

Academic Senate Minutes

Friday, October 28, 2022 10:00-11:30 DW 1001

Voting Members of the senate present: R. Adaikkalavan, T. Anderson, V. Bindroo, M. Block, D. Blouin, R. Brittenham, D. Bryant, J. Burch, J. Chaney, L. Collins, J. Cory, H. Davis, J. Deranek, J. Essig, H. Froyland, J. Garcia-Martinez, P. Geels, C. Gerken, S. Haithcox, J. Hatfield, C. He, D. Heller, J. Hernando, M. Holland, D. Hopkins, S. Imes, S.K. Jang, S. Jones, L. Kahan, N. Karakatsanis, E. Kelley, R. Kohli, V. Kwong, B. Labbe, K. Ladd, L. LaLime, R. Langton, D. Lee, A. Lidinsky, T. Liechty, E. Lucal, K. Ludy, A. Mahesh, T. Martinez, D. Marr, J. Mattox, D. McMillen, M. Merhi, S. Merken, B. Mociulski, S. Moore, E. Mrozinske, J. Muniz, S. Nichols-Boyle, M. Oake, R. Olivier, S. Opasik, A. Pant, S. Pape, J. Pearson, B. Phillips, J. Resler, K. Ritchie-Fair, M. Roberts, A. Savvopoulou, K. Sargent, A. Schmitz, A. Schnabel, C. Schult, H. Scott, R. Shockey, W. Shrader, J. Smith, C. Sofhauser, N. Somerville, T. Spencer, B. Spinda, A. Springle, D. Surma, M. Swintz, K. Takanashi, S. Thomas, W. Tourtillotte, J. VanderVeen, C. Vlaeminck, K. Werner-Sanders, B. White, K. Wooden, L. Zynda.

1. Meeting was called to order by C. Schult at 10:01am.

C. Schult brought attention to the fact that November 1st all shared google folders with people who have left the university will disappear. She prompted everyone to save files as needed.

C. Schult mentioned that the sign-in sheet is for voting members of the senate, although all faculty, staff, and students are welcome to join the meetings.

2. Approval of September 2022 Minutes [FILE](#)

C. Schult mentioned that a couple of corrections were pointed out from the Chancellor's office. No more corrections were suggested. Minutes stand approved.

C. Schult said that senate bylaws indicate that elections need to come first in the agenda, so the first two items of business were switched. No objections were raised.

3. Update on Standing Committee vacancies

a). Faculty Board of Review (full-time faculty, three years experience, prefer B & E)

The executive committee nominated Vishal Bindroo. No further nominations were suggested from the floor. Vishal Bindroo was elected by acclamation.

b). Non Tenure Track Faculty Committee (tenure track)

This committee needs a couple more tenure-track faculty. J. Resler encouraged everyone to email him if interested.

c) Policy Committee (full-time faculty, three years of experience)

A full-time member with at least three years of experience is sought. Anyone who is interested should reach out to J. Resler.

4. President's Remarks: Capacity Model

C. Schult talked about the capacity model. She hoped that everyone had already had a chance to go over the letter that the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (EVCAA) had sent out the day before through D. McMillen while she was traveling. We are told that we need to implement a capacity model and hold tenure-line faculty accountable for the 25% creativity time that faculty receive each year. IU Kokomo has been implementing such a model since 1996, called the Kokomo model. IU South Bend used to have one but has not been enforced for over 20 years.

C. Schult attended a LEAD session led by IU President P. Whitten and Vice President for Regional Campuses and Online Education, S. Sciame-Giesecke a week before the senate meeting (Friday, October 21st) where data for all regional

campuses were shared. Attendees were not allowed to take any notes or pictures of the data presented at the session or any other part of the presentation. They were told that faculty will now be held accountable for the 25% release time that they receive and the decision will be based on the last three years of productivity which, of course, include pandemic years. It was first shared that the items that would count as productivity would be juried or refereed creative activities and articles. This appears to be stricter than the Kokomo model.

C. Schult later found out on Monday, October 24th, that Deans had been instructed to start meeting with faculty to discuss their productivity. Deans would then be making recommendations who would be teaching a 4-4 load starting Fall 2023. On Monday, October 25th, the UFC executive committee met with S. Sciame-Giesecke to discuss the capacity model and on Tuesday our campus' executive committee met with the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After these meetings it was still unclear what the plan is and how it will be implemented. Nothing had been in writing till the day before the senate meeting.

C. Schult had talked to the EVCAA that morning to clarify some of the points and it seemed that some of the things faculty were asking for have been taken into account. What we know now is the following:

- faculty who are deemed unproductive in research or creative activity will be assigned a 4-4 teaching load starting Fall 2023,
- this is not applied to pre-tenure faculty,
- works in progress or near completion will also count, as the evaluation period is 2019-2024 instead of as believed in the beginning of the discussions 2019-2022, and
- faculty will be evaluated based on the current standards as defined by our campus PTR guidelines. This means that conference presentations, book chapters, interdisciplinary work, scholarship of engagement, and scholarship of teaching and learning will all count.

There still are some unanswered questions such as

- although it is good to see that there seems to be a conclusive understanding of the wide variety of activities our faculty is engaging in, things seem to be rushed. In particular, why proceed with reassignments before expectations have been made clear, before a task force has been formed, before faculty have been meaningfully consulted and had a chance to shape the policies? This is not the right way to do things; expectations need to be transparent and the process needs to be implemented in collaboration with the faculty using faculty governance procedures.

She then encouraged everyone to attend the "Listening session" hosted by the Chancellor and EVCAA on Tuesday, November 1st, 4-5:30pm.

EVCAA, J. Pearson, joined C. Schult on the podium for questions.

Question by S. Moore: Are the dates mentioned earlier academic years or fiscal years?

J. Pearson said that the 2019, 2020, 2021 annual reports will be used along with any plans through the 2023-2024 academic year. She also pointed out that the meetings with the Deans are taking place as the 2022 annual reports have not yet been submitted.

Question/Comment by J. Mattox: J. Mattox agreed with C. Schult's earlier comments that the way the capacity model has been rolling out is not even close to shared governance. It appears as faculty are told that this policy will be starting but faculty input was not asked beforehand. J. Mattox also made a second point that it seems that a policy like this has a lot to do with reducing the number of faculty on our campus and budget cutting. He encouraged administrators to be transparent and if this is the ultimate goal and not research productivity to be frank.

C. Schult said that at the LEAD meeting S. Sciame-Giesecke mentioned that this is about boosting faculty research on regional campuses as well as about saving money. Having some faculty go to a 4-4 load would reduce the number of adjuncts and visiting faculty hired.

J. Mattox also pointed out that the last few years faculty productivity has been questioned and as a result faculty morale is low.

Question by C. Sofhauser: Does the model apply to faculty who have significant administrative duties or advise a lot of students?

J. Pearson said that the Kokomo model does address this. This is something that we need to discuss while building our own capacity model. One way to address this would be to have research reassignment for faculty with significant administrative duties and call it service release time or administrative release time.

Comment by K. Takanashi: The Fall 2023 schedule is due before the end of November.

J. Pearson said that is why the Deans are holding meetings now and will make recommendations before the schedule is finalized.

Question by K. Ladd: What will happen if there are not large enough classes to reassign faculty to?

J. Pearson said that in those cases Deans and chairs should see where faculty work may be utilized.

Question/Comment by A. Lidinsky: This model will likely kill service on our campus. Many faculty post-tenure serve on committees which are essential to the running of the university. How much autonomy will our campus have in this regional task-force? It seems that there is a move to flatten and unify the experience of the regionals.

J. Pearson said that this is still unclear. The task force is being developed. There is IU policy, and there is campus policy, which may be more restricted but not less. She hopes that this task force will help articulate the value of the diverse activity that faculty do on this campus.

A. Lidinsky asked who will serve on the task force.

J. Pearson said she does not know. As soon as there is information she/they will share it.

A. Lidinsky commented that yet this is already on.

J. Pearson assured everyone that we will use our own standards for evaluations.

C. Schult said that the RFC will be meeting with S. Sciamé-Giesecke on Monday (October 31st) to talk about the charge of this task force.

C. Schult pointed out that the following three business items are being introduced and discussed at the present meeting and will be voted on at the next meeting.

5. Proposal from Library Affairs Committee for allocation of materials budget—Caitlin Vlaeminck [FILE](#)

The proposal with historical data was sent out with the meeting's agenda. There has been a reduction in funds for books and video orders. Prices for acquisition are increasing but there has been no increase in the library funds. The allocation proposal is to approve the elimination of allocations and have one source of funds. This would allow librarians more flexibility to develop and update the library collection.

Question by A. Pant: Has a regional collaboration of resources and funds that would prevent such elimination been considered?

S. Thomas said that currently there are no funds for shared resources. Bloomington provides some shared resources. We are moving towards this direction but we are not there yet.

6. Proposal from General Education Committee to add FYE Director as ex officio member—Anna Savvopoulou [FILE](#)

The General Education committee proposes that the Director(s) of the First Year Experience program be added as an ex officio voting member to the committee.

There were no questions. C. Schult said that this will come up again in November but since it involves a change in the constitution it will go out by ballot.

7. Proposal from Academic Affairs Committee for adopting a common calendar among the regional campuses—Jamie Smith and Susan Moore [FILES](#)

The rationale of the common calendar for the regional campuses was presented. J. Smith mentioned that a common calendar implies that for example all refund dates, withdrawal dates, full-semester length courses, 8-week courses, final course grade submissions, and breaks would be the same across the regional campuses. This consistency would make it easier for students who take classes across different campuses.

The impacts to IU South Bend were presented (see file). The changes to the starting and ending dates of the two summer sessions were especially noted. C. Schult said that she would ask J. Johnston about the last day of the Spring 2024 finals week as on the file it appears to be incorrect.

Question/Comment by A. Pant: Since regionals are brought together with the common calendar proposal, how about bringing IU Northwest to Indiana time? We bring a lot of students to all collaborations. This should be recognized and our rules should be imposed on the other campuses not the other way around.

C. Schult said this was not something we could push back on. We do have some control over this and may suggest changes but all regional campuses would need to agree to them. There will be benefits to our students.

Question by J. Essig: Has there been consideration regarding graduate programs, in particular ones which have modified summer schedules to accommodate clinical experiences?

J. Smith said practicum based experiences have been discussed but the specific one has not been brought up yet and was noted.

C. Schult said that exceptions will be allowed for classes which are already not on the regular schedule.

Comment by H. Davis: We currently have graduates who jump into a graduate program in the summer right after graduation, this proposal might have an impact on our graduate enrollment.

Question/Comment by D. Hopkins: Was thought given to a whole week for fall break?

Question by D. McMillen: Have the implications of having the first and second summer sessions in different fiscal years been thought of?

J. Smith said that this has not been discussed.

Comment by J. Muniz: Arts students who have final performances after Thanksgiving break would be affected by this proposal.

C. Schult said that the RFC would meet the following Monday (October 31st) and she would bring these questions up. Finally, opting out means we would be opting out of collaborative programs.

8. Academic Organizational Design Task Force update--Jason Resler & Doug McMillen, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The charge of the task force is to recommend a configuration under the seven guiding principles (see [file](#)). If you have input or concerns reach out to the committee members. There is also TEAM site for feedback. Since the September presentation, there have been two town halls. There has also been a channel for Academic Organizational Design set up. At the two town halls there were table discussions. The current structure was reviewed and three models for reorganization were discussed (see [file](#)).

There were prompting questions to generate feedback. Everything will be posted in the channel if you were not able to attend. If you attended and have more input then continue to provide it. Broad themes that came out of the discussions were shared (see [file](#)). Surveys will be distributed to chairs next week to get a better understanding of the faculty workload.

In November the task force will still be collecting data and present the proposed models at a December 8th town hall (10:00am-12:00pm). Based on feedback the models will be reviewed and revised and the final report is expected on January 31st.

Question by A. Lidinsky: Could you talk more about the size inequity? What is the problem exactly? Do all schools need to be the same size?

D. McMillen said that there are concerns with respect to distribution of resources and concerns of faculty having a disproportional voice against the other schools. Faculty size and number of students was looked at and the size difference is typical for universities that have liberal arts programs. We have two smaller schools on our campus that perhaps may be consolidated with a bigger one.

A. Lidinsky followed up by saying that commitment to a liberal arts education is a value to our university and has been a strength of ours as a regional university.

D. McMillen said that it is important for everyone to offer input.

Question by D. Surma: Will there be a concrete plan/model that will be presented at the next town hall?

D. McMillen said that several models will be presented.

D. Surma followed up and said that at the last meeting there were several models already presented. Would it then be beneficial for people to submit their ideas ahead of time and how should that happen?

D. McMillen said they are gathering information but they are not asking for people to propose a definitive model. When 3-4 models are presented on the December 8th town hall it will allow for people to bring more suggestions.

D. Surma said what if someone has a completely different model that they want to suggest. When should that input be offered?

D. McMillen said anytime using the sources that he described earlier. The committee is open to receiving new ideas.

Question/Comment by J. Mattox: The question is more about the long-term process of this committee and its charge. The main reason for reorganization was to meet the budgetary needs, has the committee's research showed that there have been savings to colleges which restructured? How much money will be saved? At the

first town hall it seemed that we do this for equity and to provide a way for our students to navigate better. What is really the main reason?

D. McMillen said the main reason is the financial savings but not the only reason. Some of the other colleges that reorganized looked at eliminations and we are not doing that. They were saving by eliminating programs that is not what we are doing. We are only aiming to reorganize with the intent to save some money. We need to temper our expectations, it will not save us one million dollars, but maybe a few hundred thousands of dollars annually which would be significant over time.

Question/Comment by S. Nichols-Boyle: My question is about timeline and input. The next town hall and the opportunity to respond is during or close to finals week and there is a quick turnaround with the January senate meeting and the annual report. Could there be one more session, maybe through ZOOM or that could be recorded for others to contribute? There are opportunities but there seems to be no effective change.

D. McMillen said the committee takes any input very seriously.

J. Resler said there will be questions sent to department chairs, and they will be bringing the questionnaire to the department meetings.

C. Schult encouraged the ZOOM component of the next town hall. She also mentioned that on December 8th UCET is having a spa day starting at 12:30pm.

9. Academic Master Plan update—Jill Pearson. EVC Academic Affairs

J. Pearson gave an update on the Academic Master Plan process. An Academic Master Plan can be done in different ways based on the institution and the moment in time. Our campus' focus during this process and outcomes were shared. The process is currently in phase one. Three meetings are taking place this semester and each meeting has specific goals and outcomes. The goals of the second phase were also shared. J. Pearson noted that academic units will work on an implementation plan for programs that will be recommended to grow, sustain, or revitalize. Any degree programs that will be recommended for elimination will follow the campus REM process. The agenda of the first session which was held on October 7th, 2022 was shared (see [file](#)). J. Pearson pointed out that at the end of the [power point presentation](#) one may see the outcomes from previous Academic Master Planning. Some of the data used during the October 7th session were about census, needs in our region and labor statistics. She thanked R. Adaikkalavan for his work in putting these data together. At the end of the session all who attended were asked to brainstorm ideas and opportunities for enrollment and/or revenue growth based on the data presented and our campus' focus and share at the second session. J. Pearson emphasized that all ideas are encouraged even if these ideas were shut down in the past by previous administration. Finally, a tentative agenda for the second session which will take place on November 4th, was shared (see [file](#)).

Comment by H. Froysland: This concern was also presented at the first session of the Academic Master Planning process but wanted to raise it at the Senate Meeting as well with the larger audience. A lot of the data presented seemed to be suited for particular programs such as nursing. A number of programs though graduate students who might end up following a career different from their earned degree. A survey conducted by the American Association of Universities and Colleges asked 400 CEOs who they are looking to employ and 80% of them said that they are not looking for a particular major but they are looking for transferrable skills such as communication and critical thinking. There should be a skill-based set.

J. Pearson said that the data that was presented was about program creation. She acknowledged that H. Froysland is raising a good point. The liberal arts education that we offer is valued and we need to do a good job of articulating this to our prospective students. The data was not intending to define how we determine other needs for the campus.

Question by D. Marr: The previous Academic Master Plan was focused on gaps and creating new programs. At this point how do we make sure to support existing programs and sustain them? We have fewer resources and fewer faculty.

J. Pearson acknowledged that D. Marr raised a great point.

Comment by D. Hopkins: We are teaching a generation of students who wants to know what they will do with their degree. The liberal arts education is important but our students do want a job title.

J. Pearson said that this is the reason why we need to articulate what each degree can lead to and what the opportunities are for the students that follow that path.

Question/Comment by D. McMillen: Also wants to talk about current programs. Consideration should be given to programs where for example a BA degree exists. Should there be a BS degree for that program that would serve students with different needs? What about accelerated programs, 3+2, 4+1? Micro credentials and certificates that students may gather along the way to graduation help boost our existing programs.

J. Pearson agreed that this process should also be seen as a revitalization opportunity.

10. CBAC update—Andy Williams, VC Administration and Finance

A. Williams thanked everyone for making him feel so welcome in the last two and a half months. He presented an update on the budget (see [file](#)). He went over the operating budget for the university and the two main funding sources, state appropriation and tuition and fees. State appropriation changes each year based on the state's performance funding model. The performance based funding model was adopted in 2002-2003 for all higher education institutions in the state. The model takes about 5 to 6% from each institution then adds a certain amount approved by the Governor and then redistributes it out to all institutions based on performance in five main categories: overall degree completions, at-risk degree completion, STEM degree completions, student persistence (for example, 15 credit hours completed, or other milestones checked), and four-year degree completions. Our university received about 1.9% of the total state performance funding pool for 2022-2023. This represents a slight increase from the year before (see [file](#) for exact numbers and comparisons with other institutions). Enrollment unfortunately declined a bit in comparison to the previous year. Our school budgeted for a 4% decline this year but fall enrollment was down 1.6%. Spring and Summer enrollments are unknown at this point but as of October 28th it appears that we will have a positive net position this year. This is largely due to salary savings from vacant positions being greater than the total amount of under-budgeted items such as marketing and athletics. This is all good news. A lot of variables are still out there and we need to see what Spring enrollment will be.

CBAC update:

- The Chancellor accepted the committee's recommendation to use the leftover money in base budget from the 1% pool for staff reclassifications.
- A one-time funding of \$25,000 has been identified by the Chancellor for professional development opportunities in the Spring (see [file](#)).
- The committee is charged to provide ideas and feedback on the possible creation of an Exemplary Performance Bonus Program.

Comment by A. Pant: In the past we had a process for requesting one-time money for special projects. The campus should consider implementing a process and collecting input about ways to use/redistribute money that is leftover.

A. Williams said that this suggestion is appreciated and CBAC will consider it.

Question by D. Surma: The \$35,000 leftover money was in base budget. Was there any other money left over for the whole fiscal year? Was any money put into the reserves? Was there another account created and some money was put into it?

A. Williams said that there was no money added to the reserves last year, it was essentially a break-even year. About \$100,000 left over. Besides we should not forget the under budgeted items that have not been incorporated into the budget yet.

E. Paice: Follow-up to A. Pant's question. Even though we're doing better, we still have \$ 4-5 million unbudgeted, so we're unlikely to have a lot of money left over to fund special projects.

11. CDC update strategic plan—Kyoko Takanashi

K. Griffith is co-chairing the committee and J. Amellio is the secretary. K. Takanashi pointed out that many people in the room were involved with developing and providing feedback for the 2021-2026 strategic plan titled "Building a brighter future". A recent development requires that we need a new strategic plan that addresses the three pillars (student success and opportunity, transformative research and creativity, service to our state and beyond) (see [file](#)). All IU campuses are required to do this. Since so many people were already involved and put work into the 2021-2026 strategic plan for our campus, the committee will not start from scratch rather they will put everything into the new format. K. Takanashi said that they will be creative and efficient. A timeline for the strategic plan was shared (see [file](#)). The goal is to have the plan finalized in March 2023. All members of the CDC were acknowledged.

Comment by R. Olivier: It is very difficult to keep track of everything that is going on on our campus, attend town hall events and provide input. It is very hard for faculty to find time to do everything.

C. Schult said that there is a lot going on and there is more coming up. She hopes that there will be survey options for people who might not be able to attend town halls. She urged everyone to do as much as they can and acknowledged that it is not easy to bring everyone together so attending the Senate meetings is important.

12. Announcements

E. Zynda: The first Deans' seminar of the year is held today at noon in the UCET classroom. R. Reddy will present his research.

A. Lidinsky: There will be a free viewing of the Hulu documentary "Aftershock" which is about maternal mortality. C. Pfeiffer and I are putting this together as part of the Women and Gender Studies program. It will take place at the main public library's Leighton Auditorium in downtown South Bend on Tuesday, November 15th, 6:00-8:30pm and will be followed by a panel discussion.

J. Muniz: There will be an IUSB Piano Series concert tonight (Friday, Oct. 28) at 7:00pm in Joshi Performance Hall) of Ukrainian-American pianist Lydia Artymiw, and a choir concert tomorrow night, Oct 29.

D. Blouin: This afternoon in the UCET classroom there will be a PTR workshop for the ones considering a second promotion next year.

R. Adaikkalavan: Spring enrollment starts next week. Students should be advised and get enrolled. There is only a few weeks before the Spring semester starts and it is usually hard to reach students after finals.

B. Mociulski: The annual Fine Arts Scholarship Art Sale is back. It runs from Nov 2–5 in the Education & Arts Art Gallery.

S. Jones: Contact the Health and Wellness center to get your flu shots and COVID boosters.

H. Davis: The American Democracy Project and Abc57 will host a forum with the candidates for the Penn-Harris-Madison school board on November 1st at 6:30pm at the Mishawaka-Penn-Harris public library. Encourage everyone to attend.

V. Kwong: There has been an online education survey for strategic planning. We do need more input from students and staff. Encourage them to respond, the link to the survey is posted on the Daily Titan.

13. Motion to Adjourn was seconded at 11:28am .

Respectfully submitted by A. Savvopoulou (Senate Secretary, 2022-2023)