Minutes
Faculty Senate Governance Council
107 Lab of Mechanics
Thursday, September 26, 2019, 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.

1. Call to order (4:00 p.m.)

2. Secretary assignment Andrea Quam

Introductions —> in attendance: Brett Sponseller (chair), Awoke Dollisop, Carol Faber, Elena Karpova, Shuzhang Fei (sub for Ajay Nair), Tim McNicholl, Jon Perkins, Natalie Royston, Ian Schneider, Denise Vrchota, and Andrea Quam

3. Changes to agenda one correction: addition of 7c role of faculty senate executive board; Correction of typo in agenda: Carol Faber, not "Faberg"; John P. moved; accepted unanimously

4. Approval of Minutes (4/4/19) minutes will be approve at the next meeting

5. Reports from committees (4:10 p.m.)
   a. Committee on Committees: Carol Faber, chair (and President-Elect)
   b. Met this week to talk about ideation for spring faculty conference—but met under the title of Representative Committee. Please send conference topic/theme ideas to Carol; looking at ways to foster creativity; interdisciplinary, alt metrics research, class discussion methods and topics are still being developed; March 24th 2020 is the conference date; this committee is made up of all the Caucus Chairs
   c. Senate Documents Committee: Denise Vrchota, chair
      This committee will meet in person this year — NOT only via e-mail as has been done in past; agenda items —> go through handbook and ensure is consistent with style sheet; documents are to be reviewed in years ending in 0 and 5, will be reviewing by-laws and constitution; guidance may be needed from this committee; FYI, constitution and bylaws are on faculty senate web site; easy to change bylaws, but if change faculty senate constitution involves all faculty and president of University; advised to get 'by-in' on bylaws, but outside for approval of bylaws not necessary
   c. College and Departmental Document Review Committee: Awoke Dollisso, chair
      CDDR met last week; minutes received already dispersed; on-going review of college documents —> this year will focus on colleges; Awoke sent e-mail asking Deans to send completed version of check-list, deadline for this is December 15; other ideas include more accessibility with web site.

6. Unfinished Business
   a. Aligning Faculty Handbook Chapter 8 University Community Policies with the ISU Policy
      Take out of chapter 8 areas of redundancy, or ones which are 'moot points' because are in policy library of University; policy library supersedes faculty handbook; redundancy has created double standard and this was problematic for J & A committee; Brett S. met with S. Rippke for help looking over and ensure are not any issues that may need to be paid attention to for faculty, knowledgeable because of her role as parliamentarian for faculty senate; also will meet with Dawn BP to ensure are aware of any conflicts that have arisen from administrative standpoint; looking for members to serve on sub-committee; Denise stated she has looked at section 8 on, seems 'on-target,' except for marked areas having to do with instruction that belong in section 10.

7. New Business (4:30 p.m.)
   a. Committee on Committees vs. Representative Committee — redundancy?
      Carol F. inquires why there are two committees with Caucus chairs involved? Representative Committee is identical in composition to the Committee on Committees; It is scheduled periodically and used at the discretion of the president-elect, typically for help planning the spring faculty conference, during conference years; Committee on Committees, requires
populating councils and committees across the Senate; The Committee on Committees consists of the president-elect and all the caucus chairs; currently the President-Elect does this by reaching out to the caucus chair through email and filling openings.

- Might be better use of time to have one committee —> representative committee and remove committee on committees; the new Representative Committee would oversee all the responsibilities of the two committees and condense it down to one committee; this would be a by-law change not a constitution change, but is in the procedural manner; need to look further into how spelled out in faculty by-laws; any changes to by-laws would be a vote on the senate floor from recommendations through Governance Council and Executive Board

- Carol will write up some language that combines the two in a clear way; Denise suggests to wait until after work on bylaws done; points to look for: 1) where are the two committees housed? 2) How do you state their charge 3) who the chair is; Carol and Brett are charged with a write-up of this proposal.

d. Joint Task Force on teaching evaluations committee, addressing this is one of our main charges; see recommendation 2 from Teaching Task Force report (link here:


) task force has already put forth several points and ideas to address; many articles related to this addressed by Chronicles of Higher Education & AAUP reported on this awhile back; are there other points to include from AAUP?

- Tim, Ian, Denise, and Natalie report interest in serving on this task force

- Discussion…
  - Q: we are focusing on faculty handbook changes… do we bring these to the faculty piece-wise? Is our role to digest this into faculty handbook changes to present to the senate that they will then vote on? How does this get implemented?
  - A: We craft here, goes to executive board and will either be returned here or moved on to faculty senate for vote; for faculty handbook will have to make it broad, yet concise to allow for differences among colleges
  - Q: Is this really a charge for governance council? Is this more for Faculty Development and Administrative Relations Council (FDAR) than Governance Council? Is a challenging fit… Another council could draft it, we could review it and then move it up?

- Brett to get more information regarding our charge for this; Faculty Senate President invited to share his charge for this, but unable to do so; looking for better ways for faculty to receive evaluation on their teaching, additionally with more rigor — report has range of suggestions. Because they are used for promotion, salary adjustment and tenure…

- Further discussion committee brought forward before moving on from this topic:
  - an over emphasis of one number, hyper focus on single number rather than broader aspect
  - evaluations currently don’t tell what students learned
  - departments will have weigh-ins on how they want it in their documents
  - instructional material effort is currently also ignored
  - a richer discussion on these is needed, presenting of data, etc so we have grounding on this… answer: this is what Joint Task Force on Teaching has done
  - this might be a policy statement more than a handbook item? … certain things, such as timeline of receiving feedback that need to be established, not to be prescriptive however
  - time requirements for creation of peer evaluations... put more demand on an already over-worked faculty

c. Governance Council to change by-laws entry for University Services:

- We put forward changing ‘University Services’ to ‘Committee on Operations and Finance’

- The committee currently exists as University Services, there is a redundancy issue; how many times this committee meets and their role of advisory to Resource Policy and Allocations Council (RPA), simple solution is to change name and ensure senior VP for president for operations and finance is included; Proposed title change, we vote and then can be brought forward to executive committee, and then they determine if they want this—> motion for this made by Tim M. for changing University Services to Committee on Operations and Finance, seconded by John P.; passed unanimously

8. Good of the order

9. Adjourn

at 3:07 p.m.