are an important part of the academic environment. We hope this will be a starting point that will lead to additional ideas for workshops at the university and college level.

c) J. Powers: We saw this as an opportunity and an investment in our faculty. Other institutions have done this.

d) B. Whitaker: I believe the faculty want to have these conversations. They want meaningful, appropriate conversations. There is a hunger for this on campus. People want the tools. This is one way to give these tools to them.

e) V. Sheets: Are we voting for an endorsement?

f) C. MacDonald: We are voting to put "Faculty Senate" on the workshop.

g) B. Bunnett: The purpose is to facilitate and not avoid difficult conversations. I was wondering if we would consider a second workshop that might explore the issue of when a student wants to avoid a difficult topic. I brought this up in the past in the context of "trigger warnings." I know this has happened before and at other universities across the nation. Do we want to have a workshop to prepare ourselves?

i) C. MacDonald: I certainly believe so. This is just the a starting point. Hopefully, we will be open to many issues.

13) Discussion: Student Grievance Policy and Procedures (Section 460)

a) C. MacDonald: You have the interim policy and procedures that the President approved on December 10. You also have the suggested changes proposed by FAC. I should tell you the Student Grievance Policy Committee met this morning and has made additional changes. This is far from a done deal at this point. We can continue to work on both the policy and procedures to make sure there are sufficient protections for students, faculty,

and staff. We want to consider due process and clarifications for academic freedom as well.

- b) R. Guell: Regarding FAC's issues: in the December iteration, academic freedom was not treated as an exclusion or in a way that would be in my mind appropriate to screen out a grievance or complaint. We recommended reformulating the scope of the policy to include this. We need to protect academic freedom to every degree possible. We recognize that there are circumstances where a faculty member might assert academic freedom in a problematic way—as a veto. The adjudication mechanism in this policy was equal portion student and the person being grieved against. FAC believed only faculty can judge the appropriateness of a claim of academic freedom. We wanted to make very clear that governance units made the nominations to the committee. And, if there are consequences we insisted that they follow the discipline and dismissal procedures in the Handbook. This is not a mechanism to bypass normal due process rights. FAC was uncomfortable pushing on the standard of evidence. It is FAC believes it should not be a preponderance of the evidence. The standard should be higher—clear and convincing. We came to the conclusion that we were never going to get our way. We are willing to trade that to get our way on everything else.
- i) K. Bolinger: Is the intent of this to be an interim policy? Is it going to supplant college policies?
- ii) C. MacDonald: This will be the permanent and it supplants all policies.
- iii) R. Guell: In 246.14 it states that students can use the faculty grievance policy. I couldn't find this last summer. That would be one of the things that would have to be struck.
- iv) B. Corcoran: Can you talk in terms of the limitations?
- v) R. Guell: In every meeting with K. Butwin we said “this is what we want.” FAC thinks this is as good as we can get.
- vi) S. Stofferahn: Might we stipulate that the chair has voting rights on this committee? It occurred to me that it could start a problem.
- (1) R. Guell: It's perfectly appropriate.
- vii) S. Stofferahn: The language is written idealistically but in the form of a vote...?
- (1) R. Guell: We were okay with the 4 to 2 vote because it's 3 students to 2 faculty members. We're okay with that because you have to peel off a faculty member.
- viii) T. Hawkins: I was really happy to see the changes you made overall. With respect to the student grievance have you considered the need for a recusal mechanism? There will likely be conflicts of interest on both sides.
- (1) R. Guell: I think that would be an appropriate protection. I am not sure about the President's view. We did not talk about recusals for faculty in your own college or department. That would also be appropriate. That's something K. Butwin, C. MacDonald and I should think about.
- ix) B. Bunnett: How many student grievances are there in the course of the semester?

- (1) R. Guell: Well, it blew up this past summer with two in one college. The process was very badly put together. We were left with the conclusion that the administration was going to make it up as they went along. I think what we have constructed is a list of exclusions for other processes and academic freedom that will appropriately redirect complaints where they need to go. We need to have for our own ethics a place where students know they can go. We also have a number of Distance Education programs that require us to have an adjudication process.
- x) K. Bolinger: Will what's coming from FAC go to Executive Committee then back to Senate?
- (1) C. MacDonald: Yes, eventually. There are several other individuals who need to review it. We have to get something together by May as that is the ultimate deadline.

14) Adjournment: 4:29pm