

**Indiana University South Bend Academic Senate meeting  
February 26, 2016, Wiekamp 1011, 1:30 pm.**

**Attending:**

Adaikkalavan, T. Allison, G. Anderson, Bennett, Bennion Turba, Bloom, Borshuk, Bushnell, Chaney, L. Chen, T. Clark, Cress, Dunn, He, Hottos, Jones, J. Joseph, Kahan, Karakatsanis, G. Kern, Kwong, LaLime, Lambert, M. Lee, D. Lee, Levine, Lidinsky, Lucal, Luppess, Lynn, Makielski, Massat, Mattox, McIntosh, McMillen, Meisami, Merhi, Mettetal, Moore, J. Murphy, Nilsen, Pant, Roth, Rusnock, K. Smith, J. Smith, Sofhauser, Stankrauff, Surma, Takanashi, Thomas, Tourtillotte, VanderVeen, Vollrath, Weiss, Zwicker, Zynda.

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by President Scott Opasik. Susan Thomas taking minutes in the absence of Secretary Nancy Colborn.

2. Approval of minutes

The minutes of the January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting were approved.

*Motion to approve, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.*

3. Committee Reports

A. Nominating Committee

President Scott Opasik displayed the election slate and asked for additional nominations from the floor. There were none. The nominations were accepted as presented.

B. Campus Directions Committee

President Scott Opasik presented the proposal for a revised charge. He highlighted the two most significant changes: reaccreditation is now handled by a separate committee, and changing the Senate reporting requirement to annually instead of at a specific meeting. There was no discussion. Because this is a change in the Constitution, it requires a written ballot. The revised charge will be included on the March ballot with the slate of candidates.

C. NTT Recommendations

Elaine Roth and April Lidinsky presented two proposals for the committee.

1. Selecting associate faculty representative to the academic senate: The Constitution states that there can be up to 15 part-time, non-tenure track faculty that are voting members of senate (associate faculty). There is currently no process in place for this practice. The Senate President and Executive Committee charged the NTT Committee with implementation. The NTT hopes that this can be implemented yet this semester. The first step is to determine each semester who the associate faculty are. On the one hand we don't want to overburden these colleagues who work hard for very little money but on the other hand do not want to disenfranchise this very important population.

Roth went over the recommendation for the body.

Elizabeth Bennion Turba inquired as to why other faculty do not vote on the associate faculty representatives. Roth responded that this is as written in the Constitution.

Ken Smith noted that paragraph 4 holds the associate faculty members to a higher standard than other faculty members. Roth noted that a NTT representative to the committee suggested this because associate faculty are not as involved, this is thought of as an invitation to participate. April Lidinsky added that they were open to a friendly amendment on this issue.

Jake Mattox asked if there was some way to compensate the associate faculty for their participation. Lidinsky responded that this was not possible.

Jerry Hinnefeld moved to strike the fourth paragraph of written proposal. Roth accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Question about why the number of 15? Lidinsky noted that the NTT Committee is simply creating a written protocol for something already in place in the Constitution.

Ilan Levine noted that many associate faculty are hired at the last minute and in comparison to tenure track faculty there are dissimilar hiring practices. He wondered if having something from the department that vouched for the associate faculty member would be helpful. Roth responded that in terms of vetting associate faculty members, the departments (at least English) are thorough, and that the University has additional background checks that candidates go through before hiring. Many of these faculty members are active in the departments and aware of faculty issues.

Susan Moore noted that she would disagree with Roth. She has certainly seen some faculty that are very invested but there are others that are not knowledgeable about faculty issues.

Roth asked if the body wants to add back in the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph or work on changes to the Constitution regarding associate faculty voting privileges.

Levine reiterated that some kind of vetting process would ensure that appropriate people are involved in making faculty decisions.

Roth noted that our vote taking process is relatively relaxed; we don't check to make sure that only tenure track faculty are voting in voice votes.

Gary Kern noted that we have already given these associate faculty members permission to teach our students and that he sees that as a higher bar.

Andrea Rusnock noted that only those associate faculty members who are invested are likely to volunteer for a voting position on the body.

*Motion to closed debate, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.*

President Opasik noted that this action would be approved as a bylaw at the end of the Constitution; as a procedure.

*Motion carried by voice vote.*

2. Senior Lecturer Reappointment. Monle Lee joined Roth and Lidinsky at the podium. Roth noted that the NTT Committee would like to propose a new category for reappointment with some reservation for one year. This would be allowed only once. IU-wide, there is no current procedure for reappointment of Sr. Lecturers, so each campus is free to design their own parameters. IU South Bend could lead the way

in proposing this new level of reappointment. President Opasik got confirmation from John Applegate's office that this was possible.

As a point of order, John McIntosh reminded the body that the approval process was housed within the department/college/Dean level and did not go further up.

Opasik asked how this was brought to committee. Roth responded that it was generated by the committee.

Question about the responsibility of the Chair and department in working with Sr. Lecturers in a positive way before it gets to this point.

Roth responded that hopefully this is the case but building this in would ensure that if someone had a bad teaching year this would allow for more time.

Discussion about if there were multiple good years before this hopefully the department would consider the body of work.

Roth agreed that hopefully that would be the case but this action would give everyone (the faculty member and department) the opportunity to agree upon actions to address any issues.

Lidinsky agreed that this year would help to clarify issues and would ultimately protect both faculty and students.

Gwynn Mettetal noted that she is in favor of it and could imagine situations where it would be advantageous to have the additional year.

Larry Lambert asked for clarification of when this would occur. Roth reiterated that this is the reappointment of someone who has already reached Sr. Lecturer status and is being reappointed (every five years).

Betsy Lucal asked for clarification on whether or not this would apply to the first up or out status vote. Roth stated that this is to apply to the 5-year reappointment process.

Monle Lee added that this is to add more flexibility for the Sr. Lecturer.

Peter Bushnell asked that the last paragraph be clarified; is it true that this interim reappointment can only be made one time. Roth agreed that this is the case.

Question about the cutting of a position in times of financial strain on the University. John McIntosh reiterated that the position would be cut and not the person in that case. Roth noted that this is a completely separate process.

President Opasik noted that the discussion today was to gather input from the faculty on this issue. Clarification that this is not an IU-wide or UFC issue. Schools are free to develop their own procedures.

#### D. Committee on Faculty Welfare

Elizabeth Bennion Turba reported that following the legalization of gay marriage in the state of Indiana, the IU Board of Trustees has eliminated domestic partner benefit effective December 31, 2016. The policy change was announced in November of 2015. Those benefits had only been extended to same sex

couples who had proven financial or legal ties and who signed an agreement that they would marry if they had the legal opportunity. Some faculty members that have been part of this policy would like the University to continue their existing benefits without requiring them to marry. They would also like the University to extend the same benefits to opposite sex domestic couples, which is supported by the AAUP and several other Midwestern public universities. Bennion Turba provided other data in support of providing benefits to domestic partners. The Committee on Faculty Welfare has researched the issues and will bring forward a resolution at the March academic senate meeting. They hope for a positive vote and if so will work with other IU campuses to pass similar resolutions. Handouts were provided with additional information; this information was also circulated electronically via the Daily Titan. The information includes a draft resolution for your consideration before the March meeting. If there are additional questions that are not covered in this document, please let Elizabeth know.

Anurag Pant asked if the resolution would be to extend benefits to all domestic partners. Bennion Turba responded in the affirmative.

Pant asked about the documentation required. Bennion Turba commented on the requirements positives and negatives, noting that because LGBTQ individuals are not protected in Indiana, coming forward to marry could open them up to other types of discrimination.

Reminder for members of the Senate to review the materials and come to the March meeting prepared to vote.

#### E. Assessment Committee

Susan Cress updated the body on Assessment issues. The campus has moved from the Weave software to Taskstream. She and the Assessment staff and Assessment committee have spent the fall semester getting Taskstream templates established and transferring data from Weave into the new system. Deans have identified individuals that work on assessment and Susan is working with those individuals. Susan is available to meet with anyone who wants to discuss assessment. Because of delays in transitioning to the new system, most assessment data was just entered by the deadline of February 1<sup>st</sup>. The next area of concern will be the certificates and minors. Curriculum maps also need added in Taskstream. The Assessment committee is currently reviewing plans that were submitted for this year. They are following a rubric to identify missing areas and will work with units to incorporate.

Elizabeth Bennion Turba thanked Susan for her work and asked if Taskstream for last year will be locked down at some point. Susan responded that something for this year can be loaded if you contact her.

Susan Moore thanked Susan for her patience with the departments.

#### 4. General Education Task Force

Lyle Zynda reported on the Task Force's progress. The Task Force was formed last year to review and revise General Education. Lyle named the committee members:

Lyle Zynda, Chair  
Cathy Borshuk, CLAS  
Linda Chen, ex officio  
Karen Clark, Education  
Julie Elliott, Library

Beth Kern, B & E  
Jennifer Muniz, Arts  
Yuri Obata, Arts  
Kristyn Quimby, CHS  
Elaine Roth, CLAS  
Henry Scott, CLAS

Some of the members went to a recent AAC&U Conference. Lyle reported that the spring semester will be spent gathering data. They are organizing forums within units, so are sending requests to the Deans to arrange those. They have already sent survey to faculty teaching upper level courses and received some lengthy responses. They are also creating an online faculty survey for another way for faculty to express opinions on General Education – this should go out mid-March. This is a two-year process.

Question/comment regarding Indiana movement on required core curriculum and complications with statewide transfer. Lyle and Linda Chen responded that this is a definite challenge among many others.

#### 5. UFC Reports

Neovi Karakatsanis reported on the recent UFC meeting. There were four action items.

1) UFC voted to withdraw a university policy on access to labs with hazardous materials or animals to bring University up to date with existing laws. Visitors cannot have access to such labs. Visitors must agree to a background check and be co-sponsored on entry to labs.

2) UFC approved a new policy on nepotism. There is now one single unified policy to apply to all university employees. Supervisory roles with related individuals or partners should be reported to the University compliance office for the arrangement of an approved management plan.

3) UFC reviewed the University transfer policy. Part a. transfer of undistributed credits completed at 100/200 level but be applied to 100/200 level courses and not higher. Part b. Wording change to undergraduate intercampus transfer policy statement to bring it in line with current practice. Part c. Revision to master course inventory policy (originally passed in 2002). UFC voted to resolve issues with identically numbered IU courses that are not sufficiently comparable. UFC implemented steps to resolve such discrepancies. Neovi outlined these steps. Differences in mode of delivery are not necessarily incomparable but course requirements may make it so.

4) UFC reviewed the policy regarding promotion and tenure of librarians. In 2012 Librarians moved the PT&R process from a centralized committee to the campuses. The UFC policy still reflected previous practice. This UFC action brought the policy up to date with current practice.

Neovi noted an additional informational item. By the end of March there should be an app on ONE IU that can see what it would look like to receive 12 paychecks instead of 10. This will be linked with an automatic savings plan. It will be up to individual faculty members to pursue this option.

#### 4. Administrative and Officer Reports

##### A. Chancellor Terry Allison

Allison noted that campus closure occurred because some of our surrounding counties were under red alert. Salary pool information is now available. Remember that while the University sets a maximum

available amount, IU South Bend currently has a structural deficit that may prevent us from reaching that maximum. We will know more after budget hearings which are scheduled after spring break. Applications and admissions for next fall are looking very good; we are up over 225 students for fall 2016. New television ads will be out in March and include the most magic word in television "Oprah," spoken three times. Facilities projects are moving forward. A pre-bid meeting for first floor administration remodeling had to be rescheduled because of weather. Planning for Riverside – the Health Sciences building - is progressing quickly. The exterior work on Northside Hall will soon be sent for bid in two phases. Search committees for open Vice Chancellor positions are formed and meeting.

Anurag Pant asked question about recent raises being less than others in the IU system. Is there a danger of falling so far behind others that it is a serious problem? Chancellor Allison agreed that this is a danger that we are aware of. There is not a central pot of money that can be transferred to make up for our structural deficit. Our main commitment is to faculty and staff members and we have a very lean staff so it is difficult to balance. We do have a strong budget hearing process and are making important choices.

Elizabeth Bennion Turba asked if the raise pool would be the same campus wide or different for some groups. Allison responded that he would allow EVCAA Joseph to respond but for staff it would be the same pool. At this point it is projected that there may be a 1% faculty pool plus an additional pool that could be used to address inequities.

Joe Chaney asked if all regional campuses are treated the same with regard to raises. Allison responded that the Board of Trustees has suggested this 1%/1.5% policy. Every campus is not able to realize this maximum because of revenue projections and structural budget issues.

Jerry Hinnefeld asked if Chancellor Allison could share the enrollment projection that was sent downstate recently. Allison noted that all campuses were asked not to count any additional projected income based on banded tuition because we don't know how this will play out. We did project some additional revenue and will share more details as budget hearings proceed.

#### B. EVCAA Jann Joseph

Joseph reported that we have received the initial report from our recent HLC visit that addressed how we are preparing to offer online programs and that the report is positive. IU South Bend has addressed all existing holes and gaps. The final vote should be in June. Regarding the previous budget question, at the budget hearings we will discuss ways to try to move salaries despite small pool. We will focus on raising salaries for specific areas and groups of people with the ultimate goal being raising the whole boat eventually. Joseph invited Kyoko Takanashi and Linda Chen to the podium to present information on Re-imagining the First Year. IU Regionals sent a proposal to American Association of State Colleges and Universities and were selected to participate. This is a 3 year project with 44 universities where participants are encouraged to crowd-source ideas about the first-year experience and create a knowledge base that can be shared with all 460 AACSB institutions. A team from IU South Bend recently attended a conference to learn from prominent people in the areas of retention and enrollment management. Kathy Sullivan also participated in this conference. The group is energized and eager to share what was learned. There are handouts available in the back and the PowerPoint will be shared. Kyoko reported that some of the important messages heard were: 1) focus on implementation and not on continually gathering knowledge 2) standard of care as applied to higher education. It is important to

address the achievement gap. This is an ethical issue. 3) This project also re-imagines the future of higher education as a whole. You can find more information at links on the handout.

The group at the conference was presented with a syllabus. They were asked to review institutional intentionality, faculty & staff, students, and the curriculum (see handout). Instead of bringing back a plan, they were asked to bring back some ideas to share. One important idea that they brought back is the idea of a growth mindset. The group also brainstormed ideas of the many initiatives on this campus that are going well but know that there are many others on campus to discover. Crowd-sourcing ideas will be a good way to highlight all the great things we are already doing on campus. They hope to develop a campus team with at least seven people; over 50% should be faculty. The team will develop a plan of action but will gather information first. Kyoko noted that the group will be interacting with specific people and will also be conducting surveys, forums, etc. to gather information. Kyoko noted that this is important work and hopes that we can come together as a campus and make important things happen.

April Lidinsky thanked Kyoko for the presentation and expressed excitement about the project. She expressed concern about the way the announcement was handled indirectly instead of in a more straightforward way. Linda Chen responded that the announcement had to be done a certain way because the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation was involved. It was announced in the South Bend Tribune through Communications and Marketing by direction of IU. Some ideas for textbooks and other HIP activities were suggested. Linda Chen noted that we will hear more from the group. June 10<sup>th</sup> is the deadline to submit the plan. Student services staff noted that they want to be involved. EVCAA Joseph added that this was an amazing experience for the group and appreciate the funding from the Chancellor to attend. If any faculty members are interested in serving, please let them know.

## 6. Announcements

Scott Opasik thanked Susan Thomas for taking minutes today.

Scott Opasik noted that the campus campaign is underway. A fund is now available for the Titan food pantry. Need to reach \$1,000 level to establish fund. There will be an announcement about this.

April Lidinsky: Michiana Monologues was rescheduled to March 5<sup>th</sup> because of weather. April gave additional dates and details about the Monologues.

The Undergraduate Research Conference will be held on April 15. Please encourage your students to present their work. The deadline for abstract submission is March 1<sup>st</sup>.

The campus community is invited to a remembrance for LuAnn Woodrick on Monday at 4:30 p.m. in the main auditorium.

Dean Lynn from SOE thanked faculty members and administration who participated in the visit by the Japanese delegation from Kansai Gaidai University. In particular, Lynn thanked Lisa Zwicker, Kwadwo Okrah, Joe Chaney, Kyoko Takanashi, Scott Sernau, Gabriel Popescu, and Shawn Nichols-Boyle.

The Trustee Teaching award deadline is March 1<sup>st</sup>.

Vision 20/20 grant deadline is also on March 1<sup>st</sup> – contact Gwynn for assistance.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy W. Colborn

Academic Senate Secretary (with special thanks to Susan Thomas)