

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

**Members Present:** Anderson, Gretchen; Baker, Patrick; Barton, David; Basolo-Kunzer, Mary; Bender, Eileen; Bennion Turba, Elizabeth; Borshuk, Catherine; Bushnell, Peter; Chen, Linda; Clark, Karen; Clark, Thomas; Colborn, J. Randall; Colborn, Nancy; Cook, Richard; Cordell, Rosanne; Demmon, Terri; Detlef, Joanne; Fisher, Linda; Fong-Morgan, Bridget; Fox, Mark; Fritschner, Linda; Furlong, Patrick; Garber, Lawrence; Gerencser, Steven; Gottwald, Judith; Hadley, Gail; Harrington, Charles; Hinnefeld, Jerry; Huitink, Geraldine; Joray, Paul; Karakatsanis, Neovi; Keen, Mike; Knowles, Brenda; Lee, Monle; Lewis, John; Lucal, Elisabeth; Maher, Ellen; Makielski, Marta; McGuire, Gail; McMillen, Douglas; Mettetal, Gwendolyn; Mooney, Elizabeth; Muralidharan, Raman; Naffziger, Frederick; Norton, Steven; Opasik, Scott; Pierce, Patricia; Quinn, Charles; Roth, Elaine; Russo, Michele; Saksena, Pankaj; Scanlan, Margaret; Schwartz, Bill; Schwartz, Ruth; Sernau, Scott; Shlapentokh, Dmitry; Smant, Kevin; Sofhauser, Cynthia; Sovereign, Nancy Rae; Tetzlaff, Monica; Torstrick, Rebecca; Vollrath, David; Walker, Lesley; Williams, Lynn; Winicur, Sandra; Wolfer, James; Yokom, Nanci.

I. Administrative Reports

A. Chancellor Perrin:

(President Vollrath: The Chancellor is on a fundraising trip downstate today and so Vice Chancellor Zemke will present that report.)

Vice Chancellor Zemke: Good morning. ... As you meet, John Withey, Reza Espahbodi, Jon Meyer and the Chancellor are meeting with a major donor in Franklin, Indiana. This particular donor has given \$100,000 in 1999, and we are hopeful to at least match that amount during the visit today. Keep your fingers crossed. I plan not only to update you on this gift but on the status of the capital campaign at the April meeting. I think you will be pleased with that report.

Also, during that April conversation with you, I plan to update you on the state budget. As I write, it would appear that a special session would have to be called. Having spent all of Monday at the Legislature, I can only tell you things do not look very promising. Most of you probably heard on WVPE this morning the news about that.

A couple of other points. Heartiest congratulations to Dr. Brenda Knowles. ... She has received the Wilburt Heights Mentoring Award. Please join me in acknowledging Brenda's selection of this year's mentoring award.

I had hoped to be able to show you a picture of our bridge at this meeting. However, the architects are still putting the finishing touches on it. We are scheduled to ask for authorization to proceed with the construction at the April 4<sup>th</sup> Trustees Meeting. This \$1.8 million project should be completed by this time next year.

The housing study is now complete and Myles has indicated that we should be the next campus, after IUPUI, to have residential housing. I may be able to at least get that affirmed before I leave.

Next week, Tom Miller and I will be meeting with folks from WVPE to discuss the moving part of their operation to our campus. This is a very positive and exciting development that could unfold very quickly over the next several weeks.

Finally, all of these activities, however, are put in proper perspective when one considers the recent terrible ordeal of our student, Jennifer Zarkowski (sp). I have been in regular communications with Jennifer and her family over the past seven days. I am pleased to advise you that she is doing as well as could be expected under the circumstances. Even before Jen was rescued, Mrs. Zarkowski (sp) gave our police department,

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

especially Marty Gersey, high praise for their professionalism. Since her return, my initial observation of all of you, as a caring concerned faculty, has been validated once again. Jen's instructors Randy Isaacson, Chuck Harrington, Eleanor Lyons and Rebecca Gordon have all been extremely generous and sensitive in dealing with this situation. Thank you very much for that. As I've said many times before, IUSB is an extraordinary place because of all of you.

See you at the Lundquist Lecture on the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Q: Mary Anne, before you go, for those of us who have not heard the WVPE report this morning, can you summarize that report?

A: They did not vote for the Bauer proposal. The WVPE comment was that the Governor would make a decision whether there'll be a special session or not.

Q: Given the budget and the serious crisis this campus is facing, I'm very concerned that the Chancellor hasn't attended this meeting in months and today the Vice Chancellor is not here either. Is the Chancellor ever going to attend this meeting again? We deserve to learn about what is going on [with the budget].

A: Yes, in April, he will be here. As a matter of fact, I was thinking about this ... and was going to propose this to the Budget Committee. ... But anyway, as maybe having a session an hour before the regular meeting to go over some of it, any questions people have because, at this point, we're really not sure with the legislature up in the air. There are various scenarios of which direction we're going to have to go. ...

B. Vice Chancellor Guillaume

(President Vollrath: Vice Chancellor Guillaume is in Washington and has been there for the last few days, reviewing requests for the Ford Foundation Grant Program. He has recently put down in the Academic Affairs Newsletter recent developments in his office and, so, he refers you to the Academic Affairs Website Newsletter for an update.

One announcement that I'm sure he would make if he were here ... is the Dean's Seminar, occurring after this meeting in the Main Auditorium of Northside, presented by Joan Metelli and Co. The topic is "The Art of Singing versus the Science of Singing: Freeing the Bel Canto Sound Master Class Presentation."

II. Meeting called to order at 10:12 a.m. by President Vollrath.

III. Action on Minutes: 15 February 2002. Moved, seconded, and approved.

IV. Committee Reports

A. Campus Directions Committee: Eileen Bender, Chair

There were copies by the sign-up sheets and in the back of the room of what is the draft work plan for strategic planning of the Campus Directions Committee.<sup>1</sup> The last time I stood before you to talk about the strategic planning process, it was about to begin and we had a slightly different work plan at that moment. Since that time, I've been reflecting, as you always do when you go back and revisit a plan and see that you didn't do it... I realized that our strategic planning has taken a very interesting course—probably one that you won't find in strategic planning textbooks because, at the outset of our planning process, as the Campus

---

<sup>1</sup> For the draft work plan, see the Addendum that is attached to the Minutes.

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

Directions Committee was discussing the organization and how we were going to get the campus immediately involved. I think that was my theme the last time I spoke about this. We were on the brink and on the verge of a chancellor's search although I think that, at that moment, we didn't have the definitive news. And, once the chancellor's search process began, the job of the Campus Directions Committee was changed. ... Our priorities still are to develop a strategic plan for IUSB for purposes of North Central Accreditation as well as for our own health as a campus. That report is due, according to the NCA mandate issued in their accreditation report, ... in final form to the NCA in 2005—beginning of the year 2005, which means that that plan for all intents and purposes should be complete by fall 2004. That has not changed, nor do I suspect that it will. That plan needs to be in place before the focus visit by North Central to IUSB, which will occur in 2007, so that part of our next accreditation review will be a close look at this campus' directions and strategic planning and how those directions are woven into the fabric of the decision-making process here. So, we still have that goal and we still have a ways to go.

What the committee did, as you well know, was to take the recommendation of President Brand ... and ... [it] conducted a pre-search campus and community discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of the campus, as perceived by all of our major constituents, which actually focused at the very end of that report, as you recall, on the qualities of an ideal chancellor. That report, because of the efforts of this wonderful committee working in the summer without even being asked to do so, conducting interviews and focus groups with more than 200 people in a very short space of time—because of their efforts, the report was done two months earlier than President Brand's deadline and it then became woven into the prospectus that was given to all the chancellor candidates who came. So, I think the committee was very gratified that that worked, which they would have done in any case, [and] actually had some good uses in the chancellor search. And, for our own perspective as a planning committee, that couldn't have been a better idea since one of the issues raised in that prospectus was the need for this campus to create a strategic plan. All the candidates who came were well aware of this priority. All of them discussed it in various sessions and various contexts. And, I understand they had also discussed their approach and their interest in strategic planning with the search committee before they arrived. So, we anticipate that when that white smoke goes up in Bloomington and we know who our next chancellor is going to be, that it will be a chancellor very much in tune to the strategic planning process and we have geared our activities this spring to that event in anticipation of new campus leadership. ...

So, what you see in front of you is our revised work plan. It's really a timetable and it still presents itself in general terms. We are in Phase I. ... We have created six taskforces. Vice Chancellor Guillaume, who has really been the person we report to [and] who gave us our charge, has appointed the taskforce chairs this year and has shared their names with you. All of their current information is available on the Campus Directions Website, which you might want to visit. ... Each task force is beginning to redefine and more narrowly define the scope of the work to be done under the rubric of these six priority areas that you can see on the chart of page one. Those six priority areas are the titles of the taskforces themselves, and the taskforces have been meeting on a monthly basis with the Campus Directions Committee—that is, the chairs have been meeting with the Campus Directions Committee. The Committees have been meeting on their own to do the rather difficult task of doing an environmental scan, doing a careful and close reading and definition of what a larger planning effort, which really will be the effort we do next year in Phase II, what it will focus on.

All of the task forces have agreed to prepare a document draft that outlines that territory that they have as their particular responsibility before the end of this semester. That will be shared with you in various ways and I hope perhaps even by the April meeting the task forces will have a document that you can look at in draft as well. It will be those documents and that general discussion that will be shared with the new chancellor when the chancellor arrives and that will form the basis of the full-scale planning process that will really begin in August.

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

The rest of our draft plan, as you can see, involves again various deadlines and timelines that we will hope to stick to pretty closely. But what isn't there is the degree of involvement that I hope will take place, that will engage all of you in meetings, hearings, discussions, communications through our website to individual task force members and campus members. The task forces will be enlarged next year so that they will become representative bodies and you will all be asked to take some role in the creation of those task forces that will begin public and formal hearings in these various subject areas, which, as you can see, are vast and critical to the campus future.

That's the summary of my report at this point. This is very much a work in progress but we're glad to report that it is in progress. I'm very grateful to the task forces for taking on this spring this particularly difficult task so that we can be ready with the new configuration of campus leadership to move ahead in this process. I'll be glad to try to answer any questions you might have.

B. Faculty Welfare Committee—Report on Faculty Misconduct Policy; Mary Basolo-Kunzer, Chair

We went back to the drawing board and I asked Dottie Frapwell to give us in writing what was the issue concerning the deletion of the three sentences in our IUSB Misconduct Policy and I'll read her email so we're all on the same page:

The simplest way to explain it is that the Trustees require that every campus adopt either the Bloomington policy or the Indianapolis policy. You have changed the policy and included language that was explicitly stricken from the policy in discussions between the Trustees and Bloomington Faculty Council Representatives when their policy was developed. The language regarding compliance with various laws will only create arguments about the compliance and there are already policies in place to deal with any noncompliance by the University.

With this additional information my committee was not pleased, however we believe that it's a done deal and we propose that the last two sentences are deleted so that our policy can go forward. And you'll see that on the back page of your agenda is the actual misconduct policy. We did have a vote last time. The one sentence that is crossed off with two lines and the additional two lines are the ones that you'll be asked about under New Business.

V. Old Business

A. Report on Ballot re/ Proposed Amendment to Article XI, Section I

The first item of Old Business is to report what Mary has just said. That is that triple slash line was voted by the faculty in our mail ballot last month to be stricken and so under New Business the proposed amendment is to strike the line immediately prior and the line immediately after to conform with Dottie Frapwell's recommendation. I have to express my appreciation for the Faculty Welfare Committee's patience and good will in all of this. I have only recently interacted with Dottie, and as Mary said, it's a done deal. We're passed anything about principle and we're into politics now and power.

B. Report on Election of Officers and Committee Members

Someone is willing to take my job and see this and other issues through. I'm pleased to announce that Roy Schreiber has been elected as President, Doug McMillen as Vice President, Bill Knight as Secretary, Nancy Colborn, Paul Joray and Marta Makielski as our At-large Representatives to the Executive Committee. I

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

will be the junior UFC representative next year. Tracey Anderson, Connie Deuschle and Judy Gottwald have been elected to two-year terms to the PTR Committee. Randy Colborn has been elected to a one-year term to the PTR Committee. Randy Isaacson, Chris White and Dave Fred were the three candidates for the Athletics Committee; they were all elected. In the case of the Faculty Misconduct Committee there was a tie and so you will be receiving a run-off ballot and we will determine who the lucky person is to be a member of that committee. All the other candidates will be alternates. At this point, it's clear that Jerry Hinnefeld is a member.

VI. New Business

A. Proposed Amendment to Article XI, Section I

This policy provides procedures to review complaints against faculty members of substantial or chronic incompetence or misconduct, limited to violations of formal rules of the University, such as violations of the Code of Academic Ethics (*IU Academic Handbook*), or failure to meet generally understood and accepted standards of professional conduct. ~~Incompetence, or inability to meet the required standards of conduct, is considered misconduct and addressed according to the procedures set forth in this document provided that: 1) the University has fulfilled all responsibilities it might have in the specific case according to federal and state Fair Employment Practices law and IU Health Benefits, and 2) the incompetence persists. (4/01) The policy provides for no new definitions of misconduct or incompetence but relies on already existing codes of conduct such as the Code of Academic Ethics (IU Academic Handbook).~~

Discussion on proposed Amendment:

Q: What would it mean to not be in compliance?

A: Are you referring to Dottie Frapwell's use of the term? My understanding is that she may have used that email ... in a couple of senses. In a phone voice mail message from her, she expressed concern that the reference to federal and state fair employment practices law and IU health benefits was, first of all, legally imprecise and, secondly, unnecessary because IU fully knows and will uphold its obligations to the faculty under those provisions. Her argument is that it need not be referenced in our document. It sort of goes without saying for those purposes. I think there is another sense of compliance, though, which is conformity of our document to the Bloomington policy that has been approved. I have heard Ray Richardson last spring say in effect the same thing—that all the regional campuses have had a choice of adopting either the IUPUI or the IUB policy and that one or the other—well, they each have been approved by the Trustees and therefore as the regionals move to conform or comply with the directive that every campus should have such a policy, those are our two options. Those are the approved options.

Comment: I can understand if they were insisting that there be one university-wide policy. I find it offensive and troubling that those two can have their own policies and we are being required to go along with either one or the other. I think we ought to have a resolution stating that we find it offensive that we're being forced to do this.

Q: What will the practical implications be if we don't go along with this?

A: Well, from a local perspective it's Roy's job. A little more broadly, the Chancellor visited me within the last couple of weeks to say that he'd had a discussion—kind of a hallway discussion—with the Trustee ... [who] is the Chair of the Subcommittee of the Board that deals with this and other matters, and when Ken has been queried about where we stand in the past, he's been able to make jokes, like "It's in process. You know how long faculty take." That kind of thing. But it was his sense with the conversation this time that it had ceased being a laughing matter, that this Trustee was now becoming very irritated, I guess, that

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

we are the only campus now that doesn't have a stamp of approval on a policy and their, in some sense, frustrated by the passage of time, as we are. Some comment that was passed along was, "Will I live to see the policy being adopted before I'm rotated off the Board?" Ken suggested that this committee, or subcommittee, is also in charge of things like approving degree programs and that it has become political. The potential is that if we resist this, they will resist that. So, that's in broad terms maybe what's at stake or what the consequences are.

Comment: I would like to support Ellen's suggestion and I think all of the committee would support it. We do not buy the legal argument and we resent the entire business of being forced to do this. ...

Comment (President Vollrath): Might I suggest that the Faculty Welfare Committee bring such a resolution to the Senate in the April meeting. Certainly you have the motivation emotionally to put those things down in writing because you've been dealing with this thing that will not die.

Q: Have the other campuses all chosen one of those two models? Are they distributed pretty evenly?

A: I know that they have all chosen one or the other. I'm not clear about the distributional choices. For what it's worth, when Ray Richardson was speaking before the UFC last spring, near the end of his term ... it was really clear to us that he wishes that he had not agreed to the IUPUI policy. That one is more developmental compared to the Bloomington model. It focuses on more steps of remediation—that sort of thing. ... So, I don't know the distribution of choices but I do know that at least one or the other has been adopted by all of the other campuses.

Comment: It may be worth finding out.

A: O.K. Again, I'll suggest that Mary and Committee contact Dottie to find out what the distribution is.

Comment: It seems to me that there are two different types of concerns here. ... If these are substantive matters of concern that we feel are not addressed, then I think we need to take our time on this. ... If, however, it's only the principle—the feeling of being snubbed—then I think we need to think more strategically.

Q: ... Might the IUPUI policy be the one we might want to adopt?

A: I guess I'm sorry I mentioned that because the Committee—not just the current membership but now for four years the Faculty Welfare Committee—has perennially been pouring over it and, from the start, it's been looking at the Bloomington plan. So, I believe it would require major, major effort to review and evaluate the two in comparison to one another.

Comment: I liked Steven's analysis of this issue. I am comfortable that the substantive principle we're dealing with is O.K. I'm comfortable with those issues and with the deletions based on substance. I'm also offended by being forced to adopt either one or the other, but I think we need to select our battles very carefully. And this is not one worth battling over right now.

A: I'm in agreement with Steve and Jerry, but, nevertheless, I think we need to send a letter telling them our committee has spent four years working on this and then to hear that we have to adopt either one or the other policy—you have wasted our time. ...

**Motion to end debate made. Seconded. Motion to end debate passed.**

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

President Vollrath: You will see this in the mail as a proposed Constitutional Amendment and I would ask the Faculty Welfare Committee to consider presenting us with a resolution next time.

B. Resolution brought to us by ten faculty members:

"All acting appointments at IUSB--academic, professional, and clerical--should be for terms of no more than twelve months. In cases of exceptional urgency, acting appointments may be extended for an additional twelve months. In no case should an acting appointment extend beyond the term of the appointing officer. All acting appointments should be announced immediately to the IUSB community."

**Discussion:**

Q: I have a question concerning the language. We recently received an email, I think, from John Huntley explaining to us the distinction between interim and acting. It seems to me an important one and I suspect that those who drafted this proposal for us might want to include the words "and interim" in the language. I propose this as a friendly amendment.

Patrick Furlong: I drafted it and I will accept it.

President Vollrath: O.K. We will add "and interim" after "All acting."

Q: I'm interested in knowing ... the second sentence from the end, ... in the case of an appointing officer whose term ends in let's say June 2002, that would really make it very difficult to appoint or to accept positions if they would only be for a very short period of time. Who would accept a position that perhaps would be only for a few weeks or a few months? And I wonder whether the good governance of IUSB would be better served by omitting that or giving a longer period?

Patrick Furlong: I do not consider that a friendly amendment. ... I feel strongly that appointments that extend for one or more years past the appointing officer's term. ...

Comment: I understand your point and I agree. It's certainly something we need to be aware of, but I wonder if perhaps some middle ground couldn't be found that would allow perhaps only in exceptional circumstances ... an officer to make an appointment perhaps up to six months. ...

Patrick Furlong: I think this case would be covered by, "In cases of exceptional urgency, acting appointments may be extended for an additional twelve months."

Comment: On the same point, I think it would be acceptable if the new appointing officer renewed that appointment. And I think we need to have that sentence in the record—a sentence making it clear that the person might be reappointed on an acting position by the appointing officer's successor.

President Vollrath: Dave Barton suggests a clause, "Unless reappointed by that person's successor."

Comment: That's good.

Patrick Furlong: I'd like to keep it simple. I think it's already covered here by "In cases of exceptional urgency." ...

Q: I would also like to talk about the second to the last sentence. "In no case" says "in no case." There are situations where, to give you a hypothetical, a dean may have appointed someone in an acting or interim

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

basis and that dean all at once resigns to accept another position elsewhere. What does that mean with regards to that acting appointment? There is also another situation here and that is when you appoint someone, there is a start and there is a stop. And, I'm not a lawyer but I think there are some legal implications. ... I think we need to be just a little cautious about having language that says "in no case." ...

Comment: There is a principle behind this resolution that we might want to capture. However, we don't want to put in place a policy that is simply not enforceable. ... We could imagine a situation where a dean, a chancellor, a vice chancellor resign because they're moving on to a new job and then we have all kinds of appointments that we need to reappoint ... a policy that is extremely byzantine to work out. So, I'm wondering whether there is not a way for us to express our dissatisfaction ... and also add some sense of ... without ... the next administration. ...

Comment: I think we expressed dissatisfaction in various ways and it had no effect. I think we have to have something that is a policy. I believe that there is enough flexibility here. ...

**Amendment made to omit:** "In no case should an acting appointment extend beyond the term of the appointing officer." **Amendment Seconded.**

**Discussion of Amendment:**

Comment: I think Mike's point is entirely correct here. ... I think it's a big mistake to set up a policy that has a reasonable likelihood of getting us into a conflict with the next administration. I think getting rid of that last sentence tells the next administration what we want done—that is we want them to be very careful about these kinds of appointments. ...

Comment: I also think that Larry's point ought to be emphasized. The personnel action form has a ... date x that is after the term of the appointing officer expires. ... We can't arbitrarily terminate that position. ...

Comment: I think that this sentence creates a large number of problems. ... I think, in general, that the resolution is great.

Comment: I can live with the amendment.

Comment: I oppose the amendment. I think the entire resolution is good as is. ... We need to make a statement and we need to quit watering it down all the time.

Patrick Furlong: As much as I hate to see my eloquent prose struck, I would be willing to accept that in order to get this resolution passed with a solid majority. This is a statement of opinion of policy. This goes beyond the legislative authority of the faculty. We're making a statement of policy, reflecting our concern with past conduct, but stating also our concern that a new administration would start off on a very different basis.

**Motion to end debate on the Amendment. Seconded. Motion to end debate on the Amendment passed.**

**Vote taken to strike the next to the last sentence. Passed.**

**Discussion of the Amended Resolution:**

Q: Very short question: Have we added the term "interim and" rather than "or?" If that is the case then the

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

person would have to be both an acting and an interim appointment.

A: So, we should switch it to “or.”

Comment: I would strongly recommend that we pass this resolution. I think the spirit is exactly what we need to say about the situation that exists currently and what we wish not to happen in the future. So, I enthusiastically support this resolution.

Q: What exactly does it mean to pass a resolution? Is it primarily a voice of the Senate speaking out on a matter?

A: Yes.

Comment: I would like to support Larry’s assessment. ...

**Motion to end debate. Seconded. Motion to end debate passed.**

**Vote taken on the Amended Resolution. Amended Resolution passed as follows:**

“All acting or interim appointments at IUSB—academic, professional, and clerical—should be for terms of no more than twelve months. In cases of exceptional urgency, acting appointments may be extended for an additional twelve months. All acting appointments should be announced immediately to the IUSB community.”

## VI. Officer Reports

### A. President

The Executive Committee met on March 1<sup>st</sup> and we set the agenda for this meeting. We also discussed the work of the Faculty Welfare Committee on the Faculty Misconduct Policy, we placed Professor Furlong’s Resolution on the Agenda, we decided that I should go forth and—following Professor Maher’s suggestion—request a list of all acting and interim appointments, and we also arranged for several members of our Executive Committee to attend a Faculty Leaders Conference that is sponsored by the Commission of Higher Education, which will occur April 4.

### B. UFC

UFC has not met since the last meeting. We’ll meet next week, so I’ll have a report for you in the April meeting.

I would encourage you to either respond to the mass mail that I sent out on committee preferences or pick up one of the small sheets on the back table. Maybe even fill it out right now and give it to me. We do have until April 1, but the Executive Committee will need to form a tentative slate of committee members for this body to approve in the April meeting, so I would appreciate a response sooner rather than later. Also, I want to strongly, strongly encourage you to give me three choices. Last couple of years, people give me a one and that’s it ... and, as you may guess, there are some committees that are highly sought after and we need to balance representation. We don’t want the committee to become infinitely large and, so, I really would appreciate the flexibility of you choosing three preferences.

Q: Is there a list somewhere of who is currently on these committees and when their terms end? And ... are

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

all the others one-year terms?

A: You can look on the W drive, under AcadSenate, under Committees. You'll see the folders for each committee and then hanging out there is a Roster and that has who's on and has, for these committees that do have a tiered structure, which year you're in currently and whether you'll be progressing on or off.

C. Chancellor Search

Nanci Yokom: The process is on the way. We've sent our recommendations to Myles Brand. Over break we had a teleconference with Myles. Now, he's inviting some of the candidates to Bloomington to meet with him and others.

D. Other Announcements

Steve Norton: I'd like to make a quick announcement about the upcoming SGA elections. This afternoon I'm meeting with two students to begin planning the next SGA election. I've drafted a letter for either Dave or Roy to sign, encouraging students to participate in the elections. ... Anyone who has questions please contact me and I'd be happy to discuss this with you.

Q: When is the date of the election?

A: I don't remember.

Q: The Political Science Club is preparing to participate in the Get Out the Vote campaign for the November elections. Perhaps they can "get out the vote" for the SGA as a practice run?

A: Let's talk about this.

Comment: One other point, the Task Force studying a Representative Senate has met and made recommendations. I thought we would be on the Agenda this time; we're not. So perhaps we'll be on the agenda next time?

President Vollrath: One last reminder, Minutes and Annual Committee Reports are due soon.

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Approved. 11:07 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Neovi M. Karakatsanis, Secretary of the Academic Senate

**ADDENDUM**

**CAMPUS DIRECTIONS COMMITTEE -Strategic Planning Process**

**Goals for IUSB Strategic Plan:**

1. A strategic plan must be in the hands of the NCA by 2004.
2. We must integrate planning activities with important issues like budget and assessment.
3. We must create campus-wide and community participation in planning.
4. Our goal is to formulate a plan that is *operational* with a clear strategy for implementation and assessment, and clear delegation of responsibility, as well as a procedure for continuous monitoring of achievements, benchmarks, and goals.

**Task Force Priority Areas**

1. Fostering student learning, access, and success.
2. Encouraging and maintaining academic excellence.
3. Enhancing diversity in the curriculum, classroom, and campus.
4. Strengthening partnerships with the community.
5. Reflecting and expanding a global perspective.
6. Heightening the recognition of IUSB's resources and achievements beyond the campus.

**Draft Work Plan**

**Phase One: Defining the Territory:**

1. Nov. 2001: Selection of, Meeting with Task Force co-chairs.
2. Dec. 2001-Jan. 2002: Organize Task Forces for Phase I
3. Jan.-April 2002: Task Force meetings
4. MARCH, 2002: Update at Spring Senate Meeting.
5. April-May 2002: Phase One reports to CDC, new Chancellor (distributed to campus, community groups via web site, *Preface*, etc.

**2002- 2003: Phase Two: Task Forces expand to gather information, draft reports and recommendations:**

1. (possible) August, 2002 Strategic Planning Retreat
2. Sept.-Dec. 2002: Task Forces hold campus' hearings, prepare reports and recommendations, discuss with CDC, campus constituencies
3. Jan.-Mar. 2003: Discussion of Task Force draft reports with the CDC, IUSB campus leadership, Deans, Faculty Senate, staff councils, student gov't.
4. Mar.-May 2003: Discussions of Task Force second drafts within colleges, schools, faculty and staff units; feedback to CDC

Indiana University South Bend  
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
15 March 2002

5. April-May, 2003: Presentation of Task Force reports and recommendations

**2003 -2004: Phase Three: CDC drafts, campus approves IUSB strategic plan:**

1. June-Sept. 2003: CDC executive group prepares first draft.
2. Sept. 2003: Strategic Plan draft to campus\* for review and discussion.
3. Jan. 2004: Final Draft of Strategic Plan to campus for review and discussion.
4. Mar.-May 2004: Final Strategic Plan Document to campus for approval, adoption, and implementation.
5. Summer/Fall 2004: Submission of strategic plan to NCA.

"campus" includes all major IUSB stakeholders