

Academic Senate Friday February 21, 2020 Meeting Minutes

IN ATTENDANCE: Adaikkalavan, Bailey, Bennion, Bindroo, Bregu, Burch, Campbell, Cheng, Clift, Colborn N., Collins, Dielman, Economalkis, Edmondson, Elrod, Eskew, Essig, Feighery J., Feighery W., Fisher, Froysland, Gatto, Gerencser, Gerken, Haithcox, Hakimzadeh, Heck, Hinnefeld, Holland, Hopkins, Jang, Jones, Kwong, Lambert, Langton, Lidinsky, Lynker, Mancino, Marr, Martinez, McGuire, McInerney, McMillen, Mociulski, Moore, Muniz Jennifer, Nichols-Boyle, Oake, Pajakowski, Pant, Reddy, Ritchie, Rogalla-Hafley, Scheessele, Schnabel, Schult, Smith K, Takanashi, Thomas, Tourtillotte, VanderVeen, Wells, Werner-Sanders, White

ACTING SECRETARY: Kim McInerney

1. Call to order – 1:32 by President Adaikkalavan
2. [3 Minutes] Approval of January 2020 Senate Meeting Minutes - No corrections or modifications from the floor. Minutes stand approved.
3. [15 Minutes] Constitution Updates – Steven Gerencser, Policy Committee
 - a) Article 1 Section 1 – In September of 2018, we put through changes but something was missed. Need to add Senior Lecturer. Also, need to add the newly created Teaching Professor. Motion from Executive Committee. Discussion and send to vote in March.
 - b) Updates to Student Affairs Committee – Jennifer Essig. Primarily language change. Updates related to “university bookstore,” and other language changes. Membership was never explicitly defined before – changing membership to reflect other committee membership standards. Any questions please bring to us. Discussion and send to vote in March.
 - c) Community Engagement Committee – proposal for a new Senate standing committee – Gail McGuire.
 - i. Background: John Reiff, consultant on community engagement, visited in the fall while working on Carnegie application, recommended a Senate Committee to institutionalize community engagement. With the application behind us, would like to move proposal forward to Senate.
 - ii. Questions proposed by Senate Executive Committee:
 - *Whether there is regular on-going business for this committee?* Yes. Here are some examples:
 - Make recommendations on the program for the annual celebration of community engagement (e.g., suggest speakers)
 - Review nominations for the community engagement awards and recommend winners [Note: starting this fall, the campus will give an award to a student, a community partner, and a faculty/staff member for outstanding community engagement.]
 - Suggest professional development workshops for the campus and give feedback on the workshops/events planned by the Director of Community Engagement
 - Review the Director’s annual report and make suggestions for future planning (based on the campus’ strategic plan around community engagement)

- Request data from the Director of Community Engagement on any matters on which they wish to take action
- Provide the Campus Directions Committee with regular updates on the campus' progress on the action items (around community engagement) in our Strategic Plan
- Prioritize the action items for community engagement in the Strategic Plan and break them up into smaller steps so there is a clear road map for achieving them
- Make recommendations on the stipends awarded through the Engage IU South Bend Internship Program (\$1600/each)
- *Would this, for instance, replace the working group that has been focused on the Carnegie Campus designation?* It would replace that working group (a task force appointed by the Executive Committee, which completed its work last spring), but have a broader mission. It would be charged with ensuring that the campus is meeting the action items in its strategic plan and making recommendations to other Senate Committees regarding institutionalizing community engagement (e.g., broadening language in our PTR documents to recognize the scholarship of engagement, expanding our list of local vendors). If the campus decides to re-apply for the Carnegie Engaged Campus Classification in five years, this group would lead that process as well. I would hope that this committee would also advocate for resources needed to institutionalize community engagement on campus. Since the Director of Community Engagement is paid through Academic Affairs and is supervised by the EVCAA, the director may not be in a good position (structurally speaking) to advocate for additional resources. For instance, the campus has one-time monies left over every year. This committee could make recommendations about how some of those funds could be spent.
- *Questions from floor:*
 - Will there be a student representation? McGuire: Yes, from SGA
 - Will this committee look at assessment? Gerencser: Up to Assessment committee
 - Could the work be combined with other committees? Bennion (Speaking to Question): People were willing to get involved and stay involved (from taskforce), a number of people across units willing to serve on this
- Motion will be proposed in March and then send to vote

4. [5 Minutes] Nominations for Elected Committees – Raman Adaikkalavan, President
- a) Adaikkalavan: Thanks to the nomination committee and to those who agreed to be nominated
 - b) Floor is open for further nominations
 - i. Anurag Pant: Why don't we get more choices?
 - Self-nomination for President
 - ii. Faculty misconduct: need to stagger terms – top two votes will be regular, next two will be two-year alternates, and others will be one-year alternates.

- iii. Kylie Rogalla-Hafley nominates Tony Randles (School of Education) for Athletics committee
 - iv. Steven Gerencser nominates Marsha Heck (School of Education) for Faculty Review Board
 - v. No further nominations. Motion to close nominations. Approved by voice vote.
- c) All unopposed candidates are elected by acclamation. Congratulations! Electronic ballots will be distributed for all the contested positions.

5. [20 Minutes] Teaching Professor Guidelines – Steven Gerencser, Policy Committee

- a) UFC approved the new rank and title last year
- b) What are the policies? Need to be set at campus level then by each college
 - i. Policy committee has been reviewing procedures and policies. Also working to streamline lecturer track processes as there is not current senate approved policy regarding these issues. We are introducing a draft of a policy so that candidates can start the application process. Basis for guidelines include UFC proposal, ACA-22, ACA-14, ACA-18, Pathways document created by UCET Directors, FACET Statement Promotion to Teaching Professor, PowerPoint presentation from former AVC Johnny McIntosh, E-dossier process, and existing PTR Guidelines.
 - Created a definition for “dossier manager”. Clarifies what counts as an external letter. Slight revisions to timelines. Time of reappointment for teaching professor has not been set – length has to be suggested by AA
 - ii. Need comments to continue moving forward. Will discuss more at March meeting and vote.
 - Anurag P.: Why is this so complicated? Could be shorter in expectations – excellence in teaching. Answer: Questions need to be resolved from each college about what is different in sustaining excellence for Senior Lecturer to higher level for Teaching Professor
 - Shawn NB.: Contract length can be difficult for people going up – need to know if it is worth it – need to know what the salary increase is as well. What happens if someone gets denied? External letters question: could be problematic at the lecturer level to have someone who does not have a professional relationship with
 - Answer: External letters: need some level of disconnect; not a perfect model but close analogy to Full Professor. Other issues need to be deliberated by AA.
 - Ken S.: Promotion in Senior Lecture has to have a contract, then have promotion to teaching professor
 - Hope DS.: Someone can go up for Senior Lecturer, then goes up for Teach Professor – reevaluation of senior lecturer and teaching professor could dovetail
 - Answer: Needs to be worked out
 - What about after achieving Teaching Professor – how does reappointment to Teaching Professor work?

- Answer: Needs to be discussed but could be reflective of current reappointment documents
 - iii. Additional questions should go out to the Policy committee
 - iv. Further discussion in March and vote.
6. [5 Minutes] Senior Lecturer Reappointment Timeline – Doug McMillen, Policy Committee
- a) Discussed the Current PTR calendar for all tenure-track and lecturer-track.
 - i. Senior Lecturer reappointments currently lose the last year of their current contract – overlap of years
 - ii. Proposal: Submit dossier in year 4 of senior lecturer contract, but start date of new contract does not start until after end of previous contract, to provide an actual 5-year contract. Further discussion in March and vote.
 - b) Question from Floor: Is there discussion of having a separate committee for the lecturer rank. Answer: Always an ongoing discussion (Doug M.); that will be adding another committee (Steven G.); The question whether we need to include a NTT member in the PTR committee has been already sent to the PTR committee (Raman A.)
 - c) Question: Would clinical be the same timeline. Answer: Yes
7. [15 Minutes] Northside Taskforce Report – Mike Scheessele, Co-Chair
- a) Recognize taskforce members, thank you
 - b) Reasons for optimism: first report in May 2019 and one more recent (last week); documented things that had not been inventoried since the last report; got reports out to units, needs wants and wishes (HVAC, water);
 - c) Recent successes: lab eye safety stations installed; clean/dehumidify; ceiling tile replacement; repainted/re-carpeted few classrooms; greenhouse leak fixed; return of hot water; \$2 mil for HVAC system, under design right now, should start in summer; new student furniture (\$95,000 for 8 classrooms); visit from IU EHS about air quality/health quality of building; communication of NS issues is improving; energy in improvements (influence of new chancellor; report from Phil I.);
 - d) Challenges include: vast number of HVAC systems; electrical issues; campus auditorium; periodic flooding of Northside east; foundation issues (flooding of science labs);
 - e) Implications: Equipment and reputation at stake; recruitment and retention (this is a student issue) at stake
 - f) A NS hall reboot is still possible. Need voluntary, sustained, effortful attention
 - g) Phil I. comments/observations: As a campus we have underinvested in our facilities, we have made choices with surpluses not to invest because of relying on the state, we can't rely on the state; other buildings need investment for improvements as well (library needs 1.2 million for new bathrooms, administration needs 1.5 million for roof, university center electrical issues, bridge 450K, Purdue tech roof 750K); stopping water damage in NS was the priority and we have stopped almost 99%; for NS we have spent 15 million so far; new HVAC in NS only covers 6% (18,000 sq. ft.) of the building; we got 2 million state money that can be used starting July 1st; only can make incremental changes – need to make

investments into our facilities; we put 250K in capital reserves which is currently less than 2 million; last two years we spent over a 1 million on Purdue tech, over a million on NS; there is 4 million dollars from students – but 4 million is more than accounted for with other improvements needed; in last 3 years we have moved forward in NS; keep giving feedback to Phil;

- i. Anurag: State should pay up; we have R&R funds? Answer: That's 4 million fund, needs to be used for highest priorities to secure buildings; challenge because historically we relied on state
- h) Northside report in the Senate Box folder
8. [22 Minutes] Test optional admissions – Theo Randall, Admissions & Advising Committee; Connie Peterson, Admissions Director;
 - a) Committee charges include campus admissions policy and has been tasked to work on test optional admissions policy for news students
 - i. Justification for test optional: Mission of the regional campuses; other IU campuses have already moved ahead or also working on the test optional policy; tests tend to bias some students (data in the PowerPoint presentation); SAT scores do show some important trends but overall bias in results; High school grades are stronger indicators of college success rates;
 - ii. Benefits: Increase in applications, including those in underrepresented populations
 - iii. How should this look: High school GPA primary focus; full admission vs conditional admission; what can we do for students with lower GPA without test scores (e.g., GPA Academic Support Program)
 - iv. Student demographics (data in the PowerPoint presentation)
 - v. Motion (from the PowerPoint presentation): *“First Year Beginners seeking admission to IU South Bend after August 1, 2020 for 2021 enrollment terms may choose whether or not to include SAT or ACT test scores as part of the application review. Submission of test scores will not negatively impact the admission decision.”*
 - Question: What is the significance of “submission of test scores will not negatively impact the admission decision” Answer: If students do submit scores they will not negatively impact the application on admissions rubric - test scores used for making stronger case
 - How consistent are the GPAs across high schools. Answer: We do not weigh GPAs based on schools
 - Question: How do we train admissions office, re-tool process, how do we accomplish this programmatically? Answer: Constantly reviewing admissions process;
 - Question: To start this in 2020 what has to be done? Answer: Training, materials, policies
 - Question: Seems noncontroversial, the system is set up for scholarships and others? Answer: Yes, test required for sports; Bloomington suggests home schooled students continue getting test scores; most merit scholarships require test scores, honors program, so on.
 - Thank you for looking at systematic barrier, important to look at students holistically, can be barrier for students we need here, “Tyranny of Meritocracy” book looks at effectiveness – has great recommendations

- Chancellor Elrod: Did we do analysis on enrollment impact? How many more students would we admit? Connie: Example, we left about 300-400 on the table last fall – about 250 had not submitted test scores; this would likely to increase the applicant pool; also how do we support students who are not as well prepared or have not been as well served as others
- Question: support the policy; increase in applicant pool; is 11th grade most predictive of student success?
 - Connie: We make our decision primarily on 11th grade GPA
 - Students over 21 do not submit test scores
- Adaikkalavan: This is the first motion the committee is putting forward. They will be back with additional proposals. We have poured through the minutes and documents from the past and could not find a unified campus admission policy approved by senate in a long time. I have charged the committee and they are working on creating a unified admissions policy similar to other campuses. The plan is to bring a policy to the senate in March or April for approval.
- **ACTION: Motion approved unanimously by voice vote**

9. [3 Minutes] President's remarks – Raman Adaikkalavan
 - a) Congratulations to Carolyn A. Schult, Professor of Psychology, on winning the IU President's Award for Distinguished Teaching
 - b) ACA Grading policies – discussion still happening – new version in Senate box folder
 - c) One of the main issues faced by senate committees is a list with activities carried out by the committee and the policies they create and maintain. Though staggered memberships help, it may be better to have them documented. We are working on creating a document to maintain the to do list, and will be shared with committee chairs.
 - d) Senate has approved so many policies but currently there is no specific structure to store and retrieve them. Executive Committee is working on a Policy format based on the one used by policies.iu.edu. All the policies (current and future) will be reformatted to fit this template and stored in a repository. Policy committee will assign policy numbers. We would use something like SB-ACA-# similar to UFC policy numbering.
 - e) Senate committee minutes please send to VP or President to be uploaded to the Senate box

10. [2 Minutes] Announcements and motion to adjourn
 - a) Carolyn S.: Dossier manager meeting, Tuesday next week at UCET
 - b) Christina G.: Annual Kauffman lecture coming up March 4th @ 6.30 pm. We will also be installing the bicentennial marker honoring Gloria Kauffman @ 4.30 pm.
 - c) Chancellor Elrod: Chancellor coffee next week Wednesday at 3:30 to discuss enrollment – what we are doing, positive trends, food for thought in SAC
 - d) Sharon J.: Friday March 27 School of Nursing Shields lecture (Health Disparities Through the Broader Lens: An Historical View) open to all university students and faculty for a small fee

e) April L.: Michiana Monologues March 6th EA 1011; story telling project; fund raising to stop violence against women;

Adjourned at: 3:01 pm