

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY SOUTH BEND ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 16, 2018 * WIEKAMP HALL 1001**

IN ATTENDANCE: ADAIKKALAVAN, AGHIMIEN, BENNION, BLOOM, BORSHUK, BREGU, L CHEN, N COLBORN, L COLLINS, H DAVIS, DIELMAN, ERVICK, J FEIGHERY, FROYSLAND, GATTO, GERENCSEK, GERKEN, GIROD, HAKIMZADEH, HINNEFELD, HORWAT, H JONES, KARAKATSANIS, G KERN, KOLBE, KWONG, LALIME, LAMBERT, D LEE, LIDINSKY, LYNKER, MARR, MATTOX, MCGUIRE, MCINERNEY, MCMILLEN, MELUCH, MERHI, METTETAL, MOCIULSKI, MOORE, OPASIK, POPESCU, QUIMBY, ROGALLA, ROTH, RUSNOCK, SAHIN, SCHEESSELE, SCHIMMRIGK, SCHNABEL, SCHULT, SCOTT, SHOCKEY, SOFFHAUSER, SURMA, TETZLAFF, THOMAS, THOMPSON, TOURTILLOTTE, VANDERVEEN, VOLLRATH, VRAJITORU, WELLS, WOLFER, ZWICKER, ZYNDA

CALL TO ORDER: 1:34pm

- 1) Call to order.
 - a. K SMITH: We have a good set of brief items and then an important discussion on general education as well as progress today on the updating of the constitution as it makes its transition to our phones or anywhere else. Earlier in the week there was a faulty version of the minutes on the website, so in case anybody gave up looking for a corrected version I'd like to delay the approval of those minutes until next time.
- 2) Approval of minutes for January. [Per above, this agenda item will be delayed]
 - a. No objections
- 3) Update on the Higher Learning Commission visit.
 - a. D VOLLRATH: We want to thank everybody for their assistance in so many ways, so many people made this a very successful visit. As you know, the process began years ago with the writing of the argument document that we submitted to HLC and so all of the criteria committees deserve lots of thanks for careful preparation that they made. One of the visitors said the document is kind of like the first assignment turned in for a class. There's always a mismatched expectation. There were a number of things the visiting team wanted after they saw the document we submitted in December, so thank you to another set of people who responded to the HLC urgent emails as we tried to collect further documents for the visiting team to have when they arrived. Thanks to the Chancellor's and Events offices, also to UITS staff for arranging all the details for the visitors, including working at the hotel downtown. Thanks to everybody who turned out for the sessions. Many people came to the general sessions. This added a third dimension for the visitors to the assurance document, they were left with a richly detailed and positive impression of our campus. We don't know exactly what will be in the final report, it is going through review by an HLC headquarters committee that will give consistency to all the different site visit reports from different campuses, and then it will come back to us. At that point we can deal with any inaccuracies. In six weeks to two months we will have an opportunity for rebuttal. After that a letter will be sent to us. We anticipate there will be some flaws, we are big enough to admit we are not perfect and have a growth mindset. We will however not have a near term visit in another four years, so while we wait don't worry too much. We will let you know when the information is ready. Thanks again to all who helped make this such a hopeful process.
 - b. K SMITH: The sessions I went to had a great spirit, and areas where we could have been defensive I thought we came across as thoughtful, and people were not bragging about themselves but rather the successes of colleagues elsewhere. It made me feel good about my colleagues. Well done, and thank you all.

- 4) Update on the Budget Hearings.
 - a. J HINNEFELD: The first meeting of the Budget Committee following the budget hearings will be this afternoon following the senate meeting, to discuss the presentations and formulate priorities for base budget and one-time funding.
 - b. K SMITH: It was great to see so many members of the Budget Committee at the budget meetings, thank you all.

- 5) Update on the Senate motion in favor of an affordable, high quality child care facility on campus.
 - a. K SMITH: The Senate passed a motion with flexible wording urging the campus to continue forward in pursuit of good quality, innovative child care on campus, and we have a brief report on the progress of that motion.
 - b. J VANDERVEEN: I took the same resolution passed by this body to the SGA and I'm pleased to report they voted on the same resolution (6 yes, 2 no). We are now on the agenda for the February 20 staff meeting and we will see if we can have the same result there as well.

- 6) Nominations for leadership positions in the Senate for next year and for the elected committees. See the slate offered to us by the nominating committee. Nominations can be made from the floor too, though it is best if the person being nominated has been consulted in advance.
 - a. K SMITH: We are about to look at the nominations that have been presented for the elected Senate offices as well as the elected committees. There is one of the proposed constitutional amendments that may impinge on your thoughts during the nomination discussion today, that comes to us from the Executive Committee. This change: In recent years the Executive Committee has lost one member because of IU system-wide reductions to size of University Faculty Council; the constitution calls for two UFC representatives, but we are not allowed two, so we have had eight voting members plus a parliamentarian of late (three at-large members, a president, a most recent president, vice president, secretary, and the UFC representative, plus the parliamentarian). There has been a very small carryover from one year to the next. So this year in September there were two of us who came forward from last year, it was also the same the year before. Two out of nine, or what would ordinarily have been two of ten, for one of the most important campus senate committees seems like a poor strategy for continuity. So the Executive Committee is bringing a whole slate of changes in a little while. We are bringing this proposal to get back to the nine, an odd number which was good for voting, and since there are not two UFC representatives to have instead four at-large representatives and to increase the carryover continuity from year to year by having the four at-large positions be two year staggered positions. So there would be about half of the committee that comes forward each year. That will be voted on by us in due time, but I wanted to introduce it at the beginning of the nominations in case it influences any thinking you have about the nomination of the at-large members.
 - b. NOTE: at this time a portion of the document from point #7 of this agenda was projected on the screen; specifically PDF page 13, Constitution Article VI (Section 2) dealing with Executive Committee membership;
 - c. SPEAKER1: I want to speak strongly in favor of this having served on the Executive Committee a couple of different times, the last time I was on I thought we needed two year terms to deal with the learning curve. The staggering is also good because there are times when some institutional memory is important. I am in favor of it.
 - d. C SCHULTE: I served on the committee for five years as the parliamentarian and I strongly urge us to support this as well. There were times near the end of my term that I was the only one on

the committee who had been there when issues under consideration had started and that should not just be up to the parliamentarian to serve as institutional memory.

- e. K SMITH: That influences our thinking. Now I will open the slides with the nominations. The people who have allowed themselves to be nominated for the at-large positions, we need to ask them if they are willing to be the first to serve two year terms, and we haven't done that yet. If we have at least two of those folks who are nominated for the at-large positions who are willing to serve for two year slots, and we have a motion saying "if this passes, that the two largest vote recipients willing to serve two year terms will get those slots." Do we have that motion?
- f. MOVED AND SECONDED
- g. D VOLLRATH: I just clarify that in case this motion is defeated, then the top three vote recipients would serve in the old structure.
- h. K SMITH: And nobody will serve for two years who hasn't agreed to do so.
- i. DISCUSSION CLOSED, PASSED BY VOICE VOTE WITHOUT DISSENT
- j. K SMITH: On the screen we have one nominee for President, one for Vice President, one for Secretary of the Senate. We have four nominees for the three current but perhaps soon to be four positions at-large on the Executive Committee. On the screen we also have the nominees for the Athletics Committee. I'll scroll through the next two screens for a quick preview. [LONG PAUSE FOR REVIEW OF SLATES] Shall we start with the officers and open the floor for nominations? Are there additional nominations for Secretary, President, or Vice President of the Senate? Or Executive Committee at-large nominations?
- k. A SCHNABEL: Nominates self for executive at-large, willing to serve a two year term.
- l. C SCHULTE: A clarification for the PTR committee, is it okay to have two people from the same department serving simultaneously?
- m. L ZWICKER: [offers to withdraw]
- n. S GERENCSEK: I am not aware of any limitation in the constitution that limits two people from the department serving at the same time, that would be the choice of the Senate. It's better to have people more broadly represented, but I'm not aware of anything in the constitution.
- o. L ZWICKER: [rescinds offer to withdraw]
- p. K SMITH: Any further discussion?
- q. S GERENCSEK: Do we have enough full professors on that list?
- r. SPEAKER: There were three.
- s. S GERENCSEK: Do we need a fourth?
- t. [general discussion ballot is determined to be appropriate with three]
- u. [no further nominations on above, display of ballot moved to faculty misconduct, then board of review, senate members remain silent and have no comment]
- v. K SMITH: Sounds like it's time to close the nominations, should we have a motion?
- w. D VOLLRATH: That is correct.
- x. Close of nominations moved, seconded and approved by voice acclamation without dissent
- y. K SMITH: Some of these can be approved by acclamation if they are not contested positions
- z. DV: Yes, the uncontested ones.
- aa. KS: So if all three officers [President, Vice President, and Secretary] could be approved by acclamation would there be such an acclamation?
- bb. Motion made, seconded, approved by voice vote without dissent
- cc. [President Raman Adaikkalavan, Vice President Jeff Wright, and Secretary Kyoko Takanashi approved and thereby elected by above motion]
- dd. KS: Thank you. Thank you to the three officers. We look forward to their work. Are there any other sections we can address here?
- ee. DV: It appears only the PTR committee ballot is also uncontested.

- ff. KS: That's right.
- gg. DV: So only that one can be by acclamation.
- hh. KS: Do we have a motion to accept this slate for the PTR committee?
- ii. Motion made, seconded, approved by voice vote without dissent
- jj. [Promotion and Tenure Committee new members are approved and thereby elected by the above motion: Vincci Kwong, Jessica McCormack, Lisa Zwicker, Caren Rossow, Joshua Rubin]
- kk. KS: Thank you all. We have acclaimed all the acclamables, and we've closed nominations, so it appears that business is done. Thank you to everybody who agreed to stand for election. Thank you to the Nominating Committee, Deb Marr, Sharon Jones, and Jeremy Linton, for all their hard work.

7) Further updates to the Senate Constitution as it moves to the new campus website.

- a. S GERENCSE: First of all let me remind you of where we are in the process. In the fall we looked for what we loosely called low-hanging fruit. Changes in the constitution to update names, titles, alternating positions that have either shifted or moved over the course of time. Now we are on slightly more difficult tasks. I want to thank all of you who are committee members who have responded to the ad hoc committee by responding with reviews of your committee membership and your committee charge. It's been a useful exercise. What we are introducing today is for quite a number of committees, a number of changes. These changes come in a few different stripes. Many are changes that are similar between committees, and we have worked with them to standardize the shape and form of the committee descriptions that will be in the constitution. So each committee will have its charge, and then its membership. Some committees have a few other things, like details of how they do their business, but we will do our best to standardize. Secondly, we've tried to standardize as best as possible the membership of such committees, keeping in mind some of the issues that came up in earlier discussions about the Executive Committee. Previously, for all committees that didn't have a description of their membership, there was a general term in the constitution that said committees should have three to nine members with one year terms. Our reflection by discussing this with various committee members is that the old rule is sometimes useful and sometimes problematic; potentially you could have a complete new membership year to year with no institutional memory or capacity to carry over business. So in every place where we deemed it appropriate we have suggested some version of the following, which almost every committee here has been willing to adopt, and in some cases needed to be altered. The change is to have four to eight committee members with two year staggered terms with best efforts made to represent the five colleges and schools from around the university. Again we've had to tailor this in some cases, for instance we are working with the Non-Tenure track committee to say that there is representation for non-tenured members. Some committees already had those details of membership because they had made adjustments along the way, for instance the Budget Committee and others have already dealt with this. In some cases committee members have added information for us that they have been doing but is not in their current charge. Also items that were in there that they were not doing, and is no longer necessary, or responsibility has shifted elsewhere. At least three committees have responded to us that the status quo is fine regarding membership distribution (Curriculum, Research and Development, Admissions, Advising will all have no changes except for formatting as talked about earlier). So what we have introduced here is a list of all the committee recommendations that have come to us, and posting on the Senate this document. This is a table of contents of all the committees that have contacted us. As you go through this document, you will see there is the previous description as it currently exists in the constitution paired with the new proposed changes. You will have the next month to look these over and we will formally introduce these to be sent out for a vote at

the March meeting. In March we will go over these as needed, case by case, ask if there are questions, and have members of those committees ready to speak to justify the changes proposed. Those will be formally introduced in March and if possible we will close the discussion then and it will be sent out as a vote for as many committees as people feel comfortable going forward with. Ideally, at that meeting we might have other committees begin that same process for April. But what we have here is a majority of the committees already. I also want to say, two committees have such a long charge and membership list that they could not fit in the column format (Information Technologies and Campus Directions), those are paginated. Both of those had few changes, but they are very big committees and they take up a lot of space. The final thing to note is that the Executive Committee will bring up a number of changes that have to do with bylaws, and with the introductory matter to the constitution. Also, what we voted on earlier (change #13) regarding the people nominated to the Executive Committee as at-large members, that vote is dependent upon this change. So these changes will be introduced as constitutional amendments at the March meeting and the result of that vote for the new member of the Executive Committee will be dependent on the approval as an amendment to that charge of the committee. They will be bringing forth other issues, but because of the relationship to the Nominating Committee at this process, we felt it was important to bring that forth now. So this document, which describes the process and all the committees for which there are recommended changes is linked in today's meeting agenda, and will live there and in the Senate blog. So you can look at those over the next month and we will submit those formally for approval in the March meeting, and that will be the best time to have substantive questions and discussions. I ask again that people who are on these committees please be prepared to speak if people have questions regarding these changes. This has been a long process, we are still in the medium difficulty stage, and the more difficult work is yet to come. That has to do with the PTR, Faculty Misconduct, General Education, and the Faculty Board of Review committees. These are difficult because some of them have to do with the nature of our procedures as they connect to IU procedures. Some will require consultation with IU Legal to make sure any changes we make are appropriate, especially regarding Faculty Board of Review and Faculty Misconduct. The General Education committee is waiting to know what will happen with gen ed reform proposals. Some of these things will carry over into the fall of 2018. We might be able to introduce more difficult changes like PTR and Misconduct by April to be voted upon in September. We are moving forward, and we are getting the processes in place to deal with the more complicated items as we go.

- b. SPEAKER: Regarding the more difficult work, is there going to be an ad hoc committee to look at the issues you mentioned last?
- c. SG: Right now the ad hoc committee that is working on this consists of myself, Ken Smith, and Doug McMillen. We are advising and committees about how they might work this process and assisting them. For committees such as PTR and General Education they have so much work to do they have trouble finding time to address these changes.
- d. KS: Amendments may be found on the Senate blog -
 - i. <http://blogs.iu.edu/senate/>
 - ii. <https://blogs.iu.edu/senate/files/2018/02/Constitution-Updates-237s3ah.pdf>

8) General Education Task Force update on the open forum meetings and other progress.

- a. L ZYNDA: This is a progress report on the last month. We released a chart and report of various draft plans. We have had a variety of meetings as suggested in the last Senate: Open Forums, Guiding Questions for Departments. Copious responses have been rolling in, from paragraph to pages in length. CLAS is almost complete, other divisions and schools are almost complete as well. We have the majority of people reporting their comments. A clear picture is emerging. As

discussed last time, curricular and management issues came out in a lot of comments. There was strong interest in a strong director of general education who does enrollment management, coordinates assessment, keeps records, enforces policies, ensures procedures are followed, etc. I've talked to the co-chairs of general education and will have a specific proposal ready for the Senate in March. There seems to be a lot of agreement on this and we should be able to move forward on it quickly. Regarding assessment we have a draft assessment plan, including learning outcomes for all general education requirements. We have been circulating it in various forms. The overall draft of the assessment plan is 9 pages, most of that is learning outcomes. We seek to align it with AACU/LEAP outcomes whenever possible. We also met with the HLC, and they will likely require: well defined measurable and shared learning outcomes for every general education requirement, every course that meets the requirements must have the learning outcomes on the syllabus and the class must be explicitly designed to address them, the learning outcomes must be used as the basis for assessing that general education requirement, and there must be a comprehensive and detailed overall plan to guide general education assessment as a whole where we close the loop to ensure we continually improve general education. Some draft assessment procedures include even in a conservative model configuring learning outcomes, recertifying all courses for general education (and some might not be), that's a big task. If there is a director of general education that person will need to collect all GenEd syllabi, we don't have that now, record keeping is being done informally. We need to review syllabi every two years to ensure that learning outcomes are still being addressed, there has to be a procedure in place to prevent drift, also a periodic and regular rubric based assessment of general education, one semester we do critical thinking, another semester we do writing, we take a random sample of GenEd courses and students on a rotating calendar to assess with a rubric. A longitudinal measure could be e-portfolios, some people like them, some don't. Another idea is to have signature assignments collected through time in various GenEd classes and you can look at how they have developed. In some places where these are conducted students keep them like Facebook pages to show who they are and how they've grown; they may write reflective essays on their experiences. That's another way. Management and assessment issues need to be addressed no matter what we do with GenEd curriculum, they are independent but you can't write an assessment plan until you have something to assess, so the specifics must be tied to the final product. These issues are just as important as curricular issues. The current draft plans are mostly about curriculum, there's no plan for how we will assess it. This will have significant effects on us, how we teach, regardless of curricular changes, our GenEd assessment is currently piecemeal, so if we build it in as the HLC wants it will change a lot of our current practice. As many of you want a strong director of GenEd that will also change things quite a bit.

- b. K SMITH: At this point we would like to have questions about the process moving forward so that we may have a vote at a later date for something that we are well informed and feel comfortable with because we may live with the results for nine or ten years. The other possibility is dividing the question of general education management and leadership from the curriculum issue, so we can have a concrete motion and a vote on a general education director as soon as possible.
- c. S GERENCSEK: The idea of a strong director of general education seems like a good idea. I don't know if the question needs to be formally divided because I don't know if that's something for the senate to vote on or not. I don't know how that that would connect to anything like the General Education committee, currently we have things like assessment oversight that is appointed by Academic Affairs, that person is then an ex officio member of the Assessment Committee, that model works in a variety of places. I'm not sure what the status is in terms of

the senate in terms of establishing a directorship. Clearly the task force is trying to connect these things, but I'm not sure what the role of the senate is in creating a director.

- d. KS: I suggest that just as we recommended a couple of meetings ago that the Executive Vice Chancellor created the CERES research center with a faculty director that we make a similar recommendation that there be a faculty director of general education with sufficient release time who can work out a relationship with the General Education committee going forward, and that this is part of the way this faculty would say we have confidence in general education and we would like to have adequate structure, we believe that structure is important.
- e. LZ: The task force agrees such a director should be created. Academic Affairs is a good source for that creation. This person won't solve all our problems, but they might have to say no a lot, and they will need the authority to say no, for example for courses on the schedule that haven't yet been approved. Even if we don't create it, it's good to make statements about what should be created.
- f. A LIDINSKY: Could somebody with a strong institutional memory remind us. Did we formerly have a director of general education?
- g. LZ: Yes, we did. It's now under Linda Chen's office. Linda could you speak to us about that process?
- h. L CHEN: When the committee originally drafted the general education program they called for a director of general education. There was an implementation committee for two years after the original committee wrote its report. Then there was a call for a director of general education for which a faculty member was appointed, a newly tenured member, who was given quite a few course releases to start that implementation of the general education curriculum, which meant going from department to department and unit to unit. That worked for a while, the director worked independently, he also had work groups for descriptions of what general education courses would be. Then senate Gen Ed Committee was created to look at curriculum and make decisions, most of the time what they were doing was getting faculty to offer courses in all categories of general education, especially in the common core and contemporary social values areas that needed more courses, the fundamental literacies that were new to our curriculum. That person left, and by that time it was felt that the committee could direct the general education program. There were all sorts of implementation issues. What about transfer students and their credits? Who approves all the new course proposals? Who determines how many sections of what course we should offer? For the longest time we did not have course proposals for certain areas of general education. So it became clear that a senate committee really couldn't run the program as was necessary. So Academic Affairs created a new position, a 50% time position, the Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, this position had to do general education, academic advising, and [inaudible]. I applied. One issue when I came on board is that we still did not have enough classes in certain categories, we still didn't have a regularized process for faculty to apply to have courses count toward general education, we did not yet have a completely usable website, people didn't know what common core courses would be offered each semester. That's how general education came under Academic Affairs, now we need to move it on to a faculty director whose sole purpose is to manage the general education program.
- i. K SMITH: And not just the implementation, but ongoing, right?
- j. LC: Yes.
- k. KS: Okay, the committee is not enough. Implementation only is not enough.
- l. K BORSHUK: A quick suggestion, could we have a Website so everybody can see the survey results and other information?
- m. LZ: Yes, we need a repository for all the things we're doing. A university Website may be difficult to implement.

- n. A LIDINSKY: How about a Canvas site?
- o. LZ: That's an idea. I was thinking about doing a blog as Ken does for the Senate and just add items as we go along in our discussions. We could also put a link to IU Box where materials would be held, so if you want to see reports they're accessible.
- p. SPEAKER: I prefer Canvas over Box so we can have more two-way communication over these issues instead of just reading things. I'd like to attend the forums, but I see a lot more people here at this meeting than I saw at the forums. Having gone to both forums for changes to public speaking requirements I felt like I gave information that only a few people heard and I would like to be able to put that statement out for everyone to read, so they can see responses, and ask me further questions. I'd like to have more open dialogue from the faculty than what we currently have.
- q. LZ: Yes, that's a good idea.
- r. J WELLS: These don't have to be exclusive. We can host all the files on Box and have a site on Canvas where there is discussion.
- s. LZ: Yes, as we are entering into a more complicated discussion we will need something like that.
- t. KS: So are there any further thoughts about having an early conversation about a director position of general education working with the General Education committee, assuming the task force will eventually retire?
- u. G METTETAL: I would like to split the question. I'd like to get a director as soon as possible so that person can help facilitate discussions to determine what general education can be. I don't see any need to wait. If we could get one tomorrow that would be okay.
- v. SPEAKER: I second what Gwynn is saying. We are swimming in the deep end of the pool and we need a lifeguard. I was here during the previous general education, and I feel like I want us to be happy with what we end up living with. I am also concerned about the timeline for this. While I do understand there is some urgency, I feel like urgency has to be balanced with voices and people who have a stake in this, so that it's meaningful to them. We are all going to live with this for another decade and the sooner to get another director the better.
- w. KS: I think that's great. I would hesitate to schedule a vote if I didn't believe we were approaching the state you describe.
- x. LZ: There seems to be a lot of general consensus on this and we should be able to move forward very quickly.
- y. SPEAKER: Don't we have to have input from Academic Affairs? We will need to allow at least two course releases per semester. I agree with what has already been said, it is imperative that we have somebody who is in charge of this so we don't end up back in the same position.
- z. KS: I have verbal commitment from the EVCAA to do this through salary savings, it is a straightforward process, and that having a director in place and funded did not seem to be a barrier, or a surprise to the EVCAA in the budget hearing. I think we're good there.
- aa. A RUSNOCK: Are we going to have that kind of money for course releases
- bb. LZ: I have heard similar responses from the administration, and ultimately we should see it in writing.
- cc. KS: I think the summary that Linda gave of the things that slipped previously after the implementation phase, is something that many colleagues here understand and agree about. We are in a position to speak strongly for not just an implementation director but also an ongoing director. I would be very surprised if we could not come to a very strong vote on that, and Academic Affairs should support us.
- dd. H FROYSLAND: I was discussing the ways other universities do this. Sometimes it is or isn't a position through Academic Affairs. Obviously faculty has to have control of the curriculum but this is a big job and could be a full-time job.

- ee. LZ: Yes there are many places not much bigger than us who have vice chancellors of general education.
- ff. HF: So I'd like us to think about those options a bit more.
- gg. SG: How much of the gargantuan responsibility for assessment would be put under this director position and how much would be tasked to the committee? That's a lot of work.
- hh. LZ: Yes, that's huge. There are different models for such committees, one of our visitors with HLC said theirs has up to 35 members because they do a lot, they have a full assessment procedure in place, and they have to work with various other committees. Obviously our Assessment Committee is going to have to cooperate with the General Education committee, and maybe sometimes the Curriculum Committee and the GenEd director. It's a complicated procedure.
- ii. KS: There is no hope that a proposal for such a position could be brought to the senate in March for a vote and to ensure that these issues get serious reflection. I would not ask for a vote in March. We could only get a vote at the earliest in April.
- jj. LZ: But we'd like you to see something in March about what it might look like.
- kk. KS: So the issue is the path forward to having a vote at an appropriate point for a director, do we have any comments about that path?
- ll. L COLLINS: I'm glad that we're returning to focusing on curriculum and how we feel about the various models before us. Are we going to spend more time in the senate talking about curriculum issues? We've had the forums, but will we have time in the senate?
- mm. KS: The plan is for an hour in the March meeting devoted to the subject of general education. We may also need a half hour for a discussion of the director. I'd like to see almost all of that meeting, two hours, a little longer than normal, with a break, be on general education, with the caution that if that meeting is the only place we discuss the issue we will be in trouble.
- nn. LZ: The open forums were very useful, but we had so much to cover we had to keep moving on to new issues. Maybe there need to be more forums. Maybe some focused. From departmental chairs' comments we are still divided on a lot of issues and requirements. For example we discussed computer literacy and visual literacy, one quarter of the time was devoted to those. We invited the chairs of departments with interests in those areas. They did a great job but there were 25-30 people there, how can we get that information to more people. That applies to many other examples too. We may need to have more open forums and specific forums dedicated to one thing.
- oo. LC: I would be happy to have more forums and attend, it is one of the most important things for faculty, but I would also be happy to use up more senate meetings.
- pp. KS: May I ask the task force to let us know after your next meeting if it is possible to declare one of the options not viable, as the general feeling is that one of them is fairly unpopular?
- qq. K BORSHUK: I'd like to add that those proposals are not permanent things.
- rr. LZ: Task force members, may I just say what the general trend is now rather than wait until our next meeting? It appears plans one and two have a lot of support but plan three has very little specific support although people may like parts of it, also a small group of people interested in the status quo. We need to look at in detail, but perhaps at this point we can say that going back to the distributional model is not something people favor and we can just withdraw it from consideration and move on.
- ss. SPEAKER: One problem we had in the past as a department was the forums were during class times and I know people cherish Fridays for other administrative tasks but it would be nice to have forums on Fridays.
- tt. LZ: Okay we can have more forums, we had already planned four more, but we can do more than that.

uu. JW: Is there any effort made to do straw polls at these forums?

vv. LZ: Yes, for instance we asked whether information literacy should be embedded in a class or retained as a one hour course as it is now. For some things it seemed as if there was enough agreement to do that.

ww. N KARAKATSANIS: I see a problem with more open forums. Because there are so many we never all get together to actually hear each other out. We're only speaking to a small subgroup of people. Why not have two senate meetings to discuss this as a campus? All of us can come together to have these discussions, rather than these forums which break us up and divide us.

xx. K SMITH: I think the Executive Committee will agree that we've promised 90 minutes at the March meeting and it appears that the April meeting may also be largely about general education

yy. NK: So the next two meetings then.

zz. KB: I suggest that if we want more forums with broader participation we should have at least one on Fridays.

aaa. LZ: We can't force people to go to extra meetings, and sometimes you just get a very select audience. That happened sometimes this time. Some people who would go to one would not attend another.

bbb. KS: This has been very fruitful. Thank you all.

- 9) Discussion on the kinds of information faculty need in order to make thoughtful decisions about an upcoming general education vote. The possibility of dividing the question. The likely need for a strong director/committee combination going forward no matter what general education program is in place.
- a. K SMITH: Among the questions I don't feel clear about, as an example, not as an argument, I don't feel clear about the financial implications of different items on the different proposals. I don't feel clear that if we vote on an item with a substantial financial implication, that we can count on that item being funded. I don't feel we clearly know what the bottom line financially would be regarding any of the plans. I also know there are different units with different pressures about the number of credit hours they need for their majors. I know that general education is a challenge for those units, but I don't feel clear about how much of a challenge it is. I know this story by hearsay, rather than being able to refer to something. So if we had a 35 hour general education proposal I only know from hearsay that it might be a problem for somebody but I don't actually know who it would be a problem for, and how much of a problem. That's just an example. There are a lot of things I don't know the answer to, as is the case for people in this room, we need to develop lists of questions we want answers to so that we can move toward a meaningful vote. It's ordinarily been the practice in previous years that motions for substantial items of business be introduced in one meeting and voted on at the end of a discussion no sooner than the next meeting. Which means we are running rather seriously up against the possibility that the final vote is not available to us in April, unless we say that we can do that process even more quickly than we have the last few years. Would anyone like to discuss that?
 - b. J HINNEFELD: It is a big deal, a big change, a big responsibility. We want to make sure that what we go forward with is what we want to do. We should not feel rushed into anything. If we have to take a long time, we do.
 - c. L ZYNDA: Yes, the proposed timeline was something to aim for but the real goal is that whatever we decide that we've thought about it in detail.
 - d. J VANDERVEEN: I appreciate that. As Kim brought up the idea of urgency, there has been this push that this must happen and it's never been explained why this has to happen on the timeline that we've seen. So I appreciate those comments that it's okay.

- e. S GERENCSE: It's important to have deadlines to avoid hundreds of years of committee activity, but with no external demand it's important to do this deliberately.
- f. KS: If I may paraphrase a comment from the vice chancellor at one of our meetings, she said a purpose to having faculty renew the general education is to go back through it thoughtfully and creatively and renew their commitment to it, and to feel good about it going forward. So not meeting a deadline, but not waiting forever, I like the spirit of that.
- g. G METTETAL: We still need a director sooner rather than later, and even if we take our time, even if we don't change we should get that person installed as soon as possible.
- h. KS: I would like to invite the task force to be in close conversation with at least the Executive Committee and any other committee that seems appropriate so that any proposal brought for discussion in March for the director is as well developed as it can be. Well done, everyone, I think this has been great.

10) The plan for an hour in the March Senate meeting devoted to the general education questions.

11) President's remarks. a) The "Best Practices" document for promotion and tenure on the regional campuses. b) Service in the PTR process for clinical ranks. c) Other items.

- a. K SMITH: We are near the end of our agenda. I want to briefly mention that there was a constructive meeting between members of the PTR committee, the Dwyer College, and the Executive Committee on the subject of how to go forward introducing a clearer understanding about policy implications for the role of service in the promotion and tenure in clinical ranks, which is a practice understood and carried out at other institutions. The PTR committee reports that it is happy to do that anyway, but is not guided by policy, because people are coming up for promotion for whom service in a clinical rank is a very important part of their work, but they don't have a clear way to move that through the familiar channels that others have best used in our PTR process. There are models that exist, Dwyer is building on some and adapting them to our current purposes. The PTR committee seemed very helpful and open. My goal in this conversation is for the faculty to understand whatever changes might be called for and to see them as appropriate, and as recognizing real strengths, real excellence that is documented in clear ways so that everyone involved can say, 'these are great colleagues.' It was very positive and I'm optimistic about the future of that. It will involve some revisiting of the "best practices" document for promotion and tenure on the regional campuses.

12) Announcements.

- a. G METTETAL: The TTA award is due on March 1. Information is on Academic Affairs under faculty resources and awards. The SOTL Conference is April 5. The keynote speaker is Ken Bain who will talk about deep learning. Early bird registration is through March 16th.
- b. J FEIGHERY: Employees and students now have complete digital access to the New York Times and the Chronicle of Higher Education.
- c. A SCHNABEL: SMART summer fellowships will be due March 26.
- d. E BENNION: American Democracy Project upcoming events include upcoming candidate forums and debates. Please share these broadly in our communities.

Adjourned 2:59pm