

## Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, January 19, 2024 1:30 – 3:00 pm DW 1001

The meeting was conducted in hybrid mode. See [here](#) for the rules that were applied.

**Members present in the room:** R. Adaikkalavan, B. Balthaser, V. Bindroo, C. Borshuk, K. Bregu, L. Collins, H. Davis, J. Deranek, K. Ervick, J. Essig, W. Feighery, T. Fong-Morgan, H. Froysland, S. Gerencser, C. Gerken, A. Grens, A. Hakanoglu, C. He, S. Hottois, L. Kahan, N. Karakatsanis, E. Kelley, B. Labbe, I. Levine, A. Lidinsky, C. Lisoni, D. Marr, T. Martinez, J. Mattox, D. McMillen, S. Merken, B. Mociulski, S. Moore, Jen. Muniz, J. Muniz, S. Nichols-Boyle, R. Olivier, S. Opasik, A. Pant, B. Pathak, J. Pearson, G. Popescu, J. Resler, E. Roth, A. Rusnock, T. Martinez, S. Salisbury, A. Savvopoulou, C. Schult, H. Scott, J. Smith, C. Sofhauser, M. Swintz, K. Takanashi, M. Tetzlaff, S. Thomas, J. Thompson, R. Torstrick, W. Tourtillotte, J. VanderVeen, C. Vlaeminck, B. White.

**Members present on Zoom:** M. Bakerson, N. Bradley, K. Borkholder, J. Campbell, L. Chen, K. Clear, S. Elrod, P. Geels, A. Gretencord, S. Haithcox, H. Hakimzadeh, J. Hatfield, T. Hebert, C. Herbert-Annis, M. Holland, D. Hopkins, S. Imes, S. Jang, B. Kern, V. Kwong, R. Langton, T. Liechty, K. Ludy, M. Lynker, K. MacInnis, M. Mancino, M. Marmorino, A. Meisami, M. Merhi, M. Monroe, A. Muhlstadt, M. Oake, B. Okanlami, K. Okrah, S. Pape, M. Roberts, C. Robinson, K. Sargent, A. Schmitz, A. Schnabel, W. Shrader, N. Somerville, Y. Song, B. Spinda, A. Springler, K. Sullivan, D. Surma, A. Swain, D. Vrajitoru, K. Werner-Sanders, K. Wilson, L. Zynda.

1. The meeting was called to order by C. Schult at 1:30 pm.

The pre-meeting slides including the land acknowledgment may be found [here](#).

C. Schult went over the guidelines for the hybrid format and participation while on Zoom. Questions may be asked after the speaker has concluded their presentation. Both questions from the floor and questions from Zoom will be addressed. She noted that the Chancellor was attending the meeting on Zoom.

2. Approval of November 2023 Minutes [FILE](#)

The November meeting minutes were approved. Two minor corrections related to acronyms had already been addressed.

*(Zoom attendees were experiencing audio issues. The meeting was briefly paused.)*

3. Nominating Committee update—presented by S. Moore

S. Moore stressed the importance of faculty governance and encouraged faculty to become members of a Senate Committee in 2024-2025. The call was for elected Senate Committees only. The positions sought are for the Executive Committee, UFC representative, Athletics Committee, PTR Senate Committee, and Faculty Board of Review. The specifics about representation and term of service may be found [here](#).

A link has appeared in the Daily Titan to complete a Qualtrics survey regarding preferences.

C. Schult urged everyone to make the nominating committee's job as easy as possible by volunteering.

She also pointed out that the clinical line and non-tenure track has not passed for the PTR Senate Committee yet but when/if it does then someone will be needed for those positions.

4. Teaching Committee update—presented by T. Fong-Morgan, L. Collins, J. VanderVeen, P. Carl

T. Fong-Morgan reminded everyone that the review of the questions on the student course evaluations started in 2019. There have been multiple years of discussion on ways to solicit qualitative feedback. In the meantime, the committee recognizes that there is significant concern about radically altering or eliminating altogether quantitative evaluation. The committee evaluated faculty feedback and suggested that we move away from instructor-focused questions and lean towards course design, individual learning, and course delivery. [Two questions are recommended](#) to be added to the student course evaluations. They are brief and appropriately open-ended and lean towards the tendency of positive response.

Questions to be added to campus-wide questions, starting Spring 2024:

- a. What worked in class to support your learning and why?
- b. What could be improved upon and how?

Question by A. Pant: One of the current quantitative questions is “I learned a lot from this course”. How about we add the option of leaving comments after that question? A longer survey might not be beneficial.

The committee representatives responded that the recommended questions are a bit more specific, and they provide more guidance and direction. Besides, comments are often not being filled in.

Follow-up by R. Torstrick: “I learned a lot in this course” does not say much about what the instructor did in the classroom. The suggested questions give students a chance to reflect on how they learned. Many of our students come to the university to earn grades and for us to be successful we need to support their transition to learning. Asking everyone the same question also allows for some data collection across the different units on campus in the future.

Follow-up by A. Pant: The sequencing of the questions is important as students may just say “see above.”

The committee representatives responded that we need to try this and see what happens.

Comment by B. White: B. White has been embedding two similar questions and they elicit different comments and feedback from the earlier questions. She does not remember ever receiving “see above.” She gets rich data from these questions and intends to keep including them if the proposal does not pass.

Comment on Zoom by M. Roberts: It might help with students answering all components if the “why” and “how” are broken into separate line items.

Comment on Zoom by H. Hakimzadeh: He has used the following questions during mid-semester course evaluations to make changes and adjustments as needed.

“ What is one specific thing about this course or my work as an instructor that I should stop doing because it has not helped your learning in this course?”, “ What is one specific thing that you as a student should stop doing because it has not helped your learning in this course?”, “What is one specific thing that your other professors have done that you think I should also start doing?”, “What is one specific thing that other students have done that you think you should also start doing?”.

Comment on Zoom by student L. Avery: These questions will allow students to realize what works for them and for their learning and use it in other courses and in future semesters, too.

J. VanderVeen added that there is always an opportunity to add personalized questions course by course or semester by semester.

C. Schult mentioned that this proposal comes from a Senate Committee, so it has been moved and seconded. Discussion was closed. An electronic ballot will be sent out next week. She thanked the committee for their work and commented that this has been a long time coming.

5. [PTR membership changes](#)—add Teaching Professor and Clinical Line faculty to committee—presented by S. Opasik

S. Opasik mentioned that it is well-known that clinical and lecture lines are expected to come to the PTR Senate Committee. There is currently no representation for these lines. The proposal to update the membership section and officers’ section of the PTR Senate Committee was shared, and if this passed, it would add representation to both lines. The proposal states that the chair of the Committee would have to be a tenured member. In fact, all officers from the committee’s membership would have to be tenured faculty members. This is a change embedded in the proposal after the last time that this was brought in front of the Senate.

Comment on Zoom by B. Spinda: It is a bit contradictory to start with “The committee shall consist of seven tenured...” And then say one must be a teaching professor and one must be a clinical line, as those are not “tenured.” Maybe consider saying that they need to be promoted at such and such level or above.

C. Schult mentioned that the proposal mentions seven voting faculty members and two observers, the clinical professor would be able to vote on certain cases. Voting members would be able to vote at their level or above. Members in the room pointed out that this is unclear as the proposal may be read as a total of eleven members. C. Schult said that the proposal will be sent back to the committee to clean up the language.

6. Non-Tenure Track committee [proposal](#)—presented by C. Schult
  - a. Allow voting privileges for visiting faculty—first reading

The Executive Committee asked the Non-Tenure Track Committee to make a recommendation on the following matter. We currently have 15 slots for associate faculty voting members in the Academic Senate. Not all 15 are filled.

There are visiting faculty who would like to be involved in faculty governance and there is no place for them. There is a motion to have the 15 slots being filled by visiting faculty and associate faculty without specifying how many for each.

We have had visiting faculty who are part of our campus for many years.

A.Pant asked for the actual proposal. C. Schult shared the [proposal](#) to have the constitution changed, highlighting where the language “visiting faculty” would be added.

Question by D. McMillen: Do we need to guarantee representation from both bodies every year?

C. Schult said that this is currently not built in.

Comment by R. Adaikkalavan: Has the committee investigated ACA 14? ACA 14 has restrictions on visiting faculty.

C. Schult said that they have not and would encourage them to do so.

Comment on Zoom by D. Surma: How long has the number 15 been in place? It might be time to revise this number since our faculty has shrunk. Also, would this apply to brand new associate and visiting faculty? The committee should consider adding a stipulation that the person must be in their second, third, or whatever year.

C. Schult acknowledged that faculty has indeed shrunk, she is not sure what the proportion was originally as to where the number 15 came from. She pointed out that we do allow associate faculty who teach one credit hour to be considered for a vote and that the school is trying to step away from third year visiting faculty.

There were no further questions.

7. [Committee membership changes](#) due to AOD reorganization—presented by J. Resler and committee representatives—first reading
  - a. Admissions, Advising, and Student Affairs; General Education; Research and Development;

J. Resler went over the changes for each of these Senate Committees. He emphasized the number of members, school representations, and term of membership. J. Resler pointed out that representatives from all three committees were present at the meeting and could address questions/concerns if needed.

Question by A. Pant: The Research and Development Committee change proposal clearly specifies that every School on campus must be represented. The same thing should happen for all other committees – the Schools should maintain their individual identities and representation on the committees.

J. Resler said that the proposals maintain the current structure and are just renaming where the members are coming from.

Follow-up comment by B. Labbe: (*B. Labbe serves as co-chair of the General Education Committee this year*) In our committee's discussions we were concerned about having representatives from each School. We also wanted to take a conservative approach due to the necessary voting requirements from the General Education Committee. The proposed changes are intended to maintain the current structure of the Gen Ed voting block as is and discuss potential revisions after the academic organization has been completed.

Question on Zoom by B. Spinda: Why are there 5 representatives from the new CAS and 3 from the Professional Schools for the Gen Ed Committee?

B. Labbe reiterated what he had already said that the committee wanted to maintain the current structure and revisit the membership requirements after restructuring. C. Schult added that most general education courses are taught within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and consequently the new/future College of Arts and Sciences.

Comment on Zoom by B. Spinda: Why are we trying to change something now then?

J. Resler mentioned that the proposals do not change the current representation but rather how we identify where people come from.

Question by A. Rusnock: Why are there so many administrators on the Admissions, Advising, and Student Affairs Committee? This is supposed to be a faculty senate committee.

Answer by A. Grens: (*A. Grens serves as co-chair of this committee for this year*) The Director of Admissions is there as part of the charge of the committee. A lot of what the committee deals with involves student engagement and enrollment management. The Committee is proposing to raise the number from three administrators to four so that there will be someone serving from the centralized advising center.

Follow-up by A. Rusnock: Do administrators vote?

A. Grens said that voting depends on what is being discussed.

Question by S. Gerencser: Are we going to go through each one of the Senate Committees one by one and update these or do you need our immediate attention on these specific ones?

J. Resler said that these are Committees with specific school representation mentioned, and the language needs to be updated to reflect the new structure.

Question by A. Pant: Will these come back in front of the Senate?

C. Schult answered affirmatively that this will be discussed again at the next Senate meeting. Since these are changes to the constitution, a ballot will also be distributed at a later time. A. Pant encouraged each School to review these and send feedback to the committees and/or their supervisors.

Comment by E. Bennion: Are these the only Senate Committees with specific representation? The Faculty Welfare and Personnel standing Committee also asks for representation from each School.

C. Schult said that most committees have a recommendation on getting as broad representation as possible, but this is not a requirement. There were no further questions.

This proposal will be reviewed at the next Senate meeting time and then go out for a vote.

8. Spring Enrollment [report](#)—presented by R. Adaikkalavan, AVCEM

As of Monday (January 15<sup>th</sup>), census day, undergraduate beginners (new students) are down 28%, transfer students are up by 20.2%, graduate beginners are up by 113%, and continuing students (everyone else) are up 5.3%. All percentages are in comparison to Spring 2023 enrollment numbers. Overall, this semester, we are by 5.5% students since one year ago, and up 1.8% since two years ago.

In terms of credit hours, we are up 6.2% in comparison to one year ago and 3.5% in comparison to two years ago. R. Adaikkalavan noted that our budget is based on credit hours offered, not the number of students. In comparison to the other IU campuses, IU South Bend had the highest positive percentage change in comparison to one year ago amongst all IU campuses in both number of students and credit hours offered. A quick analysis was also shared, see report for more information. R. Adaikkalavan thanked everyone for their work on enrollment, retention, and persistence. He especially mentioned the team of the Guided Pathways Academy (GPA), B. Lucal, R. Torstrick, and B. Lindstrom. Finally, he encouraged everyone to continue to complete the Student Engagement Report weekly especially if there is a status change for a student and urged everyone to reach out to students who have been admitted for Fall 2024 and convince them to come to IU South Bend.

9. AMP update—presented by J. Pearson, EVCAA

J. Pearson started by thanking everyone who has been involved in the AMP process for their work. We are now on our third draft. The timeline has been updated to allow for faculty creativity, an addendum about organization and clarity has been drafted, the process keeps evolving based on input and more support accompanies all the work to ensure success. The Deans are now working to submit their revisions, talk to your Deans if you have suggestions. J. Pearson shared some innovative and collaborative examples from our campus. More information may be found [here](#).

J. Pearson mentioned some reasons why AMP is necessary. We need to continue being responsible stewards since students pay tuition and the state gives us funds. We should consider what the best use of our resources is, especially as we are expecting an enrollment cliff. We also need to ensure that students are getting the best experience possible - large programs have more diversity. We also need to be cognizant of the workload impact, as low-enrolled programs do take time since there is a lot to take care of to maintain these programs. If we do not see growth, we need to use our resources to do the things we want to do. Finally, she said that IU central is expecting us to go through this process and address these issues. Every campus has been asked to look at low enrolled programs and find creative ways to address the issues. No decision has been made yet for low enrolled programs. Enrollment has been going well but we are still looking at \$2.2million worth of underbudgeted items so we are not out of the woods yet, but we have come a long way in the last two years. When AMP is complete, we will be more inventive and innovative, have better academic experiences for our students, have more streamlined workload and resources that we can invest in growth opportunities. At the end, she asked faculty to work creatively and collaboratively to maintain the broadest possible portfolio of academic disciplines, help students prepare for the future and be ready to face challenges. The Deans will continue the process and she encouraged everyone to join.

## 10. Q & A on AMP

Question by J. VanderVeen: First question, you mentioned that the timeline is being changed. Is this reflected already in the AMP or do we wait till the finalized draft comes out?

J. Pearson said that she has already made some changes throughout the process. If anything additional comes up, it would have to be discussed. In terms of flexibility, if there is a reason, we can delay but otherwise we do not have an infinite amount of time and we want to keep moving forward as proactively as possible as central IU administration will be putting more pressure.

Question by J. VanderVeen: Second question, could you speak more to the expectations from IU and the looming feeling that you are describing?

Chancellor Elrod (through Zoom) answered the question. S. Sciame-Gieseke joined the last AOD-I meeting and mentioned that IU institutional analytics was asked to create spreadsheets and dashboards around program enrollment. Every university has received their own and so have we. Chancellors have been asked to get together to discuss and find ways to collaborate on the low enrolled programs. No specific timeline or numbers of programs has been set by IU, just that these enrollments are on the radar of the leadership of IU. She has let them know of our AMP process and let them know that we are already doing this, including looking into our low enrolled programs. She will continue to advocate for our process and our thoughtful engagement of faculty in this process. No specific expectations aside from what has been outlined by J. Pearson have been shared. Chancellor Elrod will be meeting next month when more information might be shared. She will then keep everyone posted.

Question by A. Rusnock : Where are we getting the data about students not wanting to be in low enrolled classes because they get nervous? Isn't it our job to make them un-nervous? Where is the data coming from? It seems anecdotal. Lastly, in terms of low enrolled programs and low enrolled courses, when some of us have 40 or 50 students in one class and 10 in another, is this worse than someone who might have 15 and 15 in their classes? We need to count enrollment differently and need to be more strategic. This is just demoralizing for some of us.

J. Pearson asked if A. Rusnock suggested that we adjust course caps.

Follow-up by A. Rusnock: We need to look at some of these numbers differently. Someone may be teaching 15+15 students in their (two) classes, and it is okay but if someone has 40+10 students in their classes it is not good enough. This is not fair.

D. McMillen responded that historically we did take all types of things into consideration when making such decisions. We should not be focusing on low-enrolled courses but on student hours per FTE. If a department that teaches a lot of gen ed courses has upper-level low enrolled courses, then increasing the number of students in the low-level courses should be a way to honor running the upper-level courses. Now low enrolled programs provide some significant limitations. When running upper-level courses, we can only run some of these sections each semester and some students are not getting the breadth of the courses they could have if they were in a large program. In some cases, teaching a required course for 3-4 students becomes an independent study and it is unfair to the faculty member.

Question on Zoom by D. Surma: Did IU central give any parameters? How were the low enrolled programs defined?

Chancellor Elrod said that no specific parameters have been set yet. She will learn more about their expectations in the coming weeks. An example that has been mentioned is a program that has had no more than 9 graduates in 5 years and 10 students currently enrolled. Still though no parameters have been specified.

Comment by A. Lidinsky: I appreciate that no specific expectations have been communicated by IU. Another challenge we are facing is our budget, and these two seem to be hovering around each other. Certainly, an argument can be made that faculty are given the opportunity to think who we will become and what kind of institution we want to be and use the time to be as creative as possible to dream about our future. We are all going to be here and outlast the administration.

Question on Zoom by M. Bakerson: Chancellor Elrod mentioned data tables. Has the coding issue been resolved, particularly in the context of the School of Education and Business? The data for these two schools is aggregated, not allowing for a distinct analysis by individual programs. This limitation, as understood, is due to the existing coding structure. The ability to break out this data separately for each program is essential for our detailed analysis and reporting needs.

R. Adaikkalavan responded that our budget side is extremely complex. On the enrollment side we go by program codes. Data for individual programs were provided to the AMP working group during the process. If further analysis is needed in terms of enrollment and completion, they can certainly investigate it.

Question by E. Roth: In the AMP many, many programs were included in the category “need further discussion.” So, the individualized assessments were based on available data but then there is no specific set of criteria, which then becomes tricky. How do we move forward? How do we revitalize without any guidance or criteria?

J. Pearson said that there are no set numbers because then we would be cutting everything below that number. We must reduce the number of low enrolled programs, but her hope is to do this in a way to sustain as large a scope of disciplines for the campus as possible.

Comment by J. Garcia-Martinez: We need to be ahead of the curve and need to do this on our own instead of having IU telling us what to do. All the other institutions he was at previously did the same thing. Some institutions would assess each program every five years, the same type of exercise had to take place and academic re-organization was also happening at the same time.

C. Schult urged everyone to talk to their Deans or EVCAA Pearson should you have further questions/comments/concerns.

#### 11. AAUP presentation on AMP/AOD—presented by B. Feighery and J. Mattox

C. Schult said that a petition was signed by over ten faculty members and in such cases our constitution allows for a place on today’s agenda.

B. Feighery shared faculty concerns about the [AMP process and a petition for faculty to sign to stop it](#). He went over all three sections of the petition and explained that some faculty members had already seen it since November as they were trying to improve the initial draft. He described the different ways that individual faculty members may sign the petition. It is not being asked that the of faculty sign as a



group or feel forced to sign. Paper copies were available at the meeting or faculty may scan the QR code shown in the presentation. Supporting documentation is included along with the petition.

J. Mattox added that if someone scans the QR code it does not mean that this person is signing it. AAUP members would stay after the meeting and be outside the room if people wanted to chat more about this. The AAUP is an ever-changing group of faculty who are advocating for faculty interests. Faculty are here long term and should be involved as much as possible.

Question by A. Pant: In the introduction it was said that both the AMP and the AOD processes were flawed. Why is only the cessation of AMP included in this petition? Secondly, is this coming from the Senate?

B. Feighery said that a petition was signed by ten faculty members who are part of the AAUP. This is not coming from the Senate. To address the first question, B. Feighery said that when the initial draft of the proposal was distributed to a few people, their feedback was that AOD was already done.

C. Schult reminded everyone that the Trustees have already approved the reorganization.

B. Feighery invited A. Pant to join the cause.

Comment by A. Rusnock: Thank you for doing this, this is important and very impressive.

B. Feighery said that this should have been done earlier and have included the AOD process.

Comment by M. Tetzlaff: She supports this petition. People in the AAUP are willing to find ways to solve some of the problems that the AMP is designed to address, including lobbying the state government or finding other creative things that we can do. She thanked the colleagues who put this petition together.

J. Mattox asked everyone to strongly consider signing and said that faculty conversations need to keep going. Faculty have shared interests.

## 12. UFC report - presented by H. Froysland, UFC rep

The last UFC meeting was on 12/12/2023.

It started with a report from the co-chairs. The most significant thing that stood out came from C. Schult who drew attention to the University Administration tax (UA tax). She pointed out that this is particularly problematic for the regional campuses and suggested that the costs of centralized services should be shared proportionally among campuses.

Next, President Whitten talked about the 2030 strategic plan and highlighted student success. Research and creative activity were also mentioned by the President. What stood out from that part of the presentation was the expectation to increase efforts for outside funding and external support for research and creative activity. The President highlighted the accomplishments of three IU students one of whom is our own, Emilee Edmonds, a Physics and Mathematics major (*Emilee was in the room and received an enthusiastic round of applause*). Emilee presented a paper at a conference in Hawaii and J. Hinnefeld was also there. It was great to hear President Whitten mention Emilee's accomplishments.

N. Paton, Vice President and Chief Communications and Marketing Officer, spoke about the new IU brand roll out.

J. Payne -Kirchmeier, Vice President for student success, talked about resources for mental health, data analysis, and early interventions. Some of the bigger campuses are not as far along as we are with early interventions with the use of SER and the summer bridge programs, to mention a couple of examples. The new technology, Stellic, was also mentioned. Stellic is a comprehensive online tool for student success and will be launched in July 2024 at IU South Bend.

There was also a report by the co-chairs of the university-wide AI task force. The members of the team had been put together and there was a vote on that and it passed.

A brief discussion on the neutral gender term “emerit” also took place at that meeting. This was only a point of discussion.

Finally, the new policy on employee relationships involving students passed. It went into effect January 9th. It is noteworthy that President Whitten was not happy with this policy as she thought that it was not taking things far enough.

### 13. President’s Remarks— presented by C. Schult

C. Schult brought up the common calendar. This is the second semester that a common calendar among the regional campuses is in place. President Whitten invited the UFC co-chairs to a meeting in December and said that she wants a university-wide common calendar. Her intention is that all campuses should be following Bloomington’s calendar. There will be more discussion on that. This will be tricky as the regional campuses work differently.

The governance structure for IU online has also been circulating. IU online has not had enough faculty oversight. Outside consultants were invited to come in and they shared a report. C. Schult has not seen or read the report. The report pointed out that things were not done right or carefully and that resources are not being utilized enough or that sometimes the turnaround takes too long--it is hard to stay competitive in the online education domain that way. Feedback is being gathered and eventually there will be some form of faculty oversight which will be determined.

Finally, C. Schult said that she will be posting links to recent current events that happened on other campuses on the senate blog. The links to the articles may also be accessed through the president remarks slides [here](#). She quickly went through each case during the meeting.

### 14. Announcements

S. Thomas: The library has started a monthly film series. February 13, 2024 from 11:30-12:30 am in Fireside A & B we are showing *John Lewis: Get in the Way*.

The Titans Silent Book Club is reading on January 7<sup>th</sup> from 11-12:30 in Fireside A& B and February 7<sup>th</sup> from 11-12:30 in the WERC (second floor of the E&A Building). The Veterans Book Club meets Thursday, February 8<sup>th</sup>. We are reading “For Whom the Bell Tolls” by Ernest Hemingway. The club meets from 5:30-7:00 pm in the Schurz Library’s 3<sup>rd</sup> floor conference room. The Library is hosting a book sale on February 14 and 15<sup>th</sup>. Come show the library some love and buy a used book.

T. Martinez: The IU South Bend Student/Alumni Art Exhibition starts on January 22<sup>nd</sup>, gallery hours are M-Th 12pm-4pm. January 24<sup>th</sup> “Revelation: A Musical Celebration of Black History Month with George Shirley”, George Shirley is the first African American tenor to perform a leading role at the Metropolitan Opera in New York City. On January 31<sup>st</sup> come celebrate The Euclid Quartet’s CD release, Breve, on Afinat Records. The faculty showcase is on February 5<sup>th</sup>.

E. Kelley: (Director of professional engagement) A workshop called “Connecting Coursework to Careers through Transparency in Learning & Teaching (TILT)” will be held on Friday, February 9, 10:30 am to 1:00 pm in the UCET Classroom (NS 245). If interested, RSVP by January 26<sup>th</sup>.

V. Kwong (Zoom): Deadline for the Excellence in Online Teaching Award and the Excellence in Teaching with Technology Award is February 1, 2024. Please consider applying for these awards.

M. Roberts (Zoom): On February 19<sup>th</sup> the IUSB Dental Hygiene Program is partnering with HealthLinc for our annual Give Kids a Smile event. No cost preventive treatment, radiographs (if needed), sealants, etc. Call the clinic for more info.

L. Zwicker (Zoom): Deadline for study abroad trips to Iceland and Mexico is February 1<sup>st</sup>.

R. Torstrick: (Currently serving as interim Director of the GPA program) Torstrick thanked all faculty who made the spring re-enrollment for GPA students possible. This is B. Lindstorm’s and B. Lucal’s success, all their hard work is paying off. The GPA students are showing up as University Division students in class rosters.

A. Lidinsky: Emilee Edmonds should be celebrated. She is a student who gives back tenfold and has become a leader on our campus. This is exactly what we want to preserve for our University. C. Schult added that Emilee was also recognized at the most recent Trustees’ meeting.

J. VanderVeen: If you have not seen UCET’s newsletter and announcements in the Daily Titan, here are a few events to highlight. Proposals for the Midwest Conference on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning are due February 1<sup>st</sup> while the conference itself is on April 12<sup>th</sup>. The keynote speaker is Peter Felton this year. There is a book group reading one of his books. Sign up by 1/22 for all UCET’s book groups, you will get a free copy of the books if you sign up.

K. Ervick: Please encourage your students to submit their research and creative work for publication in student journals: Analecta, New Views on Gender, Undergraduate Research Journal, International Journal, History Journal, Graduate Journal. The deadline to submit is Feb 1.

B. Labbe: The Undergraduate Research Conference will be held Friday, April 26th. Students can submit their abstracts for papers or posters by March 31st through the URC website.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

-Anna Savvopoulou (Acting Senate Secretary)