

Minutes for Academic Senate Meeting
September 21, 2018, 10 – 11.30 AM
DW 1001

IN ATTENDANCE: Adaikkalavan, Ananth, Bennion, Bindroo, Blouin, Borshuk, Bregu, Brittenham, Bushnell, Campbell, L. Chen, Y. Cheng, Cleary, Clift, N. Colborn, L. Collins, Cress, Curtis, H. Davis, Deranek, Dielman, Douglas, Economakis, Edmondson, Ervick, J. Feighery, W. Feighery, T. Fisher, Fong-Morgan, Ganoë, Gerencser, Gerken, Gretencord, Hackett, Haithcox, Hakimzadeh, He, Heck, Holland, Hopkins, Horwat, Jang, Joseph, Kahan, Kelley, B. Kern, G. Kern, Kinsey, Kolbe, Kwong, LaLime, Lambert, Langton, Lemanski, Levine, Lidinsky, Liechty, Lisoni, Lucal, Lynker, Malinda, Marr, Martinez, Mattox, McInerney, McLister, McMillen, Meluch, Merhi, Merken, K. Miller, S. Miller, Mociulski, Moore, Je. Muniz, Nair, Oake, Obata, Okrah, Olivier, Opasik, Pant, Park, Pathak, Peek, Reddy, Resler, Ritchie, Rossow, Savvopoulou, Schmitz, Schnabel, Schrank, Schult, Scott, Sernau, Shepherd, Shlapentokh, Shockey, Shrader, Sofhauser, Song, Surma, Takanashi, Tetzlaff, Thomas, Thompson, Torkzadeh, Tourtillotte, VanDerVeen, Vida, Wells, White, Willig, Wooden, Zhang, Zwicker

1. Call to order at 10:00AM
2. Approval of [April 2018 Minutes](#)
 - Carolyn Schult explains new parliamentary procedures. We no longer need a motion to approve minutes; lack of objection constitutes approval of minutes.
 - Senate committees are empowered to make decisions on behalf of the senate, which they can do by submitting their meeting minutes for distribution.
 - This set of minutes include the [Senate PTR Committee Reappointment Dossier guidelines](#) as well as the [Senate Athletics Committee's approval of Women's Soccer team starting 2019](#), both of which will become policy if not amended today.
 - No corrections or objections from the floor; minutes approved.
3. Welcome; Introduction of the current executive committee
 - Introduction of President and current Executive Committee members.
 - Thanks to the previous Executive Committee members, especially to Susan Thomas (former vice president) who assisted a lot over the summer.
 - Please feel free to bring any concerns to Executive Committee members.
4. Introduction of Associate Faculty Voting Members for 2018-19
 - Thanks to Vincci Kwong, who was so efficient that we are able to introduce the Associate Faculty Voting Members at our first meeting.
 - Members Introduced and thanked for their service: Chantell Barnhill (CLAS); Kristy Ganoë (ARTS/CLAS); Melanie Hackett (EDUC); Marcia Holland (CLAS); Carlos Lisoni (CLAS); Mansfield Malinda (EDUC); Alison Moss (CLAS); A.J. Schmitz (CLAS); Sorah Stein (CLAS); Robin Vida (CHS); Kara Werner-Sanders (EDUC); Kim Wooden (B&E)
5. Senate Committees

- Overview of senate committees and number of faculty.
- We still need members for the following committees. Please email Vincci Kwong (vk Wong@iusb.edu) to volunteer:
 - Required: R&D (1 - EDUC); CDC (2 - ARTS/B&E/LIB);
 - Optional: Academic Affairs (1); Curriculum (2); Faculty welfare (1)

6. Special Election

- There was a vacancy on the PTR Committee due to resignation. The Executive Committee appointed Kwadwo Okrah as an interim member over the summer.
- We will need to hold a special election to fill vacant positions for elected committees. The Executive Committee has made the following nominations:
 - PTR Committee (Current members: CLAS, LIB, CHS)
 - 1 Tenured Faculty (2 year term):
 - Kwadwo Okrah (Prof, Teacher Education, Education) - Interim Appointment
 - 1 Tenure-Probationary Non-Voting Member (1 year term):
 - Joseph A. Campbell (Asst Prof, Counseling and Human Services, Education)
 - Young Suk Lee (Asst Prof, Integrated New Media, ARTS)
 - Faculty Misconduct Committee (Current Members: ARTS, CLAS, CHS, EDUC, LIB)
 - 1 Alternate Member (2 year term):
 - Alex Meisami (Asso Prof, Finance, B&E)
 - Senate Executive Committee (Current Members: ARTS, CLAS, LIB)
 - 1 At-large member (1 year term):
 - Mallory Edmondson (Clinical Asst Prof, Dental Educ, CHS)
- Floor opened for nominations; no other nominations from the floor; nomination is closed.
- Non-contested positions (tenured member for PTR, alternate member for Faculty Misconduct Committee, and at-large member for the Senate Executive Committee) approved by voice vote.
- Paper ballots distributed for the PTR Non-Voting Member position. Results will be announced at the end of the meeting.

7. [Constitution Revisions and Updates](#) by Steven Gerencser

- Adaikkalavan: This is an update on constitution revisions introduced to the senate in April 2018 by Steven Gerencser, Doug McMillen, and Ken Smith. They have been working hard during the summer on this.
- Gerencser: Thank you for your attention to this on-going revision to the Constitution. You may remember that about a year ago, I said this was going to happen in a few stages. There was low hanging fruit, then there was fruit we can stand up and reach for, and we are getting to the point where we're going to have to reach for the fruit tree ladder pretty soon, which I will explain in just a minute. But there are two things I want

to let you know about today. First of all, these changes that we're discussing today were initially introduced and discussed at the April meeting. You had the summer to look them over, and we received some suggestions from folks, revisions that might help make it more it even more clear. And I'll point to one of those today. Other revisions that people suggested were some very good ideas that attend to some other committees. So, we'll introduce those when we introduce some other committees later in the fall.

- The significant revisions that are different in this document today, that I will be asking for a motion to be sent out for a vote as a constitutional revision, is that in the very beginning there is a list of all the faculty ranks that currently exist at Indiana University South Bend and we had not previously included clinical faculty. So those now have been introduced as a recognition of them as a member of our academic community here. And some other changes that I just wanted to highlight is the first set of changes all had to do with committees. Those committee changes went from a series of interactions between the committees themselves and us and we tried to come up with language that was clear and consistent. We mostly were able to do that, though there are some places we'll still have to work on in the future. But the significant work has been done. And then the Executive Committee worked very closely to rewrite and update some of the language at the very beginning of the Constitution. And then we went back and integrated some of the things that were in the bylaws that attended to some particular elements of the Constitution back into where those places could be. There are still a set of bylaws, but you'll notice that the bylaws are a little shorter than they had been because we had integrated some of those things into the body of the text.
- The other thing I want to say is that we are working towards the high fruit, if you will – the really complicated committees such as the faculty board of review, the faculty misconduct review committee, and procedures regarding dismissal. These are difficult, complicated areas of the constitution. We're actually working with recent members of the committees who have served on those. Right now, we're primarily focused on the faculty board of review, and will next go to the faculty misconduct review committee. If you have served on that committee in the last five years or so don't be surprised if you get an email from me saying, here's where we are, and we will be happy for your input. And the other thing that we're doing is we'll also be in contact with IU council to make sure that any changes that we make are appropriate. Also, we will see if there are easier, cleaner and clearer procedures that perhaps another campus has already integrated, that we might be able to adopt into our setting, because we want to make sure that these are both fair committees with clear procedures, since these cases can be really convoluted. We'll make them simple to use as best we can. We'll be doing that over the course of the fall, ideally. And then there are a few other standing committees with which we still have some complicated work to do, and we'll do as best as we can. The whole purpose of this is to get the constitution updated relative to the last set of changes in the early 2000s and in an easier-to-use format,
- I realize that it's a little bit like working on an old house; it's never going to be finished and it is an ongoing, moving document. But we can make it significantly more up to date and significantly easier to find what we're looking for by the end of this process. Again,

the process won't be able to finalize the document forever; instead we will continually have to fix things. As a simple example of that, we went through and tried to standardize the number of people who serve on committees. But one of the things that we realized is that every committee said that it would be great to have a certain number of people, and we tried to standardize it, but this actually as a whole increases the total number for the body of people who are required to serve on committees. We might want to revisit whether that was a good idea to increase the number of each committee size by the number that we did. The answer might be yes. But we were thinking community by community as opposed to a larger whole and it will increase those numbers that Raman had for the number of required committee members. So that's the status of where we are right now.

- I'd like to ask if there are any questions regarding the revisions that were originally introduced in April. Again, it was about five committees and then the language about the executive committee and the language regarding the bylaws and the introductory matter to the constitution itself.
- Move for approval by vote; seconded; approved by voice vote. Faculty will receive an electronic ballot from the senate secretary.

8. [Center for Excellence in Research and Scholarship \(CERES\)](#) - Josh Wells

- This is a brief update on the Center for Excellence in Research and Scholarship which was approved by faculty vote last year. Board members will be introducing themselves at college/school meetings. Please bring them your ideas, share your interests, and use them as resources.
- We have several projects underway:
 - We will be reviving the IUSB Review, an online journal of faculty research.
 - We will organize a Research Gala
 - There is a free tech training coming to campus. A team of students and faculty from Texas Tech will offer a completely free workshop and research training on cartography and webmapping. We have enough computers to accommodate up to 75 people. We believe this is something that will be of interest to everyone. Please invite students. The workshop will take place October 8, 5-9 pm, Wiekamp 1265. There will be free pizza.
- Please help CERES (and ourselves) by creating or updating IU Experts (<https://news.iu.edu/iu-experts>) and Pivot (<https://research.iu.edu/collaborate.shtml>) profiles so that people can find you based on your research expertise and interests. This also makes you visible to the public.
- Please watch out for announcements in the Daily Titan.

9. General Education Co-Directors Video Introduction [[Link to video](#)]

- Elaine Roth and Kristyn Quimby have been appointed as the General Education Co-Directors over the summer. They are at a general education conference and cannot be here today, but they have a video to introduce themselves and the principles of general education.

10. Carnegie Engaged Campus Application and Carnegie Engaged Campus Task Force

- Dielman: The Carnegie Engaged Faculty Fellows program has been established to support community engaged teaching. Faculty fellows will work on integrating community engagement into their courses. It is a pleasure to announce year's fellows, who are Hayley Froyland and Monica Tetzlaff (co-teaching a course in history), Christina Gerken (WGS), and Andrea Meluch (Communications). They will be mentored by Elizabeth Bennion, Terri Hebert, and Scott Sernau. Please congratulate this year's fellows. The taskforce would also like to thank EVCAA Chen and Interim Chancellor Joseph for supporting this program.
- Bennion: This Fellows Program is just one example of the kind of resources that are possible to support civic- and community-based engagement through our curriculum. And if we get the Carnegie designation, it will be a great advocate to leverage additional resources, not just internally, but externally as well. It's an excellent opportunity to showcase the great work that you're involved in doing and that you may hope to do in the future. I want to just remind people that our campus has been working on this for two and a half years with some people meeting on a very regular basis. A lot of effort has gone into this application. What we need now is for the deans, chairs, and directors to answer the survey that Gail McGuire sent you. We do not have any central way of collecting data about this community engagement work at this time. We are relying on this data and this information for the application. All the work we have done until now comes down to making sure that we have that information collected. If you are a dean, chair, or director, please get those in by October 1. If you are not, but you notice that your dean, chair, or director is not here, perhaps you could encourage them to complete this. Or, if you are not sure if they're aware of all the work you're doing, have a conversation and make sure your great work is included in this particular application.
- There are a few questions that Gail has gotten a lot of as she talked to some of the deans and chairs. The first is about the assessment data. I know that it's very heavy on assessment in terms of what Carnegie's asking for. People are saying, "what does that mean?" Just give us what you've got. If all you've got are event counts, that's better than nothing; you're at least showing that you're paying attention to what is working with the community. We're looking for impact data such as interest groups, focus groups, and surveys if you pass out little surveys after your events and collect that information. Just give us whatever you have and Gail will be able to have the pleasure of making sense of it. With PTR, remember, there's still time to include a statement of some sort, even if you don't change your entire criteria, to show that we've been having this campus-wide discussion and we're moving forward at the college levels. So I would encourage you to consider that and feel free to talk with Gail or me if you need an idea of what that might look like. We have all kinds of templates ready to go for your consideration. Also, resources to the community includes furniture, books, NPR sponsorships. All of that comes in. The timeline is 2017 -18. We have had a few questions about what to do if we did something for five years straight and then we just skipped that year. Please do include something like that because what they're really looking for is a typical year and that's why they don't want us just collecting from all

different years. But if that year was a typical, and that's something you regularly do please include it. And the final question was about community voice. They don't mean community voice in your college or department as a whole but in community engagement.

- I will take any burning questions in just one second, but I want to remind you all about the American Democracy Project because we have our school board forum coming up on Tuesday and the sheriff debate coming up on Thursday. If you're in education or criminal justice it would be wonderful to have you and your students there, but really the events are for anybody who votes in St. Joe county. We will also have debate watch parties so encourage your students to attend. But the big thing I want to share is National voter registration day, which is on Tuesday the 25th. If you want to have a registration station at your office, we can do that. We have all the materials. If you're a faculty member, we know classroom registration works in producing registrations and voters. This has been studied so we know it can be done. What we want to see is as many folks involved as possible. I'm going to post two links to the Daily Titan for a do-it-yourself option and a classroom visit option. October 1st through 5th, please invite us in so that we can make sure every student has heard about this. We will also have tables across campus. Encourage your students to stop by and get registered. We are in a national study of learning and voter engagement and we were recognized for our improvement last time. And we have a lot of room for continued improvement. We hope that all of you will help us as we seek to educate for democracy and get our students involved.
- Questions?
 - Q: what is the last day students can register?
 - 10/9. They can do it online at Indianavoters.com or we can deliver their forms for them.

11. Ad Hoc Committee on Campus-Supported Childcare - April Lidinsky and Susan Cress

- Lidinsky: This is an update on the work regarding campus childcare that started last July. Jay VanderVeen and Josh Wells helped with the infrastructure work for putting together a survey that went out to students, staff and faculty. We received over 800 responses and people resoundingly support the idea of campus-supported childcare as something that will promote retention and student success as well as faculty and staff support. Last year the idea was endorsed by various campus bodies, so we moved forward and have been working with various campus offices and taskforces. Thanks to Vice Chancellor Phil Iapalucci for including us in discussions about space with IU. We look forward to working with the campus space committee on this topic. Participants in the taskforce acknowledged. We're moving forward and are grateful to the chancellor for support. We are creating a business plan this fall with an eye toward opening in fall 2019.
- Cress: We are developing a collaborative model with the YMCA and IVY Tech. We are delighted that our mission to engage the community aligns with these organizations. We are having ongoing conversations about assets they can bring to the project. Please let us know if you'd like to be involved. We will continue to provide updates at future senate meetings.

12. Student Engagement Roster - Doug McMillen and Michelle Rosemond

- We have partnered to promote the use of Student Engagement Roster which is much more robust than its predecessor, the Student Performance Roster. It can still provide early warning for attendance, participation, and academic performance. It can also promote academic success in and beyond the classroom. We are pushing the use of SER for two main reasons: as an early warning system and to support student engagement. As an early warning system, it helps us flag students who are not attending the first week of class. This is important because it helps us catch students who are no longer attending; they can be warned early so that they are not impacted financially and academically. Also, if these students are not withdrawn, they are also counting against us for retention. For academically struggling students, intervention in the first 3-6 weeks produces more success than later intervention. We can see if students are using recommended resources and whether or not that has a positive impact. As for engagement, even good students start feeling pressure mid semester, and they can feel encouraged by positive feedback to make it through the semester.
- In order to make good use of SER, we need faculty reporting both positive and negative feedback in SER along with recommendations such as “visit the writing center” and details about the location and hours for the recommended resource. The recommended resource is made available to students via Canvas as well as by email. So far, 51% of students who have received email have reviewed the recommendations. Advisors also receive emails when students receive notifications. We can also pull data from the advising system. Advisors can see their advising caseload to see which students need help and can follow-up. This may be more difficult for faculty advisors.
- Titan Success Center and the Student Engagement office have been busy reaching out to students who've been flagged for non-attendance and other issues during the first two weeks. After week three, the data is forwarded to the academic units. The most frequent recommendation is to consult with the instructor. When doing so, it is possible to give not just negative feedback but also encourage student engagement using personal notes. This will be sent out to students and advisors. When students are getting these kinds of warning for 4-5 courses, we can identify students who are really struggling. At the end of the 4th week, 41% of classes have reports about engagement – we would like this number to go up to 75%. We need this data so that we can provide good feedback and have a complete picture of our students so that we can give them resources they need to succeed at IU South Bend.
- SER can be accessed through Canvas as well as One.IU. Feel free to reach out to us if you need any help. We are looking for faculty contacts in each college. For information go to the website and or watch the instructional video (google “flags initiative”).
- Questions?
 - Q: Do students receive Canvas notifications in addition to email?
 - A: No. Students receive notifications by email only, but they can access SER through Canvas.

13. Interim Chancellor Jann Joseph

- Good morning. I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you today at the first meeting of the academic year. I am pleased to see that we are off to a good start this morning. I want to spend a few minutes encouraging you to think about how we can continue to do our best for our students, institution, and community. I want to reflect on what “best” means. We always tell people to do their best, but the question is what we can actually do. As faculty members, think about three things that you can do differently that might help students learn. For example, you saw Doug say, “come see me and let’s work together to improve your grade.” This is an example of supporting students with growth mindset by working together to identify specific things they can do to improve.
- I ask the academic senate as a whole to think about what we can do best to improve, and I want you to think big. The work that we do as a body is very important. We can make changes in processes and policies that impact students, faculty, and staff as we’ve seen this morning; We can make changes that we’ve talked about for years; we can make changes that solve problems facing our future; we can make IU South Bend a better place as a faculty body and as leaders of the institution. I know that we can make these changes together and that we can work together to make a difference.
- I don’t look at this year as a year of transition or waiting, and I hope that you won’t either. I see this year as a year to make progress, based on the information and exchanges that have taken place in this room in previous years. I’ve witnessed reports, debates, interactions, passion – lots of passion – and lots of good humor in this room. And as the Executive Vice Chancellor for the last four years, I’ve learned how this senate works, and I’ve seen times when we can be better versions of ourselves. And I’ve learned that I, too, can be better at providing what you need. As this year’s interim chancellor, I want to work with you to make progress in things that we have already given time and attention to in previous years.
- As I said at the all campus meeting, I know that there’s good work going on every day at IU South Bend, and we try to help our students. But we still need to find ways to do more, not only to improve our retention and graduation rates, but to improve the lives of our students and their families. As administrators, faculty, and staff in higher education, we are in a very unique position because we can have direct influence on lives of people who come here and who are part of our community. In upcoming meetings, I will report on issues of enrollment, retention, and budget, but today I just wanted to talk from the heart. I look forward to working with Raman, the Executive Committee, and all of you as we work to make positive change because we are in this together. Let’s have a good year together and thanks for everything you do.

14. Interim EVCAA Linda Chen

- Good morning, everyone. When I saw the agenda, I thought there would be no time for me to talk, so I want to give credit to the Senate President and Executive Committee for running a very efficient meeting so that there is time for me to say a few words. Following up on some of the comments that Jann made, I would like to echo that this is a year where we want to move forward in terms of being more successful at IU South Bend. One of my commitments is to work, especially on the academic side, on how we as faculty can move forward in promoting student success and in promoting our own

success. And the word that I'm going to say, which you'll hear you've heard it a million times (it has also kept me up at night a couple times), and that's called retention. And I know that we've talked about retention for many years, and we know that performance-based funding is dependent on retention and graduation rates. But I want to spend some time this year talking about what our specific roles can be in promoting retention, about what is the faculty role, and what are the various ways that we need to work on retention, because there is not one magic bullet. In all the years that I've been in Academic Affairs, and this is my ninth year, I've been doing a lot of reading, going to a lot of conferences, talking to people about retention, and there's not one bullet that's going to solve it. There will be multiple things that we need to do, but one of the things that I feel is that while we all need to be involved in retention, we all have different roles with regards to how we promote retention. And for faculty, that will obviously be what we do in our classes and how we run our academic programs. So that will be my focus this year.

- I'd just like to say that two weeks ago, all the academic deans and faculty leadership attended the Chancellor's leadership retreat. All the regional campuses gathered at IU Kokomo for a two-day retreat where we were given some background as to how IU is seeing the numbers with regards to projections for future enrollments in the state of Indiana. Also we had a guest speaker named David Yeager, who is a psychologist at UT Austin who has been one of the franchise, if you will, with regards to mindset and growth mindset theory. He was a student of Carol Dweck who popularized this whole idea of mindset theory; his Ph. D is from Stanford and he has a BA from the University of Notre Dame in Liberal Studies and English. We were treated to a lovely presentation about his newest thinking on growth mindset and how it is that we can encourage our students to do their best and to be in charge of being successful at their academic work. The people who attended were, as I mentioned, the academic deans but also we were asked to invite our Senate president who attended, our Director of UCET who attended, and our Co-directors of General Education. So it was faculty from all the regional campuses from these groups, and also all the deans. Out of that, we're going to begin discussions of some of the issues that were raised at that meeting and move forward with trying to promote change and introduce changes to policies and practices on our own campus in our context and so ultimately there will be faculty discussions about this. So that is my overall goal for this year.
- I want to give the rest of my time to the GenEd Task Force. Recall that GenEd Task Force has been hard at work over the last two years working on reviewing and revising our general education curriculum. I will say as an aside that some weeks ago I was contacted by Bill McKinney, the senior advisor to John Applegate, asking all the EVCs of the campuses what we are doing about general education on our campus, which showed that someone is paying attention to this. All of us have responded and four of the five regional campuses are in the process of doing a review of general education. Basically, this was a request that came from President McRobbie at the August Board of Trustees meeting and he was inquiring as to the possibility of looking at general education across the system. We all give our reports and the report was sent to President McRobbie and his conclusion was to not interfere while campuses are working on general education,

which means we really need to show that we've done something with general education reform. So just keep that in mind as we begin to have discussions. But going back to the task force, they have been the very dedicated group, they represent the entire campus, and three of the people who've been most active in it – Lyle Zynda, the chair of the task force, and Elaine and Kristyn – at the HLC General Education workshop on GenEd assessment outside of Chicago. So that's why they're not here today. But we do have several people from the task force who will refresh our memories as to where we were at the end of April, where we'll be going from here and how to access all sorts of reading materials in the Box so that you can have time to look at it in the next month. So, without much further ado, I'd like to have them take over the meeting. Thank you.

15. [General Education](#) taskforce - Cathy Borshuk, Jennifer Muniz, and Julie Elliott

- Adaikkalavan: This September meeting, we had so many requests for agenda items. I moved a couple of them to the next October meeting. But we will give enough time for the GenEd task force to present their views. And then we will see how it goes.
- Borshuk: Thanks for giving us all some time here today. During the senate meetings, we would like to finish our business of reviewing and renewing the general education curriculum here in the next few months. So it's very important that we get going on this. We're going to be moving into the decision-making phase, the actual voting phase following this meeting. And the way we've decided to do things is to give you bundles of things to look at and to vote on. This is our procedure for moving forward. Many of us are here today, and we would like to update you, tell you we've been, what we've been doing, remind you where to find things, and actually move to have a vote on accepting some aspects of the renewal of our GenEd program.
- I thought we could start by going through our timeline, our plan for the semester. Today, for this September meeting, we plan to present to you a report -- I have an executive summary that I would like to hand out -- as well as to create a motion to approve a resolution which adopts four aspects of our general education. If we all like that, we will move to another resolution to adopt another part of the GenEd. We will be voting after this meeting, not during this meeting, by email ballot in order to engage as many parts of the academic community as we can to get everybody involved in this, since we think this is really important.
- We've been working on this for over two years now; we've been meeting every two weeks for two years and a month. So it's been quite a concentrated effort. We've collected data from all over. I'm hoping you remember that we visited faculty meetings, we've had forums, we've had an online survey, we visited the SGA, we've done focus groups in classes, we've gotten feedback from constituents all throughout our campus about your feelings about learning outcomes, about general education courses, about aspects of the general education you love, aspects you would love to see refreshed, aspects that are still controversial. Those things are going to be down the road a little bit, but I promise you we still have to confront them before the end of this year, before the end of 2018. So we will have to do that. We're going to start slowly in September. We will have a vote after this meeting on the less controversial aspects that I will present today. In our October meeting, we're going to ask for time at the senate again

and will give you the results of our first vote. So we're really going to get into action here. At the October meeting, we're going to be inviting in units on our campus that have high credit hour concerns to come and present their issues. I think it is important that we hear from units that have been struggling with the current iteration of the general education curriculum because of the number of credit hours that it has. We thought the best place to do that would be at the senate so that those of you who think that general education is fine will actually get to hear from units that have not found it to be a perfect thing. They have had to do all kinds of exemptions and exceptions and they've had challenges with their students trying to complete general education. I won't name the units, but you'll find them in the report that I'm going to give you. Also in October we're going to have a discussion about contemporary social values and some other more controversial fundamental literacy categories. We anticipate that we may get 20 or 30 minutes to do that. But discussion at the senate meeting may not be enough. In light of that, we're proposing a potential special session in November, so you might want to mark your calendars now. I do know that this is the first Friday of the month, which is November 2. It's the date that many departments have department meetings so take a look at your calendars. We're suggesting an afternoon meeting to further discuss high credit hours, contemporary social values, fundamental literacies that are more controversial, as well as some of the suggested additions to general education such as financial literacy and engagement. There are troublesome implementation issues in some cases and for other items they are difficult or possibly controversial. We really do need to get to the bottom of this and decide what the campus wants. Then by the November senate meeting we will start presenting more packages that we can vote on. You might remember we started all those years ago going out all your faculty meetings asking what you want students to leave IUSB knowing. We started the student learning outcomes, and now we have to think about how to deliver. And of course, this is the tricky part. We're going to continue to listen to you to put together proposals, trying to come back really quickly with a proposal of a motion that we can vote for approval. So that's our procedure and then after the January senate meeting we can finally vote on the whole thing. So that's our plan.

- Now, in order for you to make informed decisions, you really have to know and see everything. Julie Elliott is going to show you where to find because everything is in fact available. And I know this is how you want to spend your weekend is during this reading. There's a whole lot of stuff to read and she's going to show you where that is. At the same time she is doing that, we're going to hand out a very nice one-page Executive Report, so that you can see the summary of where we are and what we're asking today.
- Julie: So here's the file folder we also showed you in April. Have any of you had a chance to take a look at it yet? We've added a few things. Here's what's in the Box folder for you to take a look at: all the students focus groups, all the faculty online survey we did, the meetings and departments, all that information is there. We have a special folder for things that are new since April that has three things in it. One is the short executive summary as well as the full version which is nine pages. And then we have the appendix you might be interested in for the different areas where we didn't have a clear consensus like visual literacy, information literacy, computer literacy. All of the

comments that came those faculty department meetings when we discussed GenEd as a whole, all those comments are available in the appendix.

- Adaikkalavan: These are all linked to the agenda.
- Muniz: The area that we felt was the easiest to tackle first was the least controversial. And it seemed that there was a fair amount of consensus on retaining the four current fundamental literacies of writing, oral communication, qualitative reasoning, and critical thinking. One thing to consider with all of these resolutions is that there may be some name changes, and there may be some implementation issues. So, for example, one of the areas that was raised was in terms of transfer students, so we wanted to try to make that easier. That would be considered an implementation issue, it wouldn't have to do with whether we actually decide to keep these four literacies in place or not. So at this point, I will make a motion that we discuss retaining these four, and then it will go to an email vote.
- Motion seconded; approved by voice vote. Discussion follows:
 - Borshuk: We will be voting on the four fundamental literacies as a bundle.
 - Muniz: One thing to keep in mind as well is that we need to be able to link whatever we decide on with assessment. And so one possible change, even if we don't make a whole lot of changes to what we currently have, is that most likely we're looking at having some common student learning outcomes that people would have in their syllabus. That would be one way that we try to maintain some consistency. Again, that would be an issue of implementation. So just be aware, that would be one slight change, so there's reference in the fine print about student learning outcomes.
 - Q: Is it correct that these items stay the same as how they were defined in 2003?
 - A: That's one thing that Elaine and Kristyn are looking at. They are trying to make sure that all the terminology across what the faculty and students see are consistent.
 - Q: Will this impact the definition and criteria for the courses?
 - A: One of the things that we're trying to do is make broad enough student learning outcomes. With classes like writing, it might be a little bit easier to have all the courses that are designated to meet those learning outcomes. But it becomes a little more difficult when we're looking at something like T190s that are taught across different departments. We are trying to keep the outcomes limited. Sometimes in our courses, we may want to have 10 or more objectives. And so, the point would be that you can add on whatever you want to the original course. But the ones that we assess as meeting this general education goal would be something like three or four.
 - Q: Is the motion of the floor that we're voting on this resolution?
 - A: No, we're just discussing it. We will need a separate motion for a vote, which will be by email.
 - Q: If somebody wants to create a new class, they could create that new class and go through an approval process to be approved for these four literacies. Is that what you're saying?
 - A: I think so. There still can be room for more courses to be added as long as they are reviewed by the general education committee using a similar process to the one

- we currently have. My understanding is that now that we have co-directors they're going to actually looking at everything again. I don't know if there will be reapplication process for everything. But given that we're going to have common student learning outcomes, I'm not sure that there's going to be automatic renewal of courses that currently meet that fundamental literacy requirement.
- A (Lucal): As co-chair of the other general education committee, there is no plan for re-approval. There is a plan to provide assistance and mentoring for faculty teaching courses that are not meeting the SLOs.
 - A: Just so you're aware, Elaine and Kristyn have been sending out emails and meeting with people who teach the courses to figure out to see what they want to be the student learning outcomes.
 - Q: In quantitative reasoning and critical thinking, there are multiple courses that fulfill these requirements, like the Common Core. In cases where multiple courses fulfill the requirement, should we go through a renewal process to ensure that these courses meet the objectives?
 - A: That issue would fall under implementation and the nine-page version addresses this issue. Now that we have co-directors of general education, there will be oversight to ensure that courses meet the learning outcomes. This was in their job description that had been approved. We are not approving courses; we are approving learning outcomes in this vote.
 - Parliamentarian: We just need to make a motion to approve these four items
 - Adaikkalavan: I need a motion to approve these four fundamental literacies.
 - Motion made; seconded; approved by voice vote to close debate; electronic ballot will be sent out because they wish to have the whole senate weigh in.
 - Adaikkalavan: We are out of time for the next general education resolution, so we will stop here and we will come back next month. You can read the resolution; these are all in the agenda so please read it and then they'll bring it up next time. Thank you.

16. President's remarks – Raman Adaikkalavan

- In my remarks I'd like to share what I learned in the last several months. The first thing is election results. Looking at the votes they both are really strong candidates, so thank them both for standing up for the election. We've elected Professor Campbell from education to the PTR committee as a non-voting member. The second item in my remarks is that there's a team from the vice president's office that will be visiting us in October, so if you have any suggestions for topics that you want us to discuss with vice president Applegate and his team please let us know. Please email me or email any of the executive committee members.
- Number three is basically about the meeting at Kokomo. It was good to learn about different campuses, different administrators, different things, and they had really nice round tables with Vice Chancellors and faculty and deans. There are a couple of things that I took away from that. Number one is there is a book called "Demographics and the Demand for Higher Education" by Nathan Grawe. It came out in the summer and it talks about how enrollments will be there in the next 10 years or so. If you get a chance, read it, it will tell us that there will be enrollment drops and this is not an exception. I'm not

saying I buy into it entirely, but I'm just saying this so that you can make up your mind. The next thing I took away from the event is that basically everyone on campus has a role; it's not just faculty or staff or peer mentors or tutors. Everybody and everything matters. One example that was demonstrated during the presentation was how a badly designed website can make students drop from the university. They have examples and research based on financial aid websites and such. So it is not just faculty or administrators, but we all have to work together to pull this off.

- The last item I have here is the Chancellor search. I know the committee is working very hard and we have seen them. I've met them twice, and they were working very hard and it's a very active committee. They are taking lots of notes and they were here on campus. They are doing an awesome job but one thing I need to bring to this body is an FYI to let you know that though the chancellor search committee has faculty as the majority, it doesn't follow the IU policy per se. This was told to me by Ken from the previous executive committee and Ken had approached Applegate and he declined to correct the issues. But this follows the practice from the 2012 chancellor search so there's nothing different from that. The UFC already posted a draft for IU policy regarding Chancellor search on their UFC of website last November. So it's a policy that is changing. For now, we have told Applegate how unhappy we are. I will stop here.

Any questions?

- Q: I don't follow what you are unhappy about.
- The two-minute version is, according to ACA-09, which is the IU policy regarding chancellor searches, when you conduct a chancellor search the committee should have faculty majority and the faculty majority should be coming from the senate list that we sent. Right now, the committee has faculty majority, but it doesn't have majority from the faculty list that we sent. We have one additional faculty from a different list that they brought. When Ken approached Applegate last year, he sent out the list which showed the 2012 committee when Chancellor Allison was hired and the 2018 committee. So there is a practice there and that's where it stands. I've raised this in RFC and we'll see where it takes us.

17. Announcements and motion to adjourn

- Announcements made:
 - New Associate Faculty Speaker series
 - Raclin School of Arts fall events and art exhibit
 - Ready to Move program
 - Bender Lecture: Rita Dove
 - Communications Arts Lecture Series
 - Save the date: Friday, April 12 for URC
 - ADP Events
 - Health Fair
 - UCET Workshop on grading
 - IUSB Twitter Feed
- Motion to adjourn; seconded; approved. Meeting adjourned 11:32AM