

Approved via e-mail.

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
2003-2004
APRIL 29, MINUTES

Time: 3:15 p.m.
Place: HMSU, Dede III
Officers: Chairperson H. Hudson, Vice Chair S. Lamb, Secretary Sr. A. Anderson
Senators: C. Amlaner, M. Bahr, G. Bierly, M. Brennan, D. Burger, P. Burkett, K. Byerman,
S. Davis, A. DiSalvo, B. Evans, B. Frank, D. Gilman, J. Harper, D. Hews, C. Hoffman,
N. Hopkins, J. Jakaitis, N. Lawrence, K. Liu, J. Lyman, C. MacDonald, S. Macke,
R. McGiverin, F. Muyumba, B. Phillips, R. Schneirov, V. Sheets, S. Shure, J. Tenerelli
Absent: F. Bell, J. Drake, J. Finnie, J. Gatrell, M. Hayden, M. Ould-Mey, S. Sharp, T. Zaher
Ex-Officio: President Benjamin, Interim Provost Maynard
Visitors: C. Barton, M. Miller

I. A memorial was read and accepted by acclamation into the record for Samuel Mehrley.

II. Administrative Report

President Benjamin:
1) Thanked SGA Chief of Staff, Doug Huntsinger, for his work this academic year;
2) Highlighted State Budget Committee activities during an on-campus meeting this week;
3) Noted continuing discussions with the Riley Efficiency Committee;
4) Thanked Senators and officers for this academic year's accomplishments;
5) Noted continuing 360° evaluations of administrators;
6) Relayed concerns with enrollment, retention and admissions and active initiatives;
7) Encouraged commencement attendance by faculty.

Provost Maynard:
No report.

III. Chair Report

Chair Hudson:
1) Noted the good attendance at the faculty recognition dinner and thanked Academic Affairs for the dinner;
2) Noted the standing committee reports presented at the Spring Faculty Meeting and the good attendance—standing committees accomplished a lot this year;
3) Encouraged participation in remaining open sessions of the Provost candidates;
4) Named members of next year's Senate Executive Committee and officers;
5) Relayed Board action on Senate approved items at the April 23rd meeting;
6) Encouraged Senators to provide feedback on the revised strategic planning documents available on the OSPIRE web site—Senate committees have discussed and these revised documents include their feedback.
7) Thanked Senators for this year's work.

IV. SGA Report

D. Huntinger expressed gratitude for his opportunity to work with the Senate this year and noted a SGA motion to check into the feasibility of building a new recreation center.

V. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

1) A concern was voiced that ISU pairs affirmative action with diversity. Recent all-day seminars by Dr. Michael R. Stevenson, director of the Diversity Policy Institute, Ball State University, were presented on campus. Dr. Stevenson observed that diversity works best when paired with academic affairs.

2) An observation was made regarding the recent identity theft exposure with an admonition that appropriate measures be undertaken to prevent this from reoccurring.

3) R. Schneirov read the following into the record in response to his receipt of the Theodore Dreiser Distinguished Research and Creativity Award:

My scholarship focuses on the origins and further development of the labor movement in the late nineteenth century in Chicago. Back then, the mainstays of early unions were the highly skilled craft workers. They used to know the entire process of production, from start to finish, inside and out. They were apprenticed for approximately seven years under the supervision of a more experienced worker and then could either become a master or stay employed as a journeyman.

But, something happened to end that situation. The work became commercialized and employers introduced a complex division of labor. They found that the simpler parts of the job could be performed by lesser trained helpers and immigrant laborers just off the boat at a much lower rate of pay. So they unbundled the bundle of skills that made up the work of the typical journeyman, leaving only the most skilled parts in the hands of the craft worker. The artisan was replaced in production by a much smaller number of skilled workers and an army of unapprenticed helpers and laborers receiving subsistence pay and closely supervised on the job. These helpers and laborers were hired by the piece, that is a piece-rate, rather than a daily or hourly wage.

During the period after the Civil War that I study, the skilled workers began to form unions, realizing that only when they stood together could they maintain some basic work standards. But, they soon realized that they would have to bring the laborers and helpers into the union; they would have to broaden the circle of solidarity under the principle: an injury to one is the concern of all.

There are some people, including a few here in this room, who would say that this process describes pretty well what is happening to research professors today in this country. Only three decades ago, two-thirds of our faculty members were hired on the tenure track, but since then the job has become subject to a division of labor or unbundling. Teaching has steadily been given over to adjuncts or faculty hired off the tenure track. These faculty usually do not have a terminal degree, the counterpart to apprenticeship, and they are paid by the course, the counterpart to piecework. Their typical yearly pay is usually less than one-third of what a tenured or tenure track faculty member makes teaching the same load. Today 63.7% of all faculty hired in the United States are hired off the tenure track.

We in academia, here and across this country, have some important decisions to make: Are research and creativity, the criteria for the Dreiser Award, essential to the practice of teaching or should teaching continue to be unbundled from research and creativity? Is it acceptable to treat teaching as if it were factory work? Is it right to pay adjuncts the same

rates of pay that McDonald's or Walmart pays its employees? Are long-term costs involved in the industrialization of the work of the faculty?

I am happy to say, with a measure of confidence, that Indiana State University has chosen the high road rather than the low road. Our Faculty Senate, with the support of Provost Jack Maynard, has chosen to upgrade the conditions of our non-tenure track faculty in a very important initiative, which will raise pay, protect academic freedom and academic standards, cap the percentage of non-tenure track faculty who can be hired, and create a post of "advocate" for the rights of adjunct faculty. It will be up to all of us—faculty and administrators alike—to make sure that this initiative is enforced and hopefully improved on, in the coming years.

If we do that, we can be assured that the values that inform and guide the Dreiser Award will remain values that inform and guide the work of all our faculty and the work of this great university.

4) J. Harper read the following into the record:

Today, about half of us will complete our two-year terms on the Faculty Senate. Some of us will also complete two years' service on the Executive Committee. For me, these two years have been my first in the Faculty Senate here.

During the past two years, we've seen deep division between the faculty and the administration be documented for history through the Faculty Senate's resolution on confidence, we've seen a sudden retirement of the Senate chair, and we've seen a sudden resignation of a provost. Yet, in more recent times, we have also seen a renewed sense of cooperation amongst the entire University Community. It appears that many of the issues that we have identified together—compensation, identity, communication, and student welfare, among other—are being thoughtfully and meaningfully addressed.

President Benjamin has identified three institutional objectives—experiential learning, eminent programs, and community engagement (or E³ as I call them)—to assist us in achieving a distinctive, positive institutional identity. He does this at some personal risk. Also, there is risk to the institution as well. This risk, however, is not nearly as great as that associated with failing to respond to the threats and pressures from the external environment. My two years of service in the highest level of shared governance have convinced me that we must respond to these pressures or see Indiana State University die a slow and agonizing death. Whether you agree with E³ or not, we have certainly had an opportunity to provide formative, meaningful input into the definition and direction of these initiatives. In fact, the input sought for the concepts is absolutely unprecedented for the administration.

It is time to move forward on this front, now. Faculty buy-in is absolutely essential for successful transformation of our institution. Our President needs our support. I ask you not to stand behind him. Instead, I ask you to stand with him, shoulder to shoulder, as we move our institution forward. Before I conclude my remarks, however, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge those colleagues who have stood shoulder to shoulder with me through any number of difficult times, sleepless nights, and raw-edged meetings.

Winston Churchill once said that democracy is the worst form of government, except for all the others. A parallel might be drawn to shared governance. Although the Faculty Senate can be criticized as intolerably slow to act, wildly biased, and an impediment to change, there is no doubt in my mind that shared governance improved the education delivered to our students at Indiana State.

Scott Davis, Rich Schneirov, and Harriet Hudson have seen all that I have as members of the Executive Committee for the past two years. Scott and Rich have represented the faculty with grace and dignity, for which they will always have my respect. Nancy Lawrence has spent a year and a half on the Exec (this time). I've served a year with Paul Hightower, "Samy" Anderson, Virgil Sheets, Joe Tenerelli, Veda Gregory—all people that I respect and admire. I've also served on Exec with Steve Lamb and Frank Bell. Steve, Frank, and I represent the faculty on the Compensation Committee. I assure you that their many years of experience and absolute integrity have served you well, and will continue to do so.

Madame Chair, it has been my privilege and honor to serve under your guidance. I remember several conversations last spring where leaders in governance discussed whether you had what it takes to be tough enough for the job. I am sure that similar conversations will not be necessary this spring. Thank you for your leadership. And to so many of, colleagues all, thank you and best wishes.

VI. Approval of the Minutes

Minutes of the March 25, 2004, meeting were approved. (Harper, Liu 30-0-1)

VII. Old Business

None

VIII. New Business

FAC: Sabbatical Leaves

Approved sabbatical leaves operating procedures with Handbook language to follow in Fall 2004. (Hoffman, Jakaitis 29-0-2)

Discussion: noted areas that need refinement when Handbook language is constructed.

AAC: Academic Calendar 2006-2007

Approved as amended. (Hoffman, Liu 28-0-1)

Discussion: placement of spring break—desire for it to be scheduled earlier in the spring semester; spring break restored to AAC recommendation: March 5-9, 2007—(follows 8th week of classes).

CAAC: Physical Science Teaching Major

Physical Science Minor

Approved. (Davis, Lawrence 25-1-2)

Discussion: concern with the number of hours within the major.

FAC: Chairs Handbook Section

Approved revised University Handbook language regarding Academic Department Chairpersons. (Hopkins, Hoffman 26-0-1)

Discussion: allow departments the option for chairs to be under a twelve-month contract with administrative stipend—an amendment to change Handbook language “on the fly” was defeated (3-18-6).

FEBC: Same-sex Domestic Partner Benefits

Approved draft of proposed policy for Same-sex Domestic Partner Benefits. (Harper, Lamb 25-0-2)

Discussion: rationale for excluding same-sex couples: University needs to further explore expense for coverage to opposite-sex domestic partners; questions similar to those asked by other schools offering this benefit and following federal regulations; implementation date.

SAC: Faculty Scholarship

Approved the application procedure and selection process for the Faculty Scholarship with delay for the first award until 2005. (Hoffman, Hopkins 27-0-1)

IX. Standing Committee Reports

AAC: Met once; worked on Professional Satisfactory Survey draft to be administered next year.

AEC: Finished work for this semester.

CAAC: Met five times; approved program and course proposals from: Computer Education and Education Technology program, Industrial and Mechanical Technology, Recreation and Sport Management, Elementary and Childhood Education, Life Sciences and Center for Science Education; reviewed and modified the draft response to the P-16 and Indiana Framework documents; accepted the general intent, integrity and organization structure of the experiential learning strategic plan with the understanding that its recommendation would be the basis for further discussion; received and discussed the Gen Ed Council Curricular issues document.

FAC: Met twice; all charges have been completed; discussed the Experiential Learning document.

FEBC: Met once; worked on health benefits survey.

Grad Council: Met four times; discussed: handling of incomplete grades, issues related to correspondence and distance courses, draft of the revised Probation Policy; and considered curricular proposals.

SAC: Finished work for this semester.

URC: Met twice; concluded discussions of Spring and Summer grant proposals at the April 2nd meeting and letters were sent out. Seven of 8 spring grants, totaling \$11,874, were funded either fully or in part; 19 of 27 summer grants, totaling \$37,634 were funded either fully or in part. In addition, so far this year the Committee has spent \$1996.50 funding reprints and publication costs. The funds remaining in the URC budget as of April 23, 2004, total \$47.00. At the April 2 meeting, the Committee also approved a motion to change the deadlines for URC applications. This motion has been sent to the Senate Executive Committee for consideration. The committee approved a motion sent forward to the Senate Executive Committee modifying the deadlines for the first and second rounds of URC applications.

General Education: met three times; much of the discussion centered on the CAAC request for the Council's response to the Framework for Policy and Planning in Higher Education document passed by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. A statement was written and passed and forwarded to CAAC. The Council also read and discussed "Not Your Parents' Language Class: Curriculum Revision to Support University Language Requirements," an article written by Lisa Calvin and Ann Rider and published in Foreign Language Annals and is considering ways to promote understanding—both on and off campus—of the General Education foreign language and culture requirement; developed a procedure for seeking letters of interest and selecting an Acting Coordinator of General Education for spring 2005, when J. Jakaitis will be on sabbatical leave; and produced in subcommittee letters of reply to be sent to faculty participating in the review and assessment of courses delivering Scientific and Mathematical Studies General Education 2000 requirements. The call for an Acting Coordinator has twice been announced through global e-mails and will be repeated next August and letters to SMS faculty should arrive next week. Finally, Tek.Xam, the modular test-out option for the ITL requirement, will be offered during finals week on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday evenings from 6-9 p.m. in Student Computing Complex 126-127. Faculty teaching ITL courses have been asked to encourage their students to complete Tek.Xam to assist us in setting valid passing scores, and negotiations are underway to offer Tek.Xam during the 2004 summer sessions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m. (Amlaner, Hoffman, by acclamation)