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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

November 2, 2010, 3:30 p.m.

HMSU 227

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, R. Dunbar, R. Guell, C. Hoffman, V. Sheets

Absent: J. Conant, J. Kuhlman

Ex officio: J. Maynard

Guests: J. Powers, L. Sperry

I. Administrative report

 Provost J. Maynard:

a. All letters pertaining to pay raises have been sent to faculty and staff on campus except for a few people who are on auxiliaries, grants and contracts. They should have their letters within the next few days.

C. Hoffman: Will letters for the part time faculty reflect changes?

Provost: Yes, if they are on a term by term or new contract, the letters will reflect those changes.

b. The president sends his apologies for not being at today’s meeting. He is out-of-town and will not be back until tomorrow.

II. Chair report

 S. Lamb:

I was able to review the departmental raises given that I am a chair person. I believe that which has been accomplished this year in the form of raises is very significant and reflects the long run viability of this Institution. My thanks go out to the president and the provost. I think a lot of solid thought went into the process, and it is very much appreciated.

As you all know, there was a successful vote to table the performance evaluation document. It was tabled so that greater faculty input could be achieved. I believe the discussions that have ensued are such that we will be able to improve the document from the faculty’s perspective and achieve much more buy-in in the process. I suspect, had it not been tabled and passed as it was, that the frustrations vented in the interim would have occurred post facto. It is indeed a difficult time for me as well as the rest of you, but nonetheless, I believe that we will end up with much greater buy-in and a more superior product.

Suggestions have been made, and there is a consistent focus to those suggestions. Generally the faculty are very concerned about the dismissal language incorporated into the document. The document will again go through modifications. The next draft will come to the Executive Committee (EC) again, hopefully for its approval. It is my suspicion, if it achieves the approval of the EC again, that we should immediately put it on the website for additional consideration. There have been a few significant issues like this in the past which have called for more input. This issue is one where I should have seen the need for greater faculty input before taking it to Faculty Senate. I apologize for that. We have been engaged in this process for three years now.

Thursday’s forum will give the faculty a chance to ask questions so we can address their concerns. The forum will begin at 3:30 p.m. in HH 103.

III. 15 Open Discussion

a. R. Guell - In description of the formula (pertaining to salary letters) the 90% number did not get altered to 94% is that a mistake?

 Provost: It is 94%. Mark Green was instructed to change it.

R. Guell: There has been a very cooperative effort on salary discussions that produced the letters as well as the performance evaluation process and other things that have come before it and perhaps will come after it. The president and the provost have taken everything we have asked them to take into account on a whole variety of subjects. They have not always agreed with us, but it is very helpful to know that our input is sought, considered, and in many cases adopted.

b. Performance Evaluation Process:

K. Bolinger suggested that in the online postings the document be annotated to depict the major concerns of faculty. There are some major themes running through the document that can be tied together.

R. Guell agreed to entertain a charge to annotate the document when the next iteration comes out.

S. Lamb: I asked R. Guell to search our records and make sure that FAC charges, as well as other Standing Committee charges, were not lost from last year. I thank him for doing this as well as putting together the material (form) related to performance evaluation on the website.

R. Guell: I want to thank Bob English and Diane McCleary for their technical help to produce it. There are major themes running through it (e.g. AUP position related to dismissals, views that the document is overly complicated, etc.) I will try to craft language and send it to the officers in an effort to make the document more concise. It will not change the content.

S. Lamb: It should also be noted that Pre-tenure faculty may opt out of the process…

 R. Guell: They wouldn’t get a rating or any money for it. The language that I crafted would be as follows:

**Pre-Tenure Faculty Exception:** Pre-tenure faculty with a continuous record of unconditional reappointments may opt to not participate in this review but will forgo the opportunity to achieve the “exceptional” rating or the raise that might accompany that designation.

It is my view that once this passes, we will have to re-visit the timing in the way we do annual and tenure reports, which all work on a calendar basis. It needs to be left alone since we are giving pre-tenure faculty an opt out.

S. Lamb: The changes that we are going to bring forward will, of course, be voted on.

c. Question: C. Hoffman to provost - Can you give us any update on the Writing Center’s situation? Provost: I apologize. I do not have enough data; will need to follow up on this.

d. R. Dunbar: What is happening with the searches; do you have any more data on that?

 Provost: Will provide an update on this at a later date.

e. R. Guell: Do we have an official retention number? Provost: Yes, I have a retention report.

R. Guell: The retention report needs to get on the website, to be acknowledged.

IV. **APPROVAL OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 19, 2010.** Hoffman/R. Dunbar 7-0-0.

V. **Summer Teaching, TIAA-CREF contribution**; Clarification needed.

TIAA-CREF Contributions for Summer Faculty *Presented to Board of Trustees*

Proposal 2011-12

Tenured or tenure track faculty currently receiving University contributions to TIAA-CREF retirement annuities based on compensation paid during the academic year will be eligible to receive TIAA-CREF contributions on compensation paid during summer sessions. Contributions will be ten (10) percent of base salary and summer session salary. The compensation must be authorized on a Summer Instructional Pay Authorization form. Other compensation paid outside annual base salary will not be eligible for TIAA-CREF contributions.

The summer TIAA-CREF contributions will begin with Summer 2011.

*Not one-time only form*

*Chairs yes (not acting or interim)*

Provost: The intent concerning the above-mentioned statement is that it will happen. I reviewed some drafts on it. I believe it will be going to the Board of Trustees soon.

C. Hoffman: There is some confusion related to language in the document (e.g. “will be able to receive”. Does this mean they will receive it? ) Summer session salary seems like a double count.

V. Sheets: It means we will get 10% in the academic year and in the summer.

Provost: It is confusing. Some clarification is necessary.

VI. FAC: Information Item, Slates for the various Awards Committees

 Review/discussion

* Caleb Mills Committee members
* Dreiser Research and Creativity Award Committee members
* Service Award Committee members

**MOVED INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION**: 4:00 p.m.

**MOVED OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION**: 4:10 p.m.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT the three slates mentioned above with the exception of one candidate will ask FAC to replace candidate with another suitable nominee.** K. Bolinger/R. Dunbar 5-1-1

VII. FAC items: Linda Sperry presented

• Definition of Emeritus, Emerita Faculty, revisited

 Review/discussion of the following statement:

A tenured faculty member who has provided at least 10 continuous years of honorable service to Indiana State University *may* be awarded the title of Emeritus or Emerita upon retirement from ISU. Eligible faculty members must be nominated by their department chair. A tenured faculty member who upon retirement has provided at least 15 years of continuous honorable service to Indiana State University *shall* upon retirement from Indiana State University be awarded the title of Emeritus or Emerita unless significant cause for non appointment to Emeriti status is presented by their immediate supervisor prior to retirement. In most cases the immediate supervisor is defined as the Department Chair of the retiree’s academic unit. The petition for denial of Emeriti status must be presented in writing to the Dean of the college in which the retiree served and approved by the dean and that college’s congress or faculty governance body.

The conferring of the title must have the approval of ~~the faculty member’s respective department chair or dean,~~ the university provost, the president, and the board of trustees. The title would normally follow the regular professional title, as in Professor Emeritus of History. Once emeritus status has been conferred, such faculty members will be encouraged to continue scholarly pursuits and enjoy continued participation in university activities; they will be offered laboratory and office space as available, on campus. They will maintain continued library privileges, and ISU e-mail accounts.

S. Lamb: I would like to consideration of the following changes:

1) change the 10 to 15; change the 15 to 20.

2) They will maintain continued library privileges, access to the recreation center, and ISU e-mail accounts.

**MOTION TO AMEND DOCUMENT to read:** A tenured faculty member who has provided at least 15 continuous years of honorable service to Indiana State University may be awarded the title of Emeritus or Emerita upon retirement from ISU. Eligible faculty members must be nominated by their department chair. A tenured faculty member who upon retirement has provided at least 20 years of continuous honorable service to Indiana State University…

B. Guell/V. Sheets 6-1-0.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT ABOVE-STATED AMENDED DOCUMENT.** V. Sheets/C. Hoffman 7-0-0.

The provost agreed to look into the availability of retirees to use the Recreation Center.

* Grade Appeal Policy – L. Sperry presented.

 Review Grade Appeal policy to consider adequacy of “informal process” description (including time limits and applicability to CEP students)

***FAC RESPONSE: Under University-level Grade Appeals, change section II. Informal Appeal to the following: Every student must follow the informal appeals process for questioning grades prior to engaging the formal appeal.  On campus students are encouraged, where possible to seek out the instructor for a face-to-face conversation.  The instructor is encouraged to listen to the entirety of the student’s case and then to consider whether the current grade is appropriate.  Should no resolution occur, the student is required to contact the department chairperson. The chairperson is required to meet with the student one-on-one, to seek a conversation with the instructor one-on-one, and then highly encouraged to meet with the two of them together.  Students must initiate their informal appeal within 30 working days of the posting of the grade.  Should no resolution occur, the student may choose to engage the formal appeals process.  Distance Education students are referred to the Office of the Dean for Extended Learning.  Students enrolled in the Corrections Education Program are referred to the CEP Coordinator’s office for assistance in filing an appeal.***

***Executive Committee Members:***

***The following is the policy as it exists today:***

 **Informal Appeal**

All students must follow the informal appeals process for questioning grades prior to engaging the formal appeal. In so doing, they are to, where possible, seek out the instructor for a face-to-face conversation. The instructor is encouraged to listen to the entirety of the student’s case and then to consider whether the current grade is appropriate. Should no resolution occur, the student is required to contact the department chairperson. The chairperson is required to meet with the student one-on-one, to seek a conversation with the instructor one-on-one, and then highly encouraged to meet with the two of them together. Students must initiate their informal appeal within 30 working days of the posting of the grade. Should no resolution occur, the student may choose to engage the formal appeal process.

**MOTION TO AMEND GRADE APPEAL POLICY** to read**:** Students enrolled in the Corrections Education Program are referred to the CEP Coordinator’s office for assistance in communications to support the informal appeal… V. Sheets/R. Dunbar 7-0-0.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT AMENDED STATEMENT:** B. Guell/K. Bolinger 7-0-0.

* Contract Faculty

Make recommendations regarding simplification of multiple faculty categories/classifications as described in University Handbook

***FAC RESPONSE: FAC unanimously approved the proposal drawn up to simplify the categories of Special Purpose, Part-Time Temporary, and Affiliate faculty by pooling them all under the category of “Contract Faculty,”, with a friendly amendment to the section dealing with possible titles of those who are serving the university while employed elsewhere.***

Provost objected to this. Need to present a more formal contract later.

**MOVE TO TABLE** **until Task Force reports–but send this version to Provost.**

R. Guell/ A. Anderson 7-0-0.

* Faculty; Singular or plural, Handbook language

This FAC charge is concerned with that specific section of the  Handbook dealing with faculty academic freedom existing in “Methods of Instruction”. (see page 8, Section III,  It is the second topic under TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES). Interpret that section and determine which part of academic freedom resides with the individual faculty member and which part with the faculty as a collective. For that part which is not individual, what collective has the academic freedom?  After analysis, construct language which is less subject to interpretation.

***FAC RESPONSE: Specific or uniform methods of instruction are not prescribed. Each faculty member is expected to adapt his/her methods to the nature and content of each course.  Selection and organization of the content of particular courses is the individual faculty member’s responsibility and development of departmental curricula is the collective responsibility of department faculty.  Teaching method is the responsibility of the individual faculty member.  The quality of his/her teaching will be given high priority in the faculty evaluation process. Faculty are encouraged to avail themselves of the services of CIRT, which provides an array of opportunities for faculty to continue their professional development.***

Ex. Committee Members; the following is the existing Handbook language;

**310.1.3 Methods of Instruction.** Specific or uniform methods of instruction are not

prescribed. Faculty are expected to adapt their methods to the nature and content of

each course. Selection and organization of content of particular courses and the

development of departmental curricula are faculty responsibilities. Teaching method is

the responsibility of the individual faculty member. The quality of his/her teaching

will be given high priority in the faculty evaluation process. Faculty are encouraged to

avail themselves of the services of the Center for Teaching and Learning, which

provides an array of opportunities for faculty to continue their professional

development as teachers.

**MOVE TO ACCEPT DOCUMENT IN ITS TOTALITY AND BRING FORWARD TO CAAC FOR REFERENCE AND CLARIFICATION**. R.Guell/A. Anderson 7-0-0.

VIII. Diversity statement, Josh Powers, Virgil Sheets

 Review/discussion of following statement:

Whereas, since its inception, Indiana State University has been a leader in promoting and providing education to all citizens, regardless of race, ethnicity, economics, or other disadvantaged social position, and

Whereas, Indiana State University continues to serve a broad array of students that represents the diversity of the population of Indiana and even stands out among state institutions in this regard, and

Whereas our ability to support the success of *all* of our students, to fully connect our curriculum and scholarship to current societal needs, and to further promote our engagement with external stakeholders, is dependent on having a faculty that reflects the diversity of our students as well as the greater public,

We, the Faculty of Indiana State University, hereby encourage the Indiana State University administration and faculty to develop and utilize systematic strategies to enhance the representation of diverse groups among the Faculty and professional staff of the institution.

**MOTION TO STRIKE FIRST THREE PARAGRAPHS OF DIVERSITY STATEMENT** R. Guell/Dunbar

 4-2-1.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT DIVERSITY STATEMENT AS AMENDED.**  S. Lamb/K. Bolinger 7-0-0.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT** J. Dominguez (for two year term) and Eli Bermudez (for 3 year term) to serve on Council on Diversity. Unanimous (7-0-0.)

IX. Need for a Faculty Member to serve on Recreational Center Committee

**MOTION TO ACCEPT**: Don Richards to serve on Recreational Committee. V. Sheets/R. Guell

7-0-0

X. International Enrollment – Informational Item only - **(see attached report**)

Dear Colleagues:

For your information, attached is a report on the demographic and academic profiles of international students matriculating at ISU as of fall 2010. ISU achieved a 10-year milestone as our number of international students eclipsed 500--539. Speaking very conservatively, when considering December graduations, we should remain in record territory for spring 2010. Special thanks to Jay Gatrell, Randy Green, El-houcin Chaqra, Leslie and Will Barratt and Ming Zhou for their willingness to support the campus' recruiting efforts--they have served as our frontline recruiters over the past year and epitomize a very successful collaboration between ISU faculty and staff. And thanks to El-houcin Chaqra for the many hours spent in compiling this comprehensive report.

V/R,

Jacques

**MOVED TO ACCEPT AND EXTEND** appreciation to Jacques Fuqua, Director, International Programs and Services for his successful efforts in International Enrollment. Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.