

#13

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

January 10, 2017

3:30 p.m., HMSU 407

Final Minutes

Members Present: L. Brown, J. Conant, R. Guell, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins, C. MacDonald, S. Lamb, L. Phillips

Members Absent: B. Kilp

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

Ex-Officio Absent: None

Guests: B. Bunnett, L. Eberman, R. Peters

1) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley:

i) The Governor's budget just came out this afternoon. He proposes cutting our budget this year by \$1.3 million and adding \$800K the following year. There are no capital funding or inflationary increases for the line items. G. Goode and D. McKee said we should not be worried and we should wait and see what comes out of the House Ways and Means Committee in the next three weeks or so. I make my presentation to that Committee next week. T. Brown has told us he is not a big fan of reallocation for Higher Education money, so he does not want to do any reallocations. For now, we will continue on the plan for a \$1 million reallocation. The University Budget Committee will reconvene towards the end of this month.

b) Provost M. Licari:

i) In regards to the reallocation, to their credit, the deans said they don't have anything to put into the pot. And as advocates for their colleges, that is their job. However, it is also their job to help with the reallocations. We will talk about it on Thursday morning.

ii) The Faculty Recognition Banquet will be moved from April 13 to April 20.

iii) I have a Commencement Committee meeting next week to discuss spring ceremonies. Last spring they were well-attended. This is good, but there is a concern about

accommodating additional attendees. We may do something different for graduate students, both for time concerns as well as space concerns in Hulman Center.

iv) The dean searches continue to move forward. I will have more information publically available shortly.

2) Chair Report: T. Hawkins

- a) I would first like to welcome everyone back to the new semester and New Year. I hope everyone is relaxed and full of energy.
- b) I want to thank everyone who was able to attend the gathering with the trustees on the 16th. I think it went quite well—and it bodes well for future relations with the Board.
- c) S. McConnaughey checked in with me yesterday. She is hoping to be cleared for a return to work by the time Senate meets next week.
- d) Let me note that Exec will meet in HMSU 407 next week as well. We also have a room change for Senate—we will be meeting in Holmstedt 102.
- e) At Senate, aside from the pending action items we are planning for a budget report from D. McKee. I have asked chairs of standing committees for a mid-year update in time for Senate. I will distribute these reports to senators in time for the meeting. This should give us a sense of how the Spring semester will unfold.
- f) We will bring R. Peters to the table after Open Discussion to consider the Traffic Engineering Technology minor.
- g) L. Eberman is here to take us through the FAC recommendation regarding engagement.
- h) We will then invite B. Bunnett to discuss his motion for a collegiality subcommittee.
- i) And we will wrap things up by giving consideration to the AAUP recommendations.

3) Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of December 6, 2016

- a) Approved as amended (L. Phillips, C. MacDonald). Vote: 8-0-0.

4) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

- a) L. Phillips: Over the break I heard from people on two issues. The first is about what we can do when we have disruptive students in the classroom. Faculty are unsure about what they can and cannot do. For example, can you ask a student to leave the classroom? I suggest that FAC and SAC take this up as a charge.
 - i) R. Guell: There is a fairly well-recognized order of operations: (a) disruptive student; (b) faculty tries to intervene; (c) student continues to be disruptive; (d) faculty asks student to leave for that class period; (e) if student does not leave, cancel the class period for everyone, then talk to chair, then Student Conduct Office. Admittedly, this is opaque, and I was chair of the Senate when a faculty grievance resulted from it.
 - ii) D. Hantzis: I appreciate L. Phillips bringing this up. I think we should make a distinction between what we are allowed to do and what R. Guell rightly describes as the customary procedure. Then we should have faculty and student professionals discuss what to actually do. We are having a discussion at our Department mini-retreat about how to respond to these situations. Not everyone knows what to do.
 - iii) T. Hawkins: As a start, we can publicize those steps in the Officers' Musings.
 - iv) M. Licari: It would be good to have an FCTE discussion about this.

- v) D. Bradley: It would be good to have this on the website of the FCTE so it would be there if someone didn't know what to do.
 - vi) D. Hantzis: It is important to have Student Affairs in the conversation because students may not know what appropriate conduct is, and appropriate conduct can vary from class to class. We should have SGA weigh in and have students guide students.
 - vii) C. MacDonald: The piece that is less intuitive to many is that there can be disruption in online classes, and that is not spelled out.
- b) S. Lamb: I think we've scraped our faculty resources down to the bone. As I was trying to find a person to teach a stat class, I heard from a couple of chairs outside the SCOB, one from BCOE and one from CAS, about how frustrated they were in trying to cover demand with existing resources. Please be careful when decisions are made about paring down instructors because some of them are of such enormous value to the institution.
- i) M. Licari: We do have to be mindful of the resources we spend in personnel and as we move forward with the budget. Things are challenging and if enrollment doesn't rebound, the available dollars that the university has is something we have to be mindful of. It is a challenge to manage resource stewardship plus quality plus student-faculty ratio. All of these things need to be balanced, and you can't be wholly focused on any one of these things or you begin to lose sight. I think there's a way to redeploy, and I'll tell the deans to do that. We can't focus on any one of those three things to the exclusion of the others.
 - ii) S. Lamb: There was a time when our ears were shut to any rationale that was presented by the administration. I give a lot of credit to R. Guell for changing that. And given that you have a body that listens and is receptive, I hope you listen to us.
 - iii) D. Bradley: There is a limit to how much you can trim. There is not a limit as to how much political bodies can restrict our revenue. So we have to think about how we can do things differently. We have to. The most obvious solution is to run the university like liberal arts colleges do—not as many courses or majors. Maybe we should knock it down to 60 credits in the major and knock it down to 60 majors.
- c) D. Hantzis: I would like to ask that the Executive Committee have a briefing on whatever classroom assignment algorithm is currently being used. There has to be a better way to meet the needs of faculty and students than for an individual faculty member to ask another to trade classrooms when a room is assigned inappropriately. Pedagogy needs to be figured in room assignments.
- d) L. Phillips: Another colleague said that the raise we received was disingenuous because the 2% bump was coupled with increases to health insurance costs, resulting in a zero raise.
- i) R. Guell: If you smoke, your spouse smokes, you didn't do the health screening, and you make less than \$36K, it could be a wash.
 - ii) D. Bradley: Health insurance is part of compensation. We are self-insured. We are getting older and a bunch of us had major health issues last year. Our usage of health care went up.
 - iii) R. Guell: We are still well short of the split, where we should be with the target.
 - iv) D. Bradley: We still subsidize health insurance for low income families and we're not up to the goal yet of 1/3 employee pay.
 - v) L. Phillips: Some faculty think it is like a company store, that we are getting a raise that then goes to pay for health insurance.

- vi) D. Bradley: I think we have people still living in a past era of low healthcare costs. Healthcare is going to get worse.
- vii) D. Hantzis: Maybe we should have a faculty forum about this that is Senate endorsed. We know more because we sit on the Senate and hear the reports from C. Barton. I don't think faculty are unreasonable, I think they are worried.
- viii) T. Hawkins: We can consider such a forum.

5) Curriculum Item

- a) Traffic Engineering Technology Minor, motion to approve (D. Hantzis, C. MacDonald).
Vote: 7-0-1.
- b) R. Peters: This is a Traffic Engineering Technology Minor. It is comprised of three courses that are currently taught with good enrollment. This will add an extra component for the Civil Engineering Technology students to make them more employable. The Indiana Department of Transportation says this would be a good addition for the students, and we can't increase the size of the major. We thought there might be other students who might be interested in this minor. So, we thought, what would it take to make it a stand-alone minor for another tech major, or maybe someone across campus? We need the mathematics and electronics. So we have a 15 credit hour minor.
 - i) D. Hantzis: So all of the things are required and part of the major. To complete the minor, for the CET major, how many extra classes are needed?
 - ii) R. Peters: One class.
 - iii) D. Hantzis: So students completing the major would only be doing 3 additional hours if they planned for the minor. I think we need to talk about how many hours should constitute a minor vs. a certificate.
 - iv) D. Bradley: The Commission for Higher Education gets into our business with certificates, but not with minors. I don't know that there is a clear definition of what an undergraduate certificate is. They've got those one-year certificates, and even one-semester certificates at Ivy Tech. To keep our own taxonomy straight, I think it might be good if certificates are a bolt-on, not part of a degree program, where minors are part of the degree.

6) FAC Item

- a) Motion to endorse the FAC recommendations: 1. Define community engagement, experiential learning, community service in the University Handbook. 2. Encourage the Promotion and Tenure Taskforce to emphasize the value of engagement within the hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure process (J. Conant, C. MacDonald). Vote: 8-0-0.
 - i) L. Eberman: We brought H. Miklozek and N. Rogers to our meeting. They provided a substantive portion of our recommendations in terms of definitions. Then we charged members to see what was happening in their own colleges. We found a high degree of variability. I agree that the recommendations are mundane, but most of what FAC is doing is looking at P&T guidelines. Maybe some colleges should be embracing this a little bit more.
 - ii) D. Hantzis: Let me say that I think this needs a lot more time than FAC was allowed. We need to do the work to formulate documentation. This is important work. I've done a lot of reading and I think FAC has brought us a good beginning. I think we need to write a report on how to document the scholarship of engagement. The

- definition is in the documentation. I hope we will find a way to move this forward with more attention to documentation guidelines.
- iii) C. MacDonald: We should remove the etc. If there is something else we need to define, let's say what it is.
 - iv) M. Licari: From the standpoint of revising P&T criteria, this will help move us along. I agree that the implications are that someone needs to decide what documenting this looks like. We need this to start those documentation things. Right now, it is a throw-away line, only lip-service.
 - v) R. Guell: I believe the operational definition has to be in the core mission and values: Handbook Section 210. Maybe next years' FAC can seriously delve into section 310 and reformulate it in a way that reflects what faculty are expected to do in all their responsibilities. And then after that, we return to 305 and talk about how it is honored in the faculty evaluation processes. But saying what we believe is an operational definition lends itself to being viewed as throwaway lines. Putting it in mission and values gives it permanence.
 - vi) D. Bradley: I think this idea of including it in the mission and values section of the Handbook is good.
 - vii) L. Eberman: We have been discussing developing a glossary. So we may place definitions where appropriate. Right now, FAC members are being asked to come back with a list of items that might need to go in the larger glossary.
 - viii) T. Hawkins: Let's vote to endorse and then make a separate motion for 210.
 - ix) D. Hantzis: I think it's helpful to have a documentation statement that's useful. UNC Greensboro has an example; we should do something like this. Let's provide an example. There's no reason for us to be wandering in the desert when people have been doing this for ten years.
- b) Motion to instruct FAC to construct an acceptable definition of community engagement and experiential learning for insertion in section 210 of the Handbook (R. Guell, J. Conant). Vote: 8-0-0.
- 7) Discussion Item: Collegiality Subcommittee
- a) Motion: The Senate Executive Committee will create a special committee to investigate how to foster a positive faculty culture. The members of the committee will be appointed by the Executive Committee and should be representative. Their work will conclude, at a time designated by the Executive Committee with the submission of a white paper containing their findings and recommendations (S. Lamb, D. Hantzis). Vote: 8-0-0.
 - i) T. Hawkins: Let's have B. Bunnett summarize his proposal.
 - ii) B. Bunnett: The reason for doing this is to eliminate the reason why some of our faculty do not remain at the university: a lack of collegiality. If we can take some measures to prevent that from happening, we should do this.
 - iii) D. Hantzis: I talked with B. Bunnett after the Senate meeting when he brought this idea to the Senate floor. I agree that it would be a worthwhile endeavor and I also agreed that we don't have a standing committee that has room to deal with this. A special committee has to have a limited focus and a finite time. It seems reasonable to ask some faculty if they are willing to investigate collegiality; not for this to be a fourth rail in tenure and promotion, but what does it mean and how can we foster it.
 - iv) T. Hawkins: Such a committee can be created by 245.7.2.

- v) S. Lamb: I would like to comment that this is certainly a double-edged sword, and I think some people that we would like to see alter their behavior won't see themselves in this. I caution against going outside the realm of peer pressure and definitions that may be misused. I certainly think it deserves investigation. I plead caution as we move forward.
- vi) D. Bradley: I guess I'm seconding S. Lamb. Some of our colleagues here and at other places have turned this into a political hammer. If we could find a substitute term for collegiality, that might be helpful. We'll have the AAUP in the room instantaneously about how this is a breakdown of academic freedom. We're basically saying that people should be nice to each other and support each other.
- vii) D. Hantzis: I did recommend that we get rid of the word greater. I have concerns about the way collegiality has been used to discipline faculty and constrain them. I think B. Bunnett's argument at Senate was that faculty don't know what this means, what the discussion has been. I think D. Nichols would be a good person on this committee. Is there room to talk about supporting each other in a work environment where we are becoming increasingly stressed?
- viii) R. Guell: I spent my early time in Exec as we tried to tackle these problems, and I became convinced that I was unable to thread that particular needle. If someone's time is to be wasted, it should not be FAC's time.
- ix) D. Bradley: I think there are two pieces to this: outright bad behavior and trying to develop a culture of faculty supporting each other. You're really talking about culture.
- x) T. Hawkins: Would it be better to research what is actually being said about it, not promote a particular view?
- xi) D. Hantzis: We need people who will stand with that 2nd year faculty member who is experiencing a bad environment. We need to promote greater collaboration and community.
- xii) L. Eberman: One of the terms that is used is shared responsibility. Shared responsibility for the work of the institution.
- xiii) C. MacDonald: Yes, but I want my faculty colleagues to both do a good job in advising and to not cuss me out in the hallways.
- xiv) D. Hantzis: I think collegiality encompasses all of that. We should use T. Hawkins' suggestions.
- xv) T. Hawkins: The motion can read: Senate Executive Committee will create a special committee to investigate how to foster a positive faculty culture.
- xvi) B. Bunnett: When I created this, I don't want it to have a punitive purpose, but maybe we could have workshops, guest speakers, so that's what I was hoping would come out of it. I know we have existing policies, but that's not the direction I was hoping this would take. I want it to have a more positive purpose.
- xvii) S. Lamb: If we are attempting to develop a climate rather than just a set of rules. I like the idea of not creating Handbook language to accomplish this goal. I like explaining positive behavior in the department.

8) AAUP Recommendations

- a) Motion: Charge FAC with (1) clarification of 305 language of contract vs. appointment and (2) develop language that clarifies first instructor appointment (C. MacDonald, R. Guell). Vote: 6-0-0.
- i) In December the ISU Chapter of the AAUP sent this memo to all of us and to FAC, and I promised I would put their recommendations on our first meeting agenda. We should take a look and see if we have anything to suggest.
 - ii) R. Guell: We do need to clean up contract vs. appointment in 305 as it relates to instructors. It is particularly important at this time when we are trying to right-size the faculty.
 - iii) D. Bradley: How many positions there are in a department is a negotiation between chair, dean and provost. I think that has to be a deal between the three of them.
 - iv) T. Hawkins: AAUP doesn't recommend Handbook changes, but rather a change in the letters.
 - v) D. Bradley: It's just sloppy language to use "contract." Very few here have a contract. I do, some coaches... everyone else has an appointment.
 - vi) R. Guell: However, when an instructor needs to be eliminated and a department has two and the better one is at the end of the contract, I don't think there will be a time when we can keep someone through an appointment in order to keep the better one.
 - vii) D. Bradley: We have that language for instructors in their first year, just like for tenure-track faculty.
 - viii) S. Lamb: It is my understanding that we can terminate an instructors' appointment at any time. We have one-year evaluations. We have the flexibility to keep the superstar.
 - ix) C. MacDonald: Do we have a motion? We send a charge to FAC to deal with language clean-up. Second, investigate a way to clarify what it means to have a 3 year appointment.
 - x) D. Bradley: We could have language that assures that they have one-year notice in the event of non-reappointment. Like we do with tenure-track faculty. In the 1st year, they know by March, in the 2nd year by December, subsequent years get one year notice. You are treated like a tenure track, so things are parallel.
- b) T. Hawkins: In terms of the second recommendation of modifying the content of New Faculty Orientation, we don't have to have FAC do anything there. We can ask that workshops be added to New Faculty Orientation to address these concerns.
- i) R. Guell: We need a cadre of ex-Exec members who know the Handbook who can advise faculty members in trouble. For example, next year, there will be C. MacDonald, S. Lamb, and me, among others.

9) Adjournment: 5:07 p.m.