

## Academic Senate Minutes

Friday, February 17, 2023 1:30 – 3:00 pm DW 1001

**Members present:** R. Adaikkalavan, M. Ananth, V. Bindroo, M. Block, D. Blouin, C. Borshuk, K. Bregu, D. Bryant, J. Burch, L. Collins, H. Davis, J. Deranek, S. Elrod, K. Ervick, J. Essig, W. Feighery, B. Fong-Morgan, C. Gerken, S. Haithcox, H. Hakimzadeh, S. Hottois, S. Imes, SK. Jang, L. Kahan, N. Karakatsanis, R. Kohli, V. Kwong, B. Labbe, K. Ladd, D. Lee, T. Liechty, B. Lucal, D. Marr, T. Martinez, J. Mattox, D. McMillen, A. Meisami, M. Merhi, S. Merken, B. Mociulski, M. Monroe, S. Moore, S. Nichols-Boyle, M. Oake, R. Olivier, S. Opasik, A. Pant, S. Pape, B. Pathak, J. Pearson, B. Phillips, K. Quimby, R. Reddy, J. Resler, M. Roberts, C. Robinson, K. Rusnock, K. Sargent, A. Savvopoulou, C. Schult, H. Scott, W. Shrader, J. Smith, B. Spinda, A. Springle, K. Sullivan, D. Surma, K. Suttman, K. Takanashi, J. Thompson, S. Torkzadeh, R. Torstrick, D. Vrajitoru, J. Wells, T. Willig, K. Wooden, L. Zwicker.

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

C. Schult made a few quick announcements:

a. Registration for the SoTL conference is open. Spots are filling up fast, reserve your spot, there is going to be a cap of 200 people.

b. Farewell to the O: Drive, make sure to save the files that you need. Contact UITS if help is needed. On April 11<sup>th</sup> the O: drive will be removed.

c. Two honors events: the St. Margaret's House Winter Walk is this coming Sunday. Party with a purpose will take place on International Women's day, on March 8<sup>th</sup>, in Fireside.

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

Minutes stand approved.

3. Ballot results for Constitution changes for Athletics Committee & Board of Review, and Regional Common Calendar—presented by J. Resler

The Athletics Committee ballot passed, 99% approved.

The Faculty Board of Review ballot passed, 99% approved.

The Common Calendar ballot passed, 94% approved.

4. Nominating Committee slate for Elected Committees—presented by H. Scott and M. Roberts

C. Schult mentioned that there was a vacancy on the Athletics Committee. The Executive Committee appoints S. Rizk for the rest of this year.

The nominations for the Senate Executive Committee, the Athletics Committee, the Faculty Board of Review and the PTR committee for the academic year 2023-2024 were presented see [file](#).

H. Scott commented that it is getting harder to find people who are willing to serve and thanked the ones who are willing to do so. There were no further nominations from the floor and nominations were closed. There are enough candidates to fill all necessary spots.

C. Schult thanked the nomination committee for their work. The nomination committee included H. Scott, M. Roberts, and J. Linton. There is no need for ballots as everyone is voted by acclamation.

#### 5. Teaching Committee—Course evaluation changes—presented by T. Fong-Morgan & K. Sullivan

T. Fong-Morgan said that the committee is looking forward to implementing the UFC recommendations for student course evaluations. She recognized that this is a difficult topic and emphasized that this is a faculty-driven initiative. Our campus is ahead of the curve and we have shown that no matter what might be thrown at us our faculty continue to teach well.

It all started with President McRobbie's 2019 State of the University when he requested a critical examination of teaching initiatives including the student course evaluation system. The UFC collaborated with the ALC (Academic Leadership Council) to explore alternatives to the student course evaluations. This undertaking was completed last year. The UFC and ALC task force made recommendations based on research, see [file](#). In December 2022, the Board of Trustees approved an amendment in support of UFC's recommendation. Now each campus and unit faculty governance organization shall have a policy for evaluating teaching that provides for qualitative student feedback and other sources of information. The Teaching Committee is beginning their work as charged. Faculty self-reflection and peer review of teaching are already part of PTR decisions and faculty's evaluation of teaching but they are not part of annual evaluations.

The Teaching Committee will have a listening session on February 23<sup>rd</sup> at 4pm. They will then review recommendations and will also seek feedback from the Deans. There will be other opportunities for input as well. The committee will report back to the senate and there will be a vote. It is important that we implement recommendations appropriate for our faculty. All ongoing documents will be available in Teams. Contact T. Fong-Morgan or K. Sullivan with questions.

#### Questions

**A. Pant:** "Because there is bias against ethnicity and gender we are giving up hope of building better numerical evaluations."

**T. Fong-Morgan:** "We are not redesigning anything. The main question is whether our quantitative use of course evaluations is appropriate for our campus."

**Follow-up by A. Pant:** "As a past chair and administrator, to completely get rid of numerical evaluations might be an issue for PTR and similar purposes."

**T. Fong-Morgan:** "We might not be necessarily getting rid of them."

C. Schult thanked the Teaching Committee for their work and encouraged everyone to participate in the process. She stressed that there will be several opportunities to form the best mix of evaluation of teaching on our campus.

## 6. Academic Organizational Design Task Force update—presented by J. Resler & D. McMillen

D. McMillen reported that the committee has been busy. The committee has been meeting its charge to recommend an organizational configuration for the academic schools and colleges that maximizes academic synergies and shared efficiencies while reducing administrative costs. The focus is not on the restructure of curricula or academic programs, only on how schools and colleges are organized administratively. They are not looking at department restructure. Once structural options are recommended, more detailed analysis of budget efficiencies for recommended structures will be conducted by additional groups in coordination with this task force to inform a final decision on the optimal structure, see [file](#). There will be input from the AMP committee, as well.

In their work they have been true to the seven guiding principles, see [file](#). This is a comprehensive list and is challenging to address in any particular model. A recap of what the committee has been doing was also shared along with the future plans of the task force, see file.

The six models presented in December have now been reduced to four and are presented today. They may be accessed at the Teams channel. Input is needed today and a survey which went out today is available. One does not need to answer every question on the survey in order to submit it.

The four models are:

### Model 1:

- this model has two colleges,
- formalizes the current integration of CLAS and Arts,
- maintains some of our core,
- it could better serve students,
- more streamlining is possible,
- somewhat disruptive,
- maintains programs at particular schools,
- will be less difficult to implement,
- given the size of these new colleges may not be as nimble,
- greatest potential for savings (in comparison to the other models), about \$300,000-\$400,000 annually, not taken into consideration department merges.

### Model 2:

- four college model,
- no significant changes since the December meeting, almost none,

- School of Education and the Arts come together,
- greatest advantage is that this is the least disruptive
- \$150,000-\$250,000 annual savings,
- the marriage of Arts and Education could potentially help with our K-12 education mission,
- maintains our status quo,
- not more nimble and does not foster interdisciplinary to a greater degree.

Model 5:

- three college model,
- very disruptive,
- significantly impacts all colleges and schools,
- task force recognizes there has been significant opposition to this model,
- it is an uncomfortable model but might foster significant changes and great opportunities for growth,
- potential of \$225,000-\$300,000 annual savings.

Model 6:

- four college model,
- disruptive model,
- Education and Health Sciences come together, Arts and Humanities come together, Math and Natural Sciences come together, and Business and Economics comes together with Computer Science and Informatics,
- synergies may be discovered and fostered,
- some opposition to this model has been expressed,
- loss of liberal arts core college,
- similar size for all schools and colleges and similar RCM (Responsibility Center Management)
- disruptive to implement, what we have to do for RCs and realigning faculty and reporting, significant amount of work,
- \$150,000-\$225,000 potential annual savings.

## **Questions:**

**A. Schnabel:** “Nimbleness seems to be a point. Why is it important? Why will that change? How is it defined?”

D. McMillen said that nimbleness is somewhat difficult to define. Basically when mandates are coming down or when we need to respond to workforce changes, a smaller college might be able to respond more appropriately. Nimbleness defines the way that we respond to external changes.

J. Pearson added that internal nimbleness has to do with process efficiency, and external nimbleness is based on responding to community needs.

**W. Feighery:** “The barriers to collaboration will not be broken down by moving departments from one college to another. Are we going to collaborate better if we call ourselves something different? The bigger question is the potential for savings, even though this is the last point on the slides, this used to be the first and main point for doing this. I appreciate that you gave us some numbers but those numbers are broad and not in detail, just counting Deans is not enough to calculate cost, we need to factor in all consequences and cost before we are expected to vote.”

D. McMillen said that sometimes when departments are working closer together, collaboration may be fostered that may give rise to potentially new programs. Maybe, for example, we would have Digital Analytics if Business and Computer Science were housed in the same school. There are some benefits to having programs together that could promote cross-discussion if housed within the same school or college. As far as potential savings, the numbers are broad, nothing in terms of detail. The potential savings that the task force has put together for each model were only based on the number of Deans and Associate Deans, nothing further. Going forward the plan is to do better modeling, but a more definitive set of structures is needed to do this. We would need to know the department level to be able to do this well. This will be presented into our final report. No voting needs to take place yet. The ultimate decision will be made with more numbers. In terms of cost offset we are only talking about potential savings on annual basis right now. Yes, there will be some costs up front during implementation. This is where we are now.

**A. Rusnock:** “Why are we doing this? What is the ultimate purpose? When these questions are answered then we could determine which model is most appropriate.”

D. McMillen said that it is not just one principle. The task force has evaluated all four models based on the seven guiding principles. One thing was to make sure to have savings administratively. Model 3, for example, was not going to have any savings and so it has been removed. The task force tried to meet all principles and different models meet the principles at a different degree. How are those principles applied in each model? Please complete the survey and share your opinion.

**J. Mattox:** “You indicated as a next step after the survey is the appropriate rigorous estimation of the financial benefits. Can the senate as a body endorse or not endorse the final model?”

D. McMillen said that it is up to the senate to endorse or not but the final decision belongs to the Chancellor.

C. Schult added that she thought the senate was not going to have a vote. REM policy indicates that whenever there is a proposal faculty need to have time to respond.

(See clarification in announcements at end of minutes).

**J. Wells:** “Thank you for the hard work. Is there a null hypothesis? Can we vote for no change? The survey does not allow that.”

D. McMillen said that they would be adding a “further comments” section.

J. Wells suggested that a null hypothesis or suggestions for other possibilities and interesting scenarios be included. Great deal of savings may be accomplished by creating efficiencies using information infrastructure. The Deans might be able to streamline and get some of the administrative work off of faculty. Can we do that without damaging the existing system? J. Wells commented that he appreciates nimbleness.

D. McMillen said that he appreciates where he is coming from. Our greatest cost to the university is personnel so that offers the greatest opportunity for savings. He also understands the desire to maintain things the way they are, some view change as negative but he would argue that change is not always a negative thing. It could be a positive outcome. Our student body has decreased, some change is needed and now is the time to do it. When the committee was doing some reading and was looking at other universities that have been through a reorganization, they were doing it because they had to, they were in a budgetary situation that mandated this. Those universities had looked at reorganization and elimination of programs. We are not there. This is an opportunity for us to make changes for the long term good of the university.

**N. Karakatsanis:** “Thank you to the committee. Given the enrollment decline this is at the right time to do this. I appreciate the fact that some numbers have been included. Since this is the faculty senate, and guiding principle number five reads “Creating efficiencies that free up faculty and staff to focus on teaching, research, student support and outreach”, has the task force thought about what those efficiencies would look like for faculty for each of the models?”

D. McMillen said that the committee had distributed a November survey to departments and chairs to figure out how to do this better. For example, we have a lot of faculty who have a lot of administrative duties and may be freed to focus on student work or research. Administratively maybe some things done by faculty should move to staff.

N. Karakatsanis said that the models do not make this obvious.

D. McMillen explained that this is because the committee has not been looking at the departmental level. Eventually they will do that going forward but received some push-back and paused this.

**C. Borshuk:** “I understand that we need savings due to low enrollment. Have there been discussions to have a smaller number of Associate Vice Chancellors? Have there been discussions about losing some administrators at the top? Second question: examining the models is hard for me to answer the questions when we do not know if every department will have a chair and whether they are going to be compensated in an equitable way.”

D. McMillen said that the committee has not looked at the number of Vice Chancellors. At every Vice Chancellor level there certainly have been reductions and an increase in workload. Associate Deans would be something to comment on when doing the survey. We need to think about this more, what will the structure look like? On average with the exception of model 1, models keep the same number of Associate Deans. Discussions about the number of chairs will be carried out when we think about our departmental restructure. Do we need to have divisions? This will be discussed later.

**D. Surma:** “All four models have pluses and minuses. This started with the Chancellor’s budget memo, and emphasis was put on cost. We need to balance cost and disruption. Two models had the same savings and one was far less disruptive. Nothing is stopping any of us from working together. We do not need to put departments/people in the same college in order for people to work together. There are other ways to do this. In any good organization, when there is change there is an option to stay the same and then one would need to justify why no change is recommended. This option should be added to the survey.”

**R. Olivier on behalf of J. Muniz:** “Who will be reading the survey or will it go further on?”

D. McMillen said that the task force and the executive committee would be reading the results.

**B. Pathak:** “Overall savings will be less than .5% of the budget. If we can quantify the benefits of the models in terms of any additional revenue that may be brought in by the creation of new programs then that could help us understand the models better.”

D. McMillen said that it is easier to predict the savings than the potential revenue that we could generate with each model. The committee would need to work with the AMP committee to do this. This would be difficult to do.

C. Schult thanked the committee and encouraged everyone to fill out the survey.

D. McMillen said that an open box for additional comments will be added to the survey.

7. Academic Master Plan update—presented by EVCAA J. Pearon

J. Pearon repeated the definition and outcomes of the Academic Master plan, see [file](#). She thanked everyone who has been involved and noted that people have been showing up to provide feedback during the process. Currently units are reviewing their programs such as majors, minors, and certificates and working with their Deans to submit recommendations based on the parameters of enrollment, feasibility, institutional mission, and community need.

J. Pearon explained a presentation slide about the number of plans by student enrollment, see [file](#). This table was generated from information shared by each department. The campus’ minimum number of enrollment for undergraduate courses is 15 so by this definition a program should have about 15 students enrolled each year not be considered low enrolled.

C. Schult noted that the presentation slides are also going to be attached to the agenda at the senate blog.

**Questions:**

**W. Feighery:** “Yes, potentially it is disturbing that no student is enrolled in some of these majors but are these majors active? We discovered a ceased program that is still in the books, for example, and students are no longer enrolling in it.”

J. Pearson said that there are definitely imperfections in our data. They are working on cleaning it up. Some programs are okay to be low enrolled, if they are subsumed by other programs. If there is a BA and a BS with shared classes then it is okay for the BA to have only a few students enrolled in it. We have asked the Deans to look at the stacked programs that work together where shared courses exist, so we can look at those programs separately and they are not included in the mix.

**A. Schnabel:** “What is the definition of low enrolled? And why?”

J. Pearson asked D. McMillen to answer. D. McMillen pointed out that the current policy requires a 100- or 200- level course to have at least 15 students enrolled. A 300- or 400- level course should have at least 12 students enrolled, and a graduate course should have at least 10 students enrolled. These numbers have been used for almost a decade now after a study was completed to make sure that the cost of the faculty member is met.

**B. Lucal:** “The last question was about the definition of a low enrolled program, not course. My understanding according to ICHE is that a program is low enrolled if it graduates fewer than 10 students over a five-year period.”

D. McMillen said that this is correct. At one point ICHE would flag any program graduating less than 10 students in a five-year period and we used to have to complete a report to justify why we would want to maintain such a program. We have not had to do this for half a dozen or so years.

**Follow-up by B. Lucal:** “So which policy is being used? Where is the policy coming from? There are a whole bunch of programs between 5 and 29 students, for example. What do these numbers actually mean?”

J. Pearson said that this is one semester of student enrollment. There are programs that are acting together in a group, that essentially function as one. They are looking at analyzing those as a single entity in terms of cost. Although individual time is needed for advertising them, for assessment, for bulleting edits and so on. What is the magic number? This number varies from discipline to discipline. We have to look at institutional mission and community need. An example of this is the nursing program. No school makes money on a nursing program but this is incredibly important to our community. We will keep it and sustain it. So all these different pieces would have to be balanced.

**K. Wooden:** Students are coming off from COVID, they are stressed out. We are talking about disrupting our lives and we are stressed out by changing our entire structure and while we are doing this we are supposed to maintain retention. Why aren't we doing more structural analysis like this to save money rather than trying to change whole departments? Things we need and things we do not need. We are trying to upset our lives in a massive way when we are supposed to be facing the students.

J. Pearson answered that in her opinion we need to do all of these things to meet our financial needs in the coming years.

**Follow-up:** “I agree with that but do we have to do them all in one semester?”

J. Pearson said that we have worked on this all year and we are not done. We will not have a finalized AMP plan till May and the task force will have a report in by March to the Chancellor. This is not all done in one semester.

**Follow-up:** “We see that but I want you to know how we feel inside. We want to help retention.”

J. Pearson acknowledged that there is always stress involved with change. She empathizes. We cannot ignore these conversations and not figure out a way to do this. The process has been slowed down. We address what we can but we cannot put it off forever.

B. Lucal commented that this data is useless. The data is not by degree completion. It is one semester worth of enrollment data and no criteria have been established. Apples and oranges are being compared. She concluded that this seems to be a scary tactic.

J. Pearson said that this was not intended to be a scare tactic. Data by completion will also be shared.

C. Schult thanked everyone working on the AMP.

#### 8. Centralized Advising update—presented by L. Kahan

L. Kahan mentioned that centralized advising has been in discussions for quite a while. This is an update on where we are and what our process is moving forward. R. Adaikkalavan and L. Kahan have been gathering information for the past six months. They have been researching advising models and they also attended the Complete College America conference where advising was the central topic. They had the opportunity to talk to people whose schools have moved to centralized advising. All this research led to the following four principles, see [file](#), build an advising model which will improve the student experience, maintain advisor connection to academic units/programs, and maintain faculty mentoring, while the transition will take place in phases. L. Kahan pointed out that making the advising experience more consistent pays dividends to student retention. The importance of faculty-student connection will not be sacrificed, there are in fact formalized models to include this component as faculty may best advise students how to prepare for graduate school or towards a specific career path. Centralized advising will not happen all at once, we will transition in phases. We have to look at capacity, we do not currently have enough advising staff. This will be a process. Faculty advising students should know that this is not going to suddenly stop. Besides conducting research, R. Adaikkalavan and L. Kahan have also met with stakeholders, such as directors and Deans, see [file](#). The next step is to draft a proposal and revise it based on feedback.

#### **Questions**

**A. Pant:** “Thanks for opening this discussion up. What is the output? What did the stakeholders say? What are the proposals? The issue here is non standardization we need to standardize but there is not enough capacity. There should be more advisors. How is the problem solved if the student-advisor ratio is the same? Did you talk to students about this and get feedback? Will advisors be in touch with all units?”

L. Kahan said that they did meet with the SGA. When they met with advisors and directors they did receive feedback. Advisors said that they do feel connected to their units but they also recognize the benefits for students and for them. We all need to understand what advisors are doing. In addition to having professional advisors and faculty we also have professional advisors wearing other hats and have

non advising responsibilities so we need to understand their workload. We do not have enough professional advisors. What would staffing look like? As far as moving advisors to a central location, there are a couple of considerations. We talked to some experts on the standardization of advising and the consensus was that it is much easier if they are all in the same place and there is the ability to have discussion regarding day-to-day operations. IU Kokomo is an example of a school that has a centralized structure but also has a very effective structure in place for advisors being in constant contact with their units.

**Question by R. Olivier:** “Admissions gives priority to the student experience. What is the burden on the staff? What is the retention in this position and equitable pay?”

**L. Kahan:** “Advisors have been able to build institutional knowledge. We have experiences like the general advising model which requires far too much knowledge of the institution to be successful. Regarding workload, there is a huge study on manageability, ensuring all advisor caseloads remain at a manageable level and there are no dramatic swings. Turnover is an issue, when losing an advisor it affects everyone else’s workload. It takes about three months to train an advisor, we want to build redundancy into the model to not have these dramatic swings.”

**Question by A. Pant:** “What is the timeline?”

L. Kahan said that it depends on a lot of variables.

C. Schult reiterated that there is no set timeline.

L. UFC Report and President’s Remarks—presented by C. Schult

The UFC did not meet. There has been one out of three meetings. The UFC Executive Committee acting on behalf of the full UFC approved updates to ACA 11—evaluation policies for core campus Deans. It only applies to Bloomington and IUPUI. The February meeting was cancelled so the next meeting will be in April.

All of the items on today’s agenda represented hours of work by faculty. C. Schult asked everyone who was involved in any of the committees, task forces, working groups represented on the agenda, plus anyone who worked on the strategic plan 2030 process to stand up and be recognized. She then thanked all our colleagues for their hard work and dedication.

M. Announcements

**Christian Martinez:** Started a monthly newsletter with monthly endeavors, a copy will be on the daily titan. Student life awards are due March 10<sup>th</sup>.

**Anna Martinez-Montavon:** Tarek Zidan earned Quality Matters certification for SWK-S623: Practice Evaluation and UCET is going to be hosting the Applying the Quality Matters Rubric workshop the following Friday (Feb. 24), in case anyone wants to take the first step in getting involved with QM.

**Andrew Schnabel:** Stipends for SMART summer fellowships have increased significantly this year (\$4500 for the 10-week fellowship) and the deadline for proposal submissions is Friday, March 24.

**Molly Block:** Encourage your students to submit to the URC. The abstract due date is Friday, March 24<sup>th</sup> and the conference is on Friday, April 14<sup>th</sup>.

**David Blouin:** On Tuesday at 4pm there will be a dossier manager training. Next Friday at 3pm and 4pm CV meetings for those going up for promotion, the first meeting is for first promotion and the second for a second promotion. In NS 038, not to coincide with quality matters.

**Ryan Olivier:** IUSB is the proud host of the 7th annual Performing Media Festival going on now through March 27th. Many on-campus events will be held the week of March 6th-10<sup>th</sup>. Reach out if interested.

**Brenda Phillips:** Ketevan Badridze will give a piano concert tonight, at 7pm in the Joshi Performance Hall.

**Douglas McMillen:** AOD Q&A correction to misstatement, the senate body will not be able to endorse, the committee will present the report which will contain the information from the models.

N. Motion to Adjourn was approved at 2:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

-Anna Savvopoulou (Senate secretary for 2022-2023)