

Indiana University East
Faculty Senate
Year-End Report, 2005-2006
President's Report

Annual Retreat

On August 25 the Senate held its annual retreat at the Richmond Holiday Inn. The theme for this year's retreat was "Elementary, My Dear Watson," signifying the focus on problem solving. The goal of the retreat was to build a sense of empowerment from envisioning our problems as solvable. The stated objective for the day was: "Problems will be named and framed in such a way that we see a way of surmounting or working around the obstacles to achievement of campus goals." Breakout session topics centered around issues concerning which faculty members (and administrators) often express frustration, or at least the need to improve:

- Student success
- Creating a *scholarly* learning environment
- Rethinking faculty workload
- Creating an environment supportive of diversity
- Building a campus community
- What is faculty governance and why should we care?

A summary of the breakout discussions is attached to this report.

Major Senate Actions

Detailed reports of the activities of the committees of the Senate are submitted by the chairs of the individual committees; however, I would like to mention a few of the more significant items.

Admissions & Academic Affairs Committee

With the adoption at the May meeting of campus-specific procedures for implementation of the revised Indiana University *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct* we now have a fully functional new policy. **Everyone should bear in mind that the little green booklets with which we are so familiar no longer are the official Student Code.**

Faculty Affairs Committee

At the beginning of the academic year we had a lecturer policy in place. However, the lack of provision in that policy for the participation of Sr. Lecturers in the review process was widely considered unacceptable. After extensive discussion we arrived at a revised policy that takes into account three factors that were considered especially important (although not always by the same people). The policy calls for the participation of one or more Sr. Lecturer in the review process, it increases the role and input of the divisions in review of their faculty, and it preserves a campus-wide level of peer review. As a first step toward implementation of the policy the Faculty Affairs Committee drafted a description of the composition of the campus-level review committee. The Senate approved the proposed composition at its May meeting. This action creates a new standing committee of the Senate.

General Studies Committee

In April the Senate voted to remove the General Studies Committee from Senate purview, offsetting the addition of the Lecturer Review Committee and keeping the number of standing committees at nine. General Studies will now be unambiguously housed in Academic Affairs.

Agenda Committee

Over the course of the year the chairs of the Senate standing committees compared notes on the difficulties they experienced finding times when the committees could meet. Finding that there was not a single hour between 8 AM and 5 PM Monday through Friday when all the members of the committee could meet was a frequently repeated scenario. In response to this, the Agenda Committee brought to the Senate a motion to set aside the 11:00 – 12:15 time slot on Tuesdays (other than Senate meeting days) exclusively for standing committees to meet. The motion was adopted.

Up-dates on some of last year's items

New Admissions Policy

During 2004-2005 the Senate adopted a new admissions policy. During 2005-2006 the Trustees of the University approved that policy, along with separate policies for each of the individual campuses. This is a change arising out of President Herbert's mission differentiation project; until this year there was one Indiana University admissions policy that was to be followed by all campuses. Now each campus has its own policy.

Academic Handbook

At the 2005 retreat, CDs were distributed containing the Senate Handbook of policies (along with a handbook of administrative policies). It was up to date in terms of the inclusion of all new policies since the last publication, but it was not up to date in terms of the deletion of obsolete policies. The process of weeding out superseded policies is still incomplete and should, in this writer's opinion, be a high priority for the Faculty Affairs Committee in the coming year.

Proposal for a Representative Senate

The motion to adopt a representative senate, which was brought forward at the end of the 2004-2005 session, was discussed at a number of meetings as well as on the listserv during 2005-2006. In the end, the idea died of attrition: a motion to postpone indefinitely the motion to create a representative senate was easily passed at the March 7 meeting, indicating a real lack of interest in changing our existing senate structure.

Items calling for follow-up

- Implementation of the Lecturer Policy

It is essential that the Senate carefully monitor the implementation of the Lecturer Policy to ensure that it is workable in practice. Most importantly and immediately, a process and timetable for electing the review committee needs to be put in place.

- Revisions to the Constitution

The failure of the proposal for a representative Senate to gather popular support leaves some unaddressed membership issues, which had been put on hold while the more comprehensive change was under discussion. In particular, our Constitution defines emeriti faculty as voting members of the Senate and includes them in the calculation of quorum. As our number of emeriti faculty increases this is becoming increasingly problematic. Likewise, there is

currently no provision for not counting faculty on leave toward quorum. In addition, our Constitution allows for representation of part time faculty and describes a process for electing those representatives, who are given voting rights in the Senate. However, the Indiana University policy on academic appointments stipulates that “Visiting and Adjunct appointees do not have voting rights in faculty governance.” These issues should be addressed.

- Recommendation regarding a campus Athletics (or Campus Life) Review Committee

The AAA Committee conducted an extensive study of our current athletics programs to determine whether we should create an Athletics Committee as called for the university’s intercollegiate athletics policy. In the course of that review both the Interim Director of Campus Life (Matt Marshall) and the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services (Ben Young) stated that they are desirous of seeing the campus move to a full-fledged intercollegiate athletics program. As a result, the committee recommended that the Chancellor create a review committee, comprising staff, faculty, and students, to study the advisability of developing an intercollegiate program and make recommendations to the Chancellor. The Executive Council supported this recommendation, although the Chancellor favored creating a committee with a broader purview: to review Campus Life programs, priorities, and plans more generally. Given the many challenges and changes currently facing the campus, it is important that the Senate follow up on these recommendations and ensure that there is faculty input into major decisions regarding the future direction of the Office of Campus Life.

- Status of the Workload Committee

The status of the Senate Workload Committee has been an item of discussion for some time now; however, the issue seemed to gain momentum over the past year. The faculty has been grappling with troublesome workload issues for many years; the question is whether there is a role for a standing committee of the Senate in dealing with these issues. If yes, then the Workload Committee needs to be reconfigured appropriately; if no, it should be eliminated.

- Zero-sum budget review

Chancellor Fulton and the Executive Council have committed to a more extensive budget review process for the 2007-2008 budget. This review would involve more than identifying overdrafts and finding pockets of money to cover them; it would involve looking more in-depth at the base budget allocations of the various units and evaluating the appropriateness of those allocations. The Budgetary Affairs Committee should be actively involved in this process.

University Faculty Council

The UFC action that will most directly affect us is the Policy on Conflicts of Commitment (on the UFC web-site at <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/Commitment.htm>). The university’s Academic Leadership Council (Chief Academic Officers) will be enforcing this policy, so it behooves us to understand its provisions and implications.

President’s Report Submitted by Cathy Ludlum Foes

2005 Faculty Retreat: *Elementary, My Dear Watson*

(Focus on Problem-Solving)

Summaries of Breakout Sessions

Student Success

Original framing of problem: We say our focus is student success, but do we really even know what we mean by that, let alone how to bring it about on a large scale?

Discussion:

1. The IUE six-year graduation rate most recently reported was 17%.
2. Academic Affairs has the analysis of the NSSE [*National Survey of Student Engagement*] data for freshman and seniors from 2001 – 2004. One area that was significantly below average was “Student/Faculty Interaction.” Compared to other Bachelor’s granting institutions, IU East was in the lowest decile. Another area of concern was “Enriching Educational Experiences.”
3. Some in the group believe we are not really “student focused.” We expect the students to adjust to us rather than adjusting what we do to serve the students. If we’re really about student success then that has to be addressed in P & T. If student success is the focus then the entire institution must change. Maybe student/faculty interaction can replace research in P & T? If research is what gets rewarded, that will be the focus over student/faculty interaction.

Reframing the problem: Rather than spending time and energy on a definition, it might be better to focus on “attributes” that contribute to student success. Another suggestion was to ask students what it means to them to be successful.

Possible steps to address the problem (envisioning it as solvable):

1. Some thought a better measure of graduation rates would be once students declare a major.
2. NSSE recommends that we establish target goals for the benchmarks.
3. IU East staff and especially the faculty need to reach out to the community, and need to be seen in the community. If, for example, community service is valued, freshman seminar could be directed toward community service. Programs that have Capstones could focus on community service.
4. We might better promote what is already occurring between students/faculty, e.g.,
 - A publication highlighting student/faculty interaction. The publication could be available at Meijer, Wal-Mart, etc. Each dept would put forth their best examples to Cynthia Vaughn.
 - A day long conference to highlight student faculty interaction (much like the “student research day.”) This could rotate to different IU East locations in New Castle, Connersville, etc.

Participants: Mary Blakefield & Jerry Wilde, *co-facilitators*; Cheryl Stolle, Judy Battraw, Emily Lemming, Brenda Buckner, Betsy Kirk, Mary Folkerth, Neil Sabine, Brian Alenskis, Kathleen Felton, Vicky Beck, Bob Ramsey, Walter Scott

Building a Campus Community

Original framing of problem: A major factor in student success is interaction with faculty members outside the classroom, yet, while there is a wide array of campus-sponsored opportunities for such interaction, few students and fewer faculty members participate in these activities.

Discussion:

1. Our non-residential status obviously has an impact. With low student participation, how can we expect high faculty participation? On the other hand, if you have a passion for something, you will do it.
2. There are logistical issues, but we are also dealing with *attitudes*—faculty attitude that this is “just” a job and as long as they get the job done they don’t need to be here; student attitude that their education consists of nothing more than satisfying course & degree requirements.
3. Best event attendance is during the day; evening students may have different priorities and/or constraints than day students.
4. There are not many inviting spaces for casual interaction, and severely limited food choices.
5. Many of today’s topics are related to one another. Building relationships is important for student success. We need to look at the bigger picture; if we do that we may find overlapping solutions.

Reframing the problem: Instead of thinking about campus community in terms of attendance at events, perhaps we should think in terms of *relationships*. Faculty-student (and student-student) relationships can be fostered in many ways, both on- and off-campus.

Possible steps to address the problem (envisioning it as solvable):

1. We should look at the big picture: our “job” is student success, and faculty-student interaction is a key factor in student success, so faculty members who don’t interact with students beyond the classroom—whether physical or virtual—aren’t fully doing their job. Perhaps each faculty member could commit to doing at least one thing with students outside of class.
2. Can we find more ways to integrate *families* into campus activities?
3. Consider having *fewer* formally scheduled events so people aren’t spread so thin, and take care to coordinate scheduling to minimize conflicts.
4. Informal, unplanned interactions are extremely important; we need to redesign our spaces—physical & virtual—for casual interaction. These might include:
 - a coffee kiosk that could move from building to building—perhaps Mon=WZ, Tue=ML, Wed=HY, & Thurs=RW, for example
 - spaces for specific majors where students could interact informally with the faculty in that discipline
 - an electronic campus “blog” site

Participants: Ange Cooksey & Emily Winburn, *co-facilitators*; John Cowling, Jerome Mahaffey, Peggy Branstrator, Beth Slattery, Frances Peacock, Stephanie Boys, Kim DeSantis, Mardi Bergen, Suzi Shapiro

Creating a Scholarly Learning Environment

Original framing of problem: Are we actively cultivating a scholarly environment. What is the role of faculty research/creative activity in student success?

Discussion:

1. We should distinguish between 2 levels: campus-wide and within individual classes. We promote research within our classes, but not necessarily at the campus level.
2. Faculty & student scholarship is still not particularly visible; few people know what their colleagues are doing. We seem to lack a formal mechanism for promoting scholarly accomplishments.
3. Faculty feel they don't have adequate time to do serious research; some think of Fridays as our "research day," but that is being eroded.

Reframing the problem: The key to creating a scholarly environment is *visibility*.

Possible steps to address the problem (envisioning it as solvable):

1. Consolidate the student research days to make one big splashy event; coordinate w/the campus calendar & incorporate into the master calendar. Invite high school students so they can see what we do. Invite local media.
2. Host more scholarly events (conferences, lectures); advertise the Mindful Explorations Faculty Lecture Series. Invite high school students and local media.
3. Display artifacts of faculty and student research, and make a bigger deal of organized research forums (sabbatical reports, SUMRS Scholar reports, etc.).
4. Make use of the internet to display and/or communicate research; encourage & assist faculty members to develop their own web-pages that would describe their research (could link w/Oncourse so students know what the professor is doing outside of class).
5. To disseminate faculty research info., whenever divisional secretaries process travel requests they could "cc" someone in Cynthia's office who could then contact the faculty member for more information (a little more cumbersome than asking faculty to report directly, but they don't do it).
6. Create spaces around campus for informal discussion of research; make better use of the library. Maybe the library would host a brown-bag series on research.

Participants: Mike Foos & Joanne Passet, *co-facilitators*; Greg Barton, Anne Szopa, Shane Dulemba, Diana Stanforth, Denise Bullock, Greg Weber, Alisa Clapp-Itnyre, Ezekiel Ette, Ron Bingaman, Errol Huffman, Pam Connerly

Faculty Governance

Original framing of problem: Perception that time devoted to faculty governance is not necessarily time well-spent. Very few people are willing to take a leadership role in campus governance.

Discussion:

1. Despite our attempts to promote continuity by making committee terms two years and stipulating (in our bylaws) that only members in the second year of their term could serve as chair, there is often the sense that committees get stuck doing the same thing over and over, not making much progress.
2. It is not always obvious what the impact is of the work done by the committees—it's frustrating to do a lot of work and not know whether it made any difference.
3. We sometimes don't follow our own guidelines (or even know what they are), and people not infrequently try to circumvent Senate policies.
4. Junior faculty members are still being told that they need to serve on Senate committees in order to get tenure, leaving us, in some cases, with half-hearted committee members whose time and energy might better be spent elsewhere.
5. Members of the Senate are, by and large, not familiar with parliamentary procedure, so while there is a benefit to tightening up the meetings it sometimes leaves people frustrated and thinking they have no opening to discuss the issues of importance to them.

Reframing the problem: Over the past several years a number of folks have retired, many of whom were very prominent in faculty governance—both through their own participation and by mentoring junior faculty—and many members of the Senate are new. Instead of thinking of the Senate as dysfunctional we could view the situation as a matter of transition. The problem then becomes, how do we manage the transition so as to emerge with a strong, well-respected governance process? In line with this, don't measure success solely in terms of getting things done; other important measures of success for a governance body are: Are all voices being heard? Are we being appropriately deliberative? Are we discussing things that are important to us?

Possible steps to address the problem (envisioning it as solvable):

1. Some educational steps have already been taken, such as the CD version of the Academic Handbook given to all faculty members and the "Information-at-a-Glance" booklets given to the members of the standing committees of the Senate.
2. Continue committee up-dates included with each meeting agenda and start to post committee minutes so that people have a better idea of what the committees are doing. Make sure members of the Senate know the proper procedure for proposing business for committee consideration.
3. Identify promising junior faculty and be intentional about mentoring them for future leadership roles in faculty governance.
4. Provide a "cheat sheet" on parliamentary procedure. Maybe take a little time at the beginning of each Senate meeting for a brief tutorial on Robert's Rules—what does it mean for a comment to be "out of order"? What are the options for making one's point if one's comment has been ruled out of order?

Participants: Cathy Foos & Markus Pomper, *co-facilitators*; Ed Fitzgerald, Sue McFadden, David Frantz

Creating an Environment Supportive of Diversity

Original framing of problem: We talk a lot about creating an environment supportive of diversity, and commit ourselves to doing so in our mission statement. Are we making progress? How do we know?

Discussion:

What we are already doing or not doing:

1. Multicultural Affairs Committee did an assessment last year, finding that all divisions do something in the classroom related to diversity.
2. HFA has a concentration in ethnic studies in place.
3. Diversity is one of the campus learning objectives.
4. Individual classes do service projects (i.e. with Townsend Center).
5. Classroom activity is important, but other areas need to be open to diversity. An environment supportive of diversity on campus starts from administration and goes on to include faculty, students, staff, and entire Richmond community.
6. It is important to know our colleagues and students well, and to know ourselves first. Few opportunities are available for faculty to get to know one another's interests and strengths, which might be helpful in promoting diversity on campus. Events we have are poorly attended due to lack of interest or availability of free time.

Reframing the problem: How do we move beyond the multiplication of individual activities to a point where honoring diversity is part of the very fabric of our institution?

Possible steps to address the problem (envisioning it as solvable):

1. There are misconceptions about what diversity means: understanding and accepting other people's differences. We need to keep in mind diversity includes race, ethnicity, gender, socio-economic status, religion, sexual orientation, ability, and age. It is the heart and soul of society. Honoring diversity must be visible in the environment.
2. Faculty year-end reports do not highlight efforts in promoting diversity. Faculty should be evaluated in this area in order to make diversity more visible and intentional.
3. There should be money from Academic Affairs for professional development to support curricular interaction/interaction in the classroom.
4. There should be special recognition for faculty who work with other divisions in promoting diversity on campus.
5. Have a Summer Fellowship for interdisciplinary projects – perhaps one per year.
6. P & T must recognize how we honor service learning.
7. Campus-wide forums discussing books such as “Diversity Matters.”
8. International film screenings and discussion – involve honors students in presentations
9. Mindful Exploration series topics to include diversity topics
10. An autobiographical writing essay assignment is an effective way to promote diversity- maybe have a campus essay contest.
11. Faculty could help form new student groups on campus.

12. There could be service projects with a common goal across campus with one focus. Sheila Armstead volunteered to be point person.

13. Mentoring programs in the community to promote campus commitment to diversity.

From Larry Richards, VCAA: Initiate an Institute for Multiculturalism/Diversity on campus, which would monitor a diversity course required for a degree from I U East, freshman seminar, or everyone on campus would be required to read a book on diversity. The goal would be to appreciate the value of differences and educate incoming students about diversity.

Participants: Sheila Armstead & Marsha Heffron Williamson, *co-facilitators*; Teresa Henderson, Marilyn Watkins, Kumara Jayasuriya, Laverne Nishihara, Paul Kriese, Anthony Naaeke, Sherry Rankin, Diane Baker, Larry Richards

Rethinking Faculty Workload

Original framing of problem: We need to address the problem of workload, but what, exactly, is the problem? Are our time and effort going to our highest priorities, collectively and individually? Is our method of allocating workload both equitable and flexible?

Discussion:

1. What is damaged by unresolved workload issues?
 - Morale
 - Feeling of fairness
2. Are people over-extended because they think they need to be for tenure? Is this over-extension done by choice or are people being forced to serve on committees? What is an appropriate work load? This should be more clearly defined across campus, especially in terms of service.
3. It is difficult for faculty to balance/manage teaching, service, and scholarship in ways that are “fair” because of the variance in disciplines. Variance in student advising across campus also complicates workload equity. Factors adding to the complications are graduate courses/programs, distance education, labs, and clinical courses. Often, the actual number of hours spent in the classroom does not reflect the real “work” done.
4. Banking hours is still problematic. Even though there is a campus-wide policy for banking hours, some divisions do not allow faculty to bank.
5. Lecturer expectations for service are not consistent or clear.
6. Faculty has increasingly less time to do our own work in regards to creative activity/scholarship (e.g., if I am a writing teacher, then I should have time to write).
7. Work on some committees seems harder and more time intensive than work on other committees. Is work on one committee “better than” work on another?
8. There is not enough incentive to do more (or better).

Reframing the problem: There must be systemic change; minor adjustments here and there are not sufficient.

Possible steps to address the problem (envisioning it as solvable):

1. All adjustments in workload policies MUST align with P&T and with guidelines for promotion/long-term contracts for lecturers & clinical faculty.
2. Set a minimum level of service, consistent with review guidelines, so that probationary faculty can be assured they are on the right track.
3. Have an evolving policy that adjusts with the needs of individual faculty members. For example, one year a faculty member might choose to do 50% scholarship, 30% teaching, and 20% service and the next year they might choose to do 20 % scholarship, 60% teaching, and 20% service. This would entail creating a contract with the division head which would then become the basis for accountability in the future.
4. Let people do what they do best. If someone is better at teaching then service, then they should be allowed the option of doing more teaching. For example, we might establish a “teaching” track vs. a “scholarship” track.
5. Use banked hours to “buy out” of service and/or scholarship, not just teaching.
6. Have lecturers only choose two of the three (teaching, service, scholarship).
7. Schedule scholarship/creative work just as we schedule classes so that there is time that cannot be taken away or shifted to service
8. Fewer members on certain committees.
9. Have better incentives for people to do more; bigger pay differentiations between merit and high merit, etc.
10. Have a pool of work study students available to faculty for clerical work.

Recommendation: Workload should primarily be a divisional decision that balances the needs of the faculty against that of the division and the campus. An open process should be introduced where faculty can request release time in any area through the Division. Once they have divisional approval, the applications would be sent to the Workload Committee for any potential campus concerns and then sent to the VCAA for final approval. Because the possible solutions above include more than release time for teaching, divisions will need to redefine how merit criteria are weighed, and the P & T document may need to be revised to reflect the variation in types of workload that faculty may have.

Participants: TJ Rivard & Dan Doerger, *co-facilitators*; Paulette Humphries, Joan Lafuze, Roberta Roswell, Jean Harper, Margaret Thomas Evans, Mary Fell, Lora Baldwin, Page Jerzak, Kelly Dempsey, Mary Ann Morse, Lee Meadow