

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING MINUTES
April 16, 1999

Present: S. Agarwal, P. Aghimien, D. Alvis, A. W. Bartholomew, E. Bender, D. Barton, L. Blodgett, A. Brown, L. Chen, Y. Cheng, H. D. Cohen, R. Cook, R. Cordell, M. Darnel, D. Duff, L. Fisher, B. Fong-Morgan, M. Fox, T. Franz, L. Fritschner, F. Fujita, L. Garber, K. Gindele, J. Good, J. Gottwald, C. Harrington, G. Huitink, P. Joray, B. Kern, G. Kern, M. Kinyon, B. Knowles, V. Larsen, M. Lee, J. Lewis, M. Lynker, E. Lyons, V. T. Mawhinney, J. McEneaney, J. Mehran, T. Miller, E. Mooney, R. Muralidharan, A. Naylor, M. Pettengill, C. Quinn, V. Riemenschneider, T. Ross, T. Ryan, A. Sabbaghi, P. Saksena, M. Scanlon, E. Scarborough, A. Schnabel, R. Schreiber, B. Schuck, S. Sernau, D. Schlapentokh, P. Schnur, S. Shore, K. Smant, K. Smith, C. Sofhauser, J. Swanda, M. Tetzlaff, L. Walker, B. Wrenn

I. Administrative Reports

- A. President Riemenschneider thanked the Alumni Association (President Larry Lentych, Joanne Phillips and Jeanne Metzger) for providing refreshments and the fine work they had done this past year. President Riemenschneider also announced that the Vice Chancellor reports were eliminated due to the full agenda today.
- B. Chancellor Kenneth Perrin, See Attachment A.

II. Presiding Officer

- A. The meeting was officially called to order at 10:28 a.m.
- B. The minutes of the March 19th meeting were approved as corrected and published in the Academic Senate folder of the shared drive:
([Condor/Shared, Vol W\AcadSenate\SenateMin\Senate Minutes_Mar199.doc](#))
The correction made by President Riemenschneider was in reference to his inquiry about whether the Senate meetings could be closed, the University Attorney replied that the Indiana open meeting law did not apply and therefore, they could be closed. Since our Constitution does not specify, it is determined by the will of the body and the senate voted to have them open.

III. Old Business

A. Senate Teaching Committee Proposal

- 1. Introduction. President Riemenschneider announced that this item was postponed until the April meeting because he could not answer the question asked by Professor Winicur. After rereading both the IU and IUSB Constitutions and consulting the Parliamentarian, they both agreed that the faculty has the legislative

authority to enact the proposal. Of course, the enforcement will be up to the departments, deans, Vice Chancellor and Chancellor.

2. Section A. Since the adoption of section a (first paragraph) of the Teaching Committee's proposal was moved and seconded, President Riemenschneider opened the floor to continuing discussion of that motion. Discussion items included a concern that it was not appropriate to vote on the motion without knowing what the forms looked like (Jim Mehran), a concern that the senate was taking away a division's discretion to not require teaching evaluations (S. Winicur), and a concern that at the present time associate faculty are required to do evaluations, while full-time faculty are not (K. Smant). The motion passed 33-30.
3. Section B. It was moved (D. Vollrath) and seconded to accept section B. J. Swanda stated he was against the motion because the Division of Business and Economics already has a highly credible alternative procedure firmly established. E. Maher, proposed an amendment-- **"Responsibility for the implementation of the TCEs will rest with the division offering the course."** The amendment was seconded by J. Swanda. Several additional concerns were raised (e.g., the specificity of the original proposal, the requirement of student names and phone numbers, the amendment does not include language regarding what happens to the TCEs after they are taken). E. Scarborough noted that the Senate passed a set of procedures for TCEs in 1989. Those procedures did not include a provision that every member must conduct TCEs. E. Maher stated she voted in favor of the first motion to require TCEs because that was the primary direction the teaching committee was going and it filled in the gap in the 1989 policy. She proposed the amendment because most objections regarding the first motion centered around divisional rights or the procedures being imposed. P. Schnur called the question. The vote on calling the question passed. The motion on the proposed amendment also passed.
4. Section C and D. D. Cohen made a motion to table the remaining paragraphs noting it would be ridiculous to proceed until the previous policies had been considered. The motion was seconded by T. Ross. Motion passed.

B. Faculty Welfare Committee Proposal: Faculty Misconduct Policy and Procedures, revised from March Meeting.

President Riemenschneider explained that the Faculty Misconduct Policy (or Post-tenure Review or any name you wish to call it) must satisfy all the Principles that were approved by the UFC and Trustees. Each campus must submit its own plan to the Educational Policy Committee of the Trustees who will approve the plan. Since the Trustee Committee must review the plan and may suggest changes, anything passed today would not necessarily be the final plan. He stated his hope was that the senate would agree on the general draft of a plan such as the Faculty Misconduct Policy and Procedures presented by our Faculty Welfare Committee. Then the Executive Committee could meet with the Faculty Welfare Committee to work on both the plan and Article X of the constitution to produce a coherent document for presentation to the

Trustees. After considerable discussion over the relationship between the new policy with Article 10, it was moved and seconded (D. Cohen) to refer this proposal back to committee with instructions to examine its relation to article 10 and develop a document that has congruence. Motion passed.

C. Curriculum Committee revision of Assessment resolution from January meeting.

The Curriculum Committee has totally revised the resolution and this is the new resolution. **"Be it resolved that 1) the campus Assessment Committee be made an Academic Senate Committee, and 2) that each university division be responsible for developing its own general education assessment plan with the advice and oversight of the Assessment Committee."** It was moved (D. Barton) and seconded (E. Maher) to divide the question. It was moved and seconded (L. Garber) to adopt part one of the resolution. Motion carried. It was moved (R. Cordell) and seconded (E. Maher) to refer the second part of the resolution back to the new committee. Motion carried.

IV. New Business

Admissions Requirements; Admissions Committee (See attachment B).

After some initial points were clarified by the committee chair (E. Maher), President Riemenschneider noted that there was no longer a quorum and we could no longer continue with the business of senate.

V. Reports

A. President's Report, Professor Riemenschneider

1. I extend my sincere appreciation for all the comments I received in response to my request about TERA. I removed the names and organized them into favorable and unfavorable for the report for Academic Affairs. I need to summarize them and prepare a report for the UFC for next fall. So you have not contributed and want to, I can still use your input.
2. Please take note of the Roundtable discussion being held next weekend in Indianapolis on the Community College. It was planned by the state chapter of the AAUP in hope that faculty input could shape the standards of the new Community College Program. I will send more information by email.
3. Please attend the Dean's Seminar immediately following this meeting in Northside Hall, Room 113. Our colleague Virginia Smith is presenting a reading of her play, Lockhart Bonanza.
4. There is a reception from 3 to 4 p.m. on the 4th floor of the Library for our colleagues who have published or presented their creative works this year.

B. UFC Representative's Report, Professor Joray

Note: This report was not presented to the senate but is attached for your information.
(See attachment C.)

VI. Announcements.

AAUP meeting in Indianapolis is featuring a Roundtable discussion on Community Colleges in Indiana at 9:30 a.m. on April 24, 1999 in the Schwitzer Center of the University of Indianapolis.

Senate meeting dates for 1999-2000: September 3, 1999; October 15, 1999; November 19, 1999; (no December meeting); January 21, 2000; February 18, 2000; March 17, 2000; and April 21, 2000.

Faculty are requested to pick up their caps and gowns for commencement at the bookstore. A medical leave for a staff member has left them unable to deliver the caps and gowns this year.

Meeting adjourned at 11:35.

VII. Attachments

A. Chancellor Kenneth Perrin, See Attachment A.

Good morning. It's hard to believe that the semester is almost over. At least for me, semesters seem to go by faster with each passing year. Vic advised me that you have a very long agenda so I will try to be brief. First, I want to make a few acknowledgments. All of USA Today is a real tribute to her academic prowess but also to all of you who have worked with her at IUSB. Amanda will be graduating next month and then is on her way to Boston University to pursue a doctorate in mathematics. I didn't want this semester to slip away without having an opportunity for all of us to recognize this extraordinary student and her many accomplishments. Therefore, I had her fame framed! Please join me in recognizing Amanda. (Applause) I'll miss you Amanda.

Now I want to take a moment to recognize a special friend and colleague. While I'm elated that Alfred has agreed to become our new Vice Chancellor, will truly miss working with John Lewis. John, please join me at the podium. John has given outstanding service this past year and as a small token of our appreciation, I am pleased to present John with this plaque which reads: With grateful appreciation Indiana University South Bend recognizes John M. Lewis for outstanding service as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs 1998-1999. Please join me in thanking John for a job well done! By the way, John, this doesn't signal that your job is over. Alfred isn't scheduled to arrive until July 1st.

Now, John please join me in awarding the first annual IUSB distinguished research award. This award, which I initiated when I was installed two years ago is designed to recognize the scholarly contributions of you, our outstanding faculty. Like the Lundquist, this award carries a cash value of \$5,000. I am very pleased to present this year's award to Steve Shore! We do important scholarship at IUSB. This award is designed to recognize this fact! Congratulations Steve!

To further emphasize how much we value scholarship I'm pleased to announce that beginning with the class of '99, each new faculty member will receive \$1000 dollars for his or her use in terms of scholarly activities. Hopefully, this small amount of seed money will kick start their work and more importantly, stress how much we value scholarship at IUSB. I hope you all will be pleased with this new initiative which grew out of conversations I had with the history faculty last year.

Let me now turn to our budget, the student activity center, the community college initiative, admissions, athletics and student fees! First, we really don't know where we presently are in terms of our final appropriation or whether our student activity center will be fully funded. As you will recall, I last

reported that the house version of the budget included funding for the center, albeit \$2 million shy of full construction costs and generally treated higher education, especially IUSB, quite well. The senate, however, totally eliminated funding for the center and was not so generous to us. Now the horse trading begins and based on the two hour meeting I had with Pat Bauer last Friday as well as a lot of work by a lot of our friends in the community as well, I remain optimistic about the outcome.

Speaking of my lunch with Pat, he stressed that IU and Purdue has lost control of the higher education agenda in Indiana. He believes, as do I, it is now controlled by Ivy Tech and Vincennes. I shared this painful observation with President Brand earlier this week and he agreed!! for this reason, he indicated he planned to ask me to assume more responsibility at the state level. Hopefully, I can help reverse this situation, especially when you realize that 79 of the 150 legislators are Purdue and IU alumni.

The community college initiative continues to occupy much of my attention. I am pleased to report that once again, Pat is assisting us with this "Problem". On April 14 the legislature finally learned the details of how much the community college will cost. Although irritated, they approved a tuition freeze at both Vincennes and Ivy Tech. This freeze will result in a 5 million dollar cost over the next two years. To counter this, Myles is proposing that we initiate a differentiated tuition schedule. Under this plan, tuition at the lower division level would only increase by 2 percent next year whereas upper division would increase by 3 percent. This would have little or no budgetary impact on us. The full price tag for the community college initiative is now estimated by senate republicans at 67 million dollars. Senator Borst, chairman of the senate finance committee, has asked whether the entire project shouldn't be delayed to allow further study. And pat has offered a very well received piece of legislation that designates non-duplicative sites for establishment of community colleges. He limits the growth of this system to ten sites rather than the proposed 22. This legislation would exclude south bend as a site for a community college.

Because of the volatility of the community college initiative, Myles has encouraged me to slow down any major change in our admission standards. He believes that a radical change in our standards could play right into Stan Jones' hands. While I think we should be guided by his counsel, we must assure ourselves that if we continue to admit under prepared students that we provide an adequate number of remedial courses and limit enrollment of high risk students in collegiate level courses until we are satisfied that they are adequately prepared. We are setting students up for failure when we admit 240 students who have reading skills below the 9th grade level or for that matter even 132 students who read between the 9th and 11th grade levels.

Let me end by sharing some interesting data with you and by the way, you will be seeing more cost data in this format in the future. This slide indicates the expenditures from student activity fees. While I'm respectful that it is the student government that oversees these expenses, one of my responsibilities is to approve this budget. Unfortunately, I have never been provided that opportunity until now. Personally, I have grave concern about these expenditures. Finally, take a look at the cost of our athletic program. As you can see, 17 students participate on our two teams at a cost of \$12,350 per athlete. Significantly, it appears that at southeast, 91 student athletes participate in 8 sports at a total cost of 145,845 dollars. You all should know, I still have not identified a source of funds to pay the 86,000 dollars in scholarships that once was absorbed by bookstore "profits." and further, we failed to pay the rent last year at Adams high school so this figure is now 20,000 dollars. I haven't found a source for this cost either. We have a moral responsibility to cover these costs and I will do so. In the short term, we may cover these expenses from raised funds which are at an all time high, but this begs the question as to what are our responsibilities. Clearly, we have a serious problem that we must resolve very soon.

With that I will close and take any questions. Before I do, however, I want to thank you all for the support you have given me both personally and professionally these past two years. You are a truly outstanding group of professionals and I view it as both an honor and a privilege to work with and for you. Shirley and I hope you all have a wonderful summer!

B. IUSB Admissions Committee, Policy on Conditional Admission, Approved by the Committee, March 12, 1999

Preamble:

Policies governing admission to IUSB must strike a balance between two complementary goals:

- (1) to make our programs available to all who may be capable of succeeding in them and*
- (2) to ensure that only those who are capable of succeeding in our programs are admitted to them.*

Overly-restrictive admissions policies address the second goal at the expense of the first, screening out potentially successful applicants on the basis of weak performance in the past and denying them the second chance that it has been our historic mission to provide. On the other hand, overly lenient policies encourage the admission of unqualified applicants, a disservice to these students as well as to their instructors and classmates.

In order to promote a more balanced and practical approach to these twin admissions goals, the Academic Senate Admissions Committee proposes the adoption of a conditional admission status. Conditional admission will carry with it requirements designed to foster these students' success and to encourage them to address deficiencies in their preparation promptly.

* * * * *

For full admission to Indiana University South Bend, an applicant must meet the following criteria:

- Rank in the upper half of the high school graduating class (waived for GED)
- Completion of an Indiana CORE 40 high school curriculum or the equivalent
- A high school GPA of 2.0 or higher (or 52 on the GED)
- A score of 930 on the SAT or 20 on the ACT (waived if 21 years of age or older)
- A GPA of 2.0 or higher on any previous college work

Applicants to IUSB who do not meet all of the above standards for full admission shall be required to take campus placement tests in reading, writing, and mathematics prior to the decision on their admission. Those who fail to place at the college level on any of the tests will be denied full admission; they may be admitted on a conditional basis if their overall record and test performance suggest a reasonable prospect of achieving full admission status within one year.

All students admitted conditionally will be subject to the following requirements:

- Completion of the test-indicated developmental courses in reading, writing and/or mathematics, or college-level performance on the appropriate placement tests
- Completion of U100 (or an equivalent course designed to meet the same basic objectives and approved by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee)
- Participation in a regular program of academic and career advising
- Maintenance of a minimum GPA of 2.0

Students who fail to meet these conditions within their first year at IUSB will not be permitted to re-enroll unless and until they qualify for full admission, for which they may not re-apply for at least one year. In special circumstances, alternative arrangements for completing these requirements may be approved by the student's dean on the recommendation of the academic advisor.

Some questions and answers regarding the Conditional Admissions Policy:

Q: How do the standards for full admission in this document compare with our existing standards?

A: They are essentially the same. The existing standards are presented slightly differently in various places; the list here is intended to make the individual elements clearer by listing each of them as separate item.

Q: How do the “full” and “conditional” admission statuses in the proposal correspond to present statuses?

A: Full admission is basically the same as our present formal admission, except that under this proposal the criteria are to be more strictly applied than at present (e.g., applicants would need to meet all of the criteria, not just two out of three, as is frequently the case at present). The conditional admission status would replace probationary admission, thus eliminating any confusion with academic probation resulting from poor performance by students who have already matriculated.

Q: How much latitude do we have as a campus in setting admissions standards?

A: We have some latitude, but certain standards are defined by University (i.e., Trustee) policy. The University-wide policy is spelled on in the Academic Handbook, 1997 edition, pp. 114-115. They may also be found at the following Web address:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/acadhbkc/admip.html>.

Q: Our present standards don’t seem to be consistent with the Trustee policy in all respects. For example, the latter do not say anything about the “Core 40.” Why is that?

A: According to IUSB Admissions staff, the Core 40 requirements are essentially the same as the list of requirements in the Trustee policy. As noted in the previous answer, there is considerable variation (both within and across campuses) in the way the standards are presented. It would probably be desirable for us to adopt consistent language for use in all campus documents, either the list in the Conditional Admissions document or some other version.

Q: What does the Committee hope to accomplish with this change?

A: As indicated in the Preamble, we hope to balance opportunity with support. Under the present proposal, applicants who are not fully-qualified for admission but who demonstrate promise of success within a reasonable time may be admitted, but only under conditions designed to promote that success by providing and requiring systematic academic support.

Q: How is this proposed policy different from what we do at present?

A: It is different in several ways:

First, Admissions staff currently have considerable latitude in admitting students who lack some of the requisites for admission; unless these students are admitted on probation, they are treated like fully-qualified students and they cannot be held to any special requirements such as timely completion of remedial work. The proposed change would increase the number of students who are subject to such requirements, without imposing the negative label of probationary admission.

Second, applicants are generally not required to take placement tests until after they are admitted (either fully or on probation); under the proposed plan, Admissions staff would have the additional information from testing to use in making decisions about whether to admit marginal students. We anticipate that some students who might have been admitted under our current practices will not be admitted under this proposal (e.g., students whose reading scores fall too far below college level).

Q: When would the proposed change take effect?

A: We recommend that the change apply to all applicants for admission for Fall, 2000. It may be possible to implement some aspects at an earlier date; a proposal for a pilot project along these lines has been under discussion in the Office of Academic Affairs, for example.

Q: Do we have the resources necessary to provide developmental courses, advising, and other specified support to all those who would be admitted conditionally?

A: We lack clear data on the numbers involved, but it appears that some additional resources would be required, particularly additional sections of the developmental reading courses X100 and X101. Recent administrative statements suggest a willingness to provide the needed resources. In the long run, the improved retention which can be expected from the combination of greater selectivity and enhanced support should more than justify the additional costs.

C. UFC Representative's Report, Professor Joray

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL REPORT, MEETING: MARCH 30, 1999

1. **Presiding Officer's Business**
(President Miles Brand)

A. **Budget:** The budget proposed by the Indiana Senate is reasonably good, although somewhat different than the budget proposed by the House. Both proposals include 4 % for maintenance. The House version has buildings for South Bend and Northwest, but the Senate version does not have either. The conference committee will work out the final version.

B. **Tenure Statement:** President Brand has written an article in defense of tenure for the **CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION**. He commented at the UFC meeting that tenure was under attack in many places, and he felt that a major college president should articulate the importance of tenure in higher education.

2. **Agenda Committee business:** The status of Post-Tenure Review was discussed. President Riemenschneider has reported on this item.

3. **Proposal to Establish the "FN" Grade:** Faculty will assign a grade of FN to students who fail the course because they stop attending. Faculty will identify the last documented date of the student's attendance. The proposal passed.

4. **Inter-Campus Transfers at IU:** President Riemenschneider has reported on this item.

5. **University Research Policy Committee:** When the Advanced Research and Technology Institute (ARTI) was created the organizational structure included the University Research Policy Committee, a ARTI Liaison Committee, and several Specific Committees. The Technology Transfer committee was the only specific committee appointed. This structure has not been productive, so the proposal eliminates the Liaison Committee and the Specific Committees and combines their duties in the University Research Policy Committee. The proposal also changes the current system of co-chairs--one from Bloomington and one from Indianapolis-- to alternating chairs--one year the chair would be from Bloomington and the next year from Indianapolis.

6. **Discussion of Procedures Being Used in the Trustees' Review of President Brand:**
As mentioned in the letter all faculty received from John D. Walda President, Trustees of Indiana University, the review of the President is being conducted by Robert H. Atwell.

The UFC is proposing that, given the amount of information that must be processed by Mr. Atwell, it would be helpful if the Co-Chairs of the UFC reviewed Mr. Atwell's report before it is sent to the Trustees. The proposal passed.