

#9

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

March 31, 2016

3:30pm, Holmstedt 102

Final Minutes

Members Present: A. Anderson, C. Ball, P. Bro, L. Brown, J. Conant, E. Gallatin, R. Guell, D. Hantzis, M. Harmon, T. Hawkins, J. Kinne, J. Kuhlman, A. Kummerow, S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, J. Pommier, V. Sheets, S. Stofferahn, L. Phillips, E. Hampton, E. Southard, M. Schafer, K. Lee

Members Absent: K. Berlin, B. Bunnett, B. Corcoran, N. Goswami, I. Land, C. Paterson, H. Tapley

Ex-Officio Present:

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

Guests: S. Powers

1) Memorial Resolutions: none

2) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley: none.

b) Provost M. Licari: none.

3) Chair Report:

a) C. MacDonald:

- i) We have no administrative reports today. I would like to provide an answer to a question posed to me regarding the interpretation of a section of the Handbook. Do absences from Special Senate meetings count against your attendance record? The answer is no. I do hope you will attend any way. Typically, Senate meetings are scheduled a year in advance and should already be in your calendar. This is not the case for special meetings.
- ii) Our next meeting is on the 14th. I hope to complete our discussion of the Biennial Review today and vote on revisions on the 14th. At our last meeting on the 28th we will take care of all other business. That's the plan right now, so please help me get

to that point. I would rather not have to call another Special Senate meeting. There is one additional Thursday open in April.

- iii) Voting for the new Senate closes tomorrow at noon. The New Senate Social is on Monday. Officer elections are next Thursday.
- iv) We cannot progress today at the rate we did last time. I ask that you limit your comments to the issue under discussion.
- v) If we can get through the remaining items, it has been suggested that we vote on a motion to instruct Exec regarding the sense of the Senate. I'm willing to entertain such a motion at the end of the meeting.

4) Support Staff Report: None.

5) SGA Report: None.

6) Temporary Faculty Advocate:

- a) M. Muyumba: I mentioned last time that I would meet with FEBC regarding access to the Student Recreation Center. It is still not confirmed whether we have it. According to President Bradley, we do. But the Student Recreation Center says we do not. The issue is now at HR. Hopefully, by this time next week we will know for sure.

7) Approval of March 24, 2016 Minutes

- a) Motion to approve as amended (J. Kuhlman, E. Hampton) Vote: 21-0-3.

8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) None.

9) Biennial Review:

- a) R. Guell: Issue #3: Do we continue with the reconciliation meeting between the dean and the department committee? FAC noted at least two situations where it could be argued that the process was gamed by the department chair when he or she was in the minority regarding the evaluation of a faculty member. The intention of the reconciliation meeting was to see if common ground could be found between the committee and chair. We had a choice between having the dean meet with the committee or eliminating the meeting. FAC chose to eliminate it.
 - i) C. MacDonald: I will say that Exec leaned that way as well.
- b) R. Guell: Issue #4: Interpretive authority. If we had included this paragraph originally, there would be less red ink. There were different interpretations, missed

interpretations, and malicious interpretations that required clarifications. This mirrors the language we passed for the Handbook.

- c) R. Guell: Issue #5 includes things that are sort of bound up in Issue #6. When you as a faculty member complete your work and submit documentation, when can supplemental material be added and what is the standard? FACs view is that the information available to the departmental committee is locked down by the faculty submission. The chairperson has a slightly bigger box, one that includes personnel file information and university data, e.g., a letter of admonishment. Such information could be brought by the chair to the department reconciliation meeting. We wanted to exclude anything in the category of rumor or anything unofficial.
 - i) D. Hantzis: I have a slight point of confusion about the double reference to this information. I agree with the revisions to this section. The first reference is in letter B and the second is in letter D – if that material is being used, isn't it already a part of the chair's review? How would such information be used in an oral communication?
 - ii) R. Guell: The argument for duplicating it is to make clear that not only can the chairperson base his or her recommendation on it, but the chairperson can also bring the actual documentation to the meeting and present the data. It's about not only being able to use it but also being able to present it.
 - iii) C. MacDonald: The benefit is that it gives the committee the chance to see the evidence.
 - iv) M. Schafer: What if there was a deficiency there, but the faculty member already made changes?
 - v) C. MacDonald: Both should be part of the personnel file. The chair should disclose the deficiency and the resolution.
 - vi) R. Guell: That is a potential weakness in the language that would be good for Exec to close.
 - vii) C. MacDonald: Even if we don't close it, it could be the basis for a letter of objection.
 - viii) R. Guell: It would also be a good opportunity to use interpretive authority. The chair of the Senate could clarify this.
- d) R. Guell: Issue #7: There was a circumstance in this round when a faculty member forgot to include a required element. A chairperson who was already predisposed to consider the faculty member deficient evaluated them as "Below Expectations". This would make it the responsibility of the chairperson to ensure that all required elements are there. They are agents of faculty, not bosses of faculty. This makes the agent role explicit. Dr. Powers objects on behalf of chairpersons to the second part—to ensure accuracy of required data. We have a form that we create now with data. We then manipulate it, change it. Somebody has to be responsible for making sure that the data

is accurate. Or, we have to give reviewers authority to check data. Someone has to do it. FAC recommends the chair.

- i) C. MacDonald: That doesn't mean you don't trust all of your faculty. But, you may need to check a random number for accuracy.
- ii) L. Brown: I have twenty-one people I would have to check. That's a lot of checking. I don't think that should be the responsibility of the chairperson. There is also a wide disparity between departments in terms of size.
- iii) E. Hampton I agree. Chairs have more important work to do. This is onerous.
- iv) S. Lamb: I agree.
- v) V. Sheets: I agree. Can't we just accept that it is the faculty member's responsibility for accuracy? I don't want to be held responsible if people were dishonest and I didn't know.
- vi) J. Conant: I don't disagree that it's burdensome, but I would argue that quality control is a sampling process.
- vii) R. Guell: Is it possible to work with M. Miller or whoever is responsible to create a locked data form that would occupy as little space as possible?
- viii) S. Powers: What we did three years ago was produce a PDF that was attached and did not go against your page-number limit. We could possibly work with Insight to find out if we could generate two reports, one being the required data sheet. The chair could run the faculty report in Digital Measures.
- ix) R. Guell: In my opinion it would be most useful to have a solution that did not require verification. I think FAC would be fine eliminating this revision pending technological improvements.
- x) D. Hantzis: I agree about the role of chair. I think the language of reformatting is important. I take issue with the phrase "remains accurate". Faculty need to be alert to possible inaccurate data.
- e) R. Guell: Issue #8: Criteria are to be in place at least a year prior to the Biennial Review. Some departments were changing the criteria up to the time the BR was run.
- f) R. Guell: Issue #9: This clarifies the consequences if one does not submit materials.
 - i) C. MacDonald: There's a whole list of what things could happen if that occurs. Chairs would use good judgement regarding consequences.
- g) R. Guell: Issue #10: If the department has not established criteria, then no one in the department is eligible for an overall Contributing Exceptionally. That motivates the department to approve something.
 - i) M. Schafer: My department is fine tuning its requirements for the upcoming BR. How far up does it have to go?
 - ii) C. MacDonald: Not above the department.
 - iii) D. Malooley: If the department does not explicitly vote...?

- iv) R. Guell: Then they do not have criteria. They have to meet before August and have it recorded in the minutes.
 - v) D. Malooley: If the department is to make it its own criteria, can they be weaker than the college criteria?
 - vi) R. Guell: It can be more stringent but not weaker.
 - vii) C. MacDonald: The deans have the opportunity to talk to the departments.
 - viii) S. Lamb: Our department decided last time to accept the college criteria. Do we need to do it again?
 - ix) R. Guell: Not if you have a vote recorded.
 - x) C. MacDonald: I agree with that. And, until it's changed that is your criteria.
 - xi) J. Kuhlman: Does it say that in the document anywhere that your criteria have to be equal to or more stringent than the college?
 - xii) R. Guell: I'm not sure, but it may be important for Exec to check up on that and close the loophole.
- h) R. Guell: Issue #11: Do chairpersons get evaluated in their role as chairpersons by department committees? Now, anyone with an administrative assignment gets evaluated by the immediate supervisor. Does the faculty committee get to evaluate the chair as chair? I have been persuaded by S. Lamb's position. There is no position in the Handbook as well described as that of department chair. This creates sufficient criteria for evaluation.
- i) E. Hampton: I believe we lack established criteria for any administrative role. I do not think it should be a part of this review.
 - ii) T. Hawkins: I agree. This review is of faculty duties. This means teaching, service, and scholarship. It is not a review of administrators. There are faculty on campus who have administrative aspects to their job. The process now acknowledges that. I think it's important that we distinguish between administrative and faculty review. The way I understand our current administrative review, especially in terms of the chair, is that we effectively check the box to confirm that the administrator is doing his other administrative duties. However, the primary part of the review is the teaching, service, and scholarship.
 - iii) S. Lamb: There would have to be extensive re-writing. Also, you have several chairs serving on the Faculty Senate. Year after year we have pleaded with you to be considered faculty. We don't want to be only the communicator from dean to faculty. If we are only administrators why are we in Faculty Senate? The chairpersons need to be given this. These three-year evaluations are spotty. I have been evaluated once. We need to be evaluated as faculty and need to move into that direction.

- iv) D. Hantzis: I agree with S. Lamb and recognize that this is a complex issue. One of the things we fixed in the early revision was to evaluate chairpersons as faculty members. We have until September 20th for people to be more comfortable. The larger question has to do with faculty who have administrative assignments of 100% but who also do service, scholarship, and teaching. What do we do with them?
- v) T. Hawkins: How can you have a 100% administrative assignment and still do service, etc.?
- vi) D. Hantzis: There's an MOU that was signed by seventeen people
- vii) T. Hawkins: Does that not seem illogical?
- viii) D. Hantzis: That's what we talked about in 2013.
- ix) R. Guell: There is one who sits two chairs down from you in Exec. I have been chair for nine days, and S. Lamb has been chair for 7300 days. The way he is evaluated in his job is supposed to be half time as a chair person and being the agent of a diverse set of faculty. If the input is ignored at the dean level that diminishes him.
- x) E. Hampton: I have no problem with that. This document does not have the criteria for such an evaluation.
- i) R. Guell: Issue #12: Comments are not optional. Again, this was obvious, we thought but in more than a couple of cases, the chairpersons simply checked the box and gave no detail whatsoever. Or they checked the box and then sent a separate explanation. It eviscerated the right to object.
 - i) E. Hampton: I'm in favor of transparency, but this does not cover objections to "Meets Expectations". It should cover all evaluations.
 - ii) R. Guell: We have strayed so far from the original expectations of the BR. That is a legitimate concern. However, we still want to do this with as little work as possible.
 - iii) S. Lamb: At this point it will take three days to read the document.
 - iv) J. Kinne: If you want to object to "Meets Expectations", then you would object on those grounds.
 - v) D. Hantzis: I agree with E. Hampton. Faculty should always be clear on how they are being evaluated. On the other hand, I could still write a statement of objection. Of course this reflects the fact that we have no criteria for "Meets Expectations".. We told departments not to define "meets". Maybe we can revise by September and encourage people to pay attention to the "meets".
 - vi) L. Brown: We are not actually reviewed until September 20th. But the review period ends on July 30th.
 - vii) R. Guell: The year starts when the department starts their review.
 - viii) J. Conant: If we require comments for the middle category, the comments will be simple.
 - ix) J. Kuhlman: Are evaluation forms to be shared with all faculty?

- x) R. Guell: No, the forms get shared down to the individual.
- xi) J. Kinne: But the chairperson meets with each faculty member?
- xii) R. Guell: You have to get your forms. There does not have to be a face-to-face meeting.
- j) R. Guell: Issue #13: If there is agreement that faculty is in the middle category and there exists no letter of objection, then there is no need for a college review. Neither the dean nor committee is to write on the form. No boxes are checked and no narratives. Also, deans are required to examine every submission. This ensures that every two years the dean puts his or her eyes on the work of every individual faculty member.
- k) R. Guell: Issue #14: If you have an administrative assignment you cannot control the length of evaluation your supervisor provides, so we exempt it from the page count.
- l) R. Guell: Issue #15: One page objections can be written for overall assessments or domain-specific.
- m) R. Guell: Issue #16: This folds back to #5&6. It's essentially the same area. They can't bring in stray information.
- n) R. Guell: Issue #17: Exec agrees that this is not needed now.
- o) R. Guell: Issue #18: We mandate training.
 - i) E. Hampton: I would ask if this is aspirational. What happens if the training does not occur? Does it just not occur? Do we leave it for a year?
 - ii) R. Guell: I believe in the integrity of everyone in this room and those who aspire for leadership at the Senate level. If the administration doesn't participate, then shame on them. We are tired of rewriting this. We will do it ourselves, if necessary.
 - iii) D. Hantzis: I would prefer that the consequences be a part of the statement. If the training is not provided then the BR will not be held. People are making mistakes about things that matter. Departments have to implement this. If I am selected for the committee but do not participate in training, then I am off of the committee. We need to be clear about the meaning of this clause. We have to exclude people who do not participate in training.
 - iv) R. Guell: I would suggest that we get an understanding from the administration. The Faculty Senate of next year needs to work with S. Powers and the Provost's Office to create web-based training like *"It's On Blue"*.
 - v) J. Kinne: I would assume some departments wouldn't do it. Could we at least preclude "exceptional" designations?
- p) C. MacDonald: Do we wish to consider a motion to instruct Exec on bifurcation?
 - i) E. Hampton: Do you mean, for example, a motion that would ask Exec to move forward with the bifurcated model of the BR?
 - ii) R. Guell: That is how I would go. Or you could trust Exec to come up with the right language.

- iii) J. Kinne: If you want data you can do a straw poll.
- iv) C. MacDonald: That doesn't go to Exec.
- v) M. Schafer: Can you explain what the difference is?
- vi) C. MacDonald: If you don't want to take an official vote, I am happy to take a straw poll.
- vii) T. Hawkins: The advantage to making a motion is that there seems to be some pushback from the President on this idea. I think that if the Senate is in favor of a bifurcated model it will be easier to express it to the President in the form of a clear motion.
- viii) D. Hantzis: This idea seemed to dominate the last meeting. I am still ambivalent.
- ix) T. Hawkins: If we take a vote now, Exec will have that on Tuesday, and the president will be there. He will not be here on the 14th.
- x) C. MacDonald: That will be the opportunity to hear from you all.
- xi) L. Phillips: One thing that persuaded me was the pool of money.
- xii) J. Kinne: There is definitely something that did not work this time. There's no better way to fix this for this go around?
- xiii) C. MacDonald: That is what some folks think.
- xiv) D. Hantzis: It isn't exactly that there's more money but the 1/7th of "X" and "Y" will be funded.
- xv) M. Schafer: I wanted to share what my department came up with. We worded it such that you would all be evaluated according to what your contract is.
- xvi) C. MacDonald: When we get to Exec, hopefully we can vote on the less controversial issues. We will then bring to you what passes through Exec.

10) Adjournment: 4:40pm