

Minutes for Academic Senate Meeting
February 15, 2019, 1:30 – 3:00 PM
DW 1001

This document provides a digest (not a full transcript) per request of the Senate President

IN ATTENDANCE: Adaikkalavan, Bakerson, Borshuk, Breese, L. Chen, Y. Cheng, X. Cheng, Cleary, L. Collins, Cress, H. Davis, Ervick, Essig, J. Feighery, W. Feighery, Gerken, Gretencord, Haithcox, Heck, Hernando, Hinnefeld, Holland, Jang, Karakatsanis, B. Kern, G. Kern, Kolbe, Kwong, Lambert, Lidinsky, Lucal, Lynker, Marr, Martinez, McGuire, McInerney, McLister, McMillen, Meisami, Meluch, Merhi, Merken, Mlotshwa, Mociulski, Monsma, Moore, Olivier, Pajakowski, Pant, Park, Pathak, Popescu, Resler, Rusnock, Savvopoulou, Scheessele, Schimmrigk, Schmitz, Schnabel, Schult, Shlapentokh, Shrader, J. Smith, K. Smith, Sofhauser, Song, Surma, Swain, Takanashi, Thomas, Thompson, Torkzadeh, Tourtillotte, Vlaeminck, Vrajitoru, Werner-Sanders, White, Yu, Zhang, Zynda

1. Call to order at 1:30pm
2. [3 Minutes] Approval of January 2019 Senate Meeting Minutes
 - No corrections or modifications from the floor; minutes stand approved.
3. [5 Minutes] Nominations for Elected Positions
 - Adaikkalavan thanked members of the nominating committee – Gary Kern (B&E), Craig Finlay (Library), and Hayley Froysland (History) – for putting together the nominations.
 - Shared the list of nominees and clarified modifications, number of members required, and term lengths.
 - Opened to the floor for further nominations
 - Suggestion of name correction: Mecklenburg (add “c”)
 - Motion to close nomination; seconded; approved by voice vote.
 - Ballot will be sent out for voting.
4. [2 Minutes] Voting Updates – Constitution updates, General Education Motions 1e and 1f – Raman Adaikkalavan
 - Constitution updates were approved; 88.3% voted “yes,” 11.7% voted “no.”
 - General Education motion 1e: Enhanced Student Experience did not pass; 45.5% voted “yes,” 54.5% voted “no.”
 - General Education motion 1f: Information Literacy passed; 67.6% voted “yes,” 32.4% voted “no.”
5. [5 Minutes] Third Lecturer Rank – Kim McInerney
 - Kim McInerney is one of the regional campus representatives for the UFC taskforce on the third lecturer rank and presented an update from the taskforce.
 - In the 2017 university address, President McRobbie suggested that we consider changes to the non-tenure-track ranks to create stronger career paths that recognize the

professionalism of these important and growing segments of the IU instructional community.

- There are nine members on the UFC taskforce; the taskforce will recommend adding a third lecturer rank above the senior lecturer rank to mirror tenure and clinical ranks. Details regarding contracts, pay, and other issues have not been discussed. The taskforce is currently working on coming up with a title for new position.
- Sometime today, IUPUI will send out a Qualtrics survey asking respondents to rank options for titles that have been recommended; every member of the faculty senate will have a chance to vote. The survey is very short and includes a comment box for suggestions of titles that are not currently listed.
- Questions and discussions included the following:
 - Question regarding the timing of this discussion and whether there will be further discussions about details of the third lecturer rank. Answer: Bloomington and IUPUI have already been having this conversation; regional campuses are still catching up. Regional representatives have expressed the need to catch up to discuss content, specifically issues regarding contract and salary. However, these details may be left up to each campus.
 - Question asking if this is a done deal. Answer: We are making a recommendation to UFC. It appears that this is a done deal for Bloomington.
 - Question about whether this push is driven by faculty or administration. Answer: It seems faculty-driven, especially at Bloomington. There is strong support from President McRobbie's administration.
 - Question about whether this is required on all campuses and whether this will work like post-tenure promotion from associate to full. Answer: Yes, but the decision regarding adoption and details will be left to each campus. The title is the main point of discussion right now so that it can be uniform IU-wide.
- Adaikkalavan provided additional context and explained that Bloomington and IUPUI have already had a lot of discussion about this, including discussions about the title. The main hurdle was agreeing on a title; the title of "teaching professor" is supported by IUPUI but not by Bloomington. UFC created a taskforce on this issue to include regionals who have not been having these discussions yet. The survey will ask respondents to rank which title they think is appropriate. The survey will be used by the taskforce to make a recommendation.

6. [15 Minutes] Senate Teaching Committee – Anna Savvopoulou

- Adaikkalavan introduced the Teaching Committee, who worked quickly to draft the Policy Regarding Using Data from Course Questionnaires which they will be sharing today. The context for this policy is that some faculty have expressed concern about how data from the course questionnaires are being used. As the campus transitioned from paper to electronic course evaluations, the electronic course evaluation system had been maintained by Hossein Hakimzadeh. The system will now be handled by the Academic Affairs, and we need to clarify how course evaluation data will be handled.
- Anna Savvopoulou shared the Policy Regarding Using Data from Course Questionnaires drafted by the Senate Teaching Committee. The policy reads as follows:

End-of-semester formal student course questionnaires (or evaluations) serve multiple purposes. They provide timely feedback to faculty members to improve teaching strategies, pedagogy, course content and teaching materials, and they may be used for tenure and promotion decisions as well as applications for teaching related awards and grants. The university personnel who have access to the evaluation data may include faculty, academic supervisors and/or their delegates (in the department, college/school, and campus). A faculty member, at their discretion, may share data with others. The access and storage of evaluation data shall adhere to relevant University Faculty Council policies. Those with access to the evaluation data should adhere to the following policies:

- 1) The evaluation data shall not be made public.
 - 2) Academic supervisors shall only access the standard campus and department questions. Personalized questions added by a faculty member, if any, shall only be viewed by said faculty member. However, the results of added personalized questions may be shared with others at the discretion of said faculty member.
 - 3) Those with access to the data shall only use the data for its intended purpose as described above. Processing the data or otherwise running separate analyses is not permitted.
- Discussions included the following:
 - Concern about whether or not evaluations should be attached to the electronic Faculty Annual Reports. This issue was raised when the senate came up with the shared evaluation questions; perhaps a review of senate minutes will help to clarify whether this issue was resolved.
 - Clarification that this policy focuses on how this information should be shared, whether it should be shared, and for what purpose it should be shared. The committee reviewed policies on other campuses, but there were no equivalent policies.
 - Concern about how this concern applies to PTR processes; it is important to clarify whether faculty must share raw evaluation data or whether a synopsis will suffice.
 - Suggestion to add “reappointment” in the policy language.
 - Question about how “academic supervisors” are defined and who has access to evaluations submitted through the annual report system.
 - Clarification that the committee was charged to draft a policy regarding how data should be used for those who have direct access to the Explorance Blue system, not how data will be used and distributed outside the system.
 - The senate teaching committee has already moved and seconded the approval of this policy. Further discussions:
 - Motion to send this policy back to the Teaching Committee to clarify – in consultation with the PTR and executive committees – important questions regarding PTR processes with an emphasis on which supervisors have access to the data.
 - No further discussion. Motion to send the policy back to the committee seconded, approved by voice vote.

7. [15 Minutes] Senate PTR Committee: PTR Guidelines Template – Peter Bushnell

- Peter Bushnell introduced the PTR guidelines template, which is a part of his Chancellor’s Professor project. The senate PTR committee and Bushnell propose that we adopt this template.
- Why are we doing it: PTR guidelines provide the framework for promotion/tenure decisions. It is important to provide clear expectations, but some guidelines do not make the norms of the discipline clear or are outdated. It is particularly important to ensure that PTR policies are clear and up-to-date, especially in the context of changing institutional policies. Units/schools should review PTR guidelines on a regular basis to stay up to date and ensure that the guidelines cover fundamental topics.
- What does it look like?: The template should list each available promotional rank (associate, full, senior lecturer, etc.), and three topics should be addressed for each rank as follows: 1) Specific guidelines – a statement of what must be achieved for promotion (eg. excellence in one area, satisfactory in others). The guidelines need to be explicit not only for evaluators but also for those seeking promotion. 2) Criteria – this provides standards for evaluating performance as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory (or very good for balanced cases); the more general the criteria, the less clear they are to others. 3) Exemplars – examples that demonstrate specific examples of performance in each of the areas (eg. do electronic publications count towards research?).
- What is the tentative timeline?: The current goal is to have colleges\schools finish revisions by December 2019. By September 2020, units (or departments) finish review/revisions and send it to respective college/school PTR committee and dean; by November 2020, dean will send everything to Senate PTR for verification; by March 2021, Senate PTR will send everything to the EVCAA.
- Discussions
 - Suggestion that Senate PTR should not include multiple people from the same department.
 - Clarification of the difference between policies and templates. A number of departments already list what is included in the template, so there is no need to worry too much about the distinction.
 - Clarification about the terminology of “very good.” This is just for balanced cases, and in that context we don’t use “excellent” but “very good.” At other campuses they use “highly satisfactory.”
 - Adaikkalavan requested that faculty review the PTR guidelines template and notify him or the senate PTR committee of any concerns.
 - Question about what does or does not count for promotion (eg. service); this is up to the individual unit.
- Bushnell requested that it be noted in the minutes that he flashed the academic senate with a “sharks makes me happy, you not so much” t-shirt.

8. [30 Minutes] Discussion and Send to Vote: General Education Motions 2a and 2d – Lyle Zynda

- Senate Vice President, Vincci Kwong, will moderate the discussion.
- Lyle Zynda explained that the salmon-colored handout is a summary of the requirements we have approved so far as well as the categories and courses we are considering today. The blue handout summarizes the range of input the taskforce has received for each of the categories.

- Cathy Borshuk reminded faculty that for HLC purposes, we need general education assessment data for a full year by Fall 2020. To make this happen, we need the general education reform process to be completed by the end of this semester. Today the taskforce is presenting the final categories. The faculty own the curriculum and so everyone needs to participate in this democratic process.
- Jim McLister will introduce today's motions that focus on what categories to include in the remainder of our General Education curriculum. The general education co-directors have been busy establishing learning outcomes with faculty for the categories we have already been approved. Based on the outcome of the votes for these categories, there will be a motion next month to weigh various models that will outline how to include those categories. Today's motion focuses on the essential characteristics of each category.
- McLister presented motions 2a-d, that ask for a yes/no vote for each category. This method allows everyone to vote for or against each motion and does not constrain decisions based on random combinations of courses. When voting, people can also keep in mind how many credit hours they want the general education to be. This method of voting allows for the most democratic decision-making process. The motions read as follows:

*The following are four motions for retaining or adding categories to the components already approved for General Education in recent Senate votes. (**)*

MOTION 2a

Computer literacy (or a revised version of it, e.g., "technology and its impacts") shall be retained as a category in campus-wide Gen Ed, and will be included in all subsequent models for the final revised Gen Ed curriculum. YES or NO

MOTION 2b

Visual literacy shall be retained as a category in campus-wide Gen Ed, and will be included in all subsequent models for the final revised Gen Ed curriculum. YES or NO

MOTION 2c

Health & wellness shall be retained as a category in campus-wide Gen Ed, and will be included in all subsequent models for the final revised Gen Ed curriculum. YES or NO

MOTION 2d

Financial literacy shall be added as a category in campus-wide Gen Ed, to be limited to 1-credit, and will be included in all subsequent models for the final revised Gen Ed curriculum. YES or NO

*(**)GENERAL NOTES:*

- The motions above are only about retaining these categories in Gen Ed, or, in the case of financial literacy, adding to it; hence:*
- Each of them, if approved as categories, will be followed by a later Senate vote finalizing what their general characteristics should be (e.g., whether computer literacy will be*

updated to "technology and its impacts," with new essential characteristics, as has been proposed);

- (c) Several models for combining the categories that are approved in Motions 2a-d with those already approved in Motions 1a-f will be presented for the Senate to consider in March, each with a different total credit hour count for Gen Ed;*
- (d) These models will include specific ways of combining the Gen Ed categories to achieve various reductions in the overall credit hours required for Gen Ed;*
- (e) Unless Motions 2a-c all fail, an exemptions policy for the Common Core will also be put forward for faculty to consider at the March Senate meeting.*

- Questions and discussions included the following:
 - Clarification about the number of credit hours for Health and Wellness; this is a vote on including the category and the number of credit hours will be decided later.
 - Clarification that we are voting today to decide whether the category will be retained; they could be required or optional, which is something we will need to decide later.
 - Clarification that this vote will help determine what everyone agrees does not need to be part of our general education.
 - Clarification about how the future motion regarding options and exemptions will work. We have already voted for a total of 30 credits assuming that each course is 3-credits; however, only a total of 24 credit hours are specified in the motions approved so far.
 - Request to hear from faculty members who teach in these categories:
 - Visual literacy –We live in a visual culture and students need to be able to read visual images when they look at media; there are different modalities and disciplines that address this way of understanding the world. We complain that the website is unnavigable, which is because of the lack of visual literacy. Our students are GenZ and they need to be able to critically analyze visual messages.
 - Computer Literacy – Technology impacts more than computer literacy; computers are important for all of us and for all of our students. We cannot live without technology; activities ranging from sending secure email to protecting information are all important. Computer literacies is part of the state-wide general education core.
 - Health and Wellness – People in the Midwest do not lead particularly healthy lives and should be informed about the good choices they can make.
 - Financial Literacy – Financial literacy received strong support from students in open forums.
 - Request to add definitions of the categories; the taskforce can provide definitions and the categories will be discussed again at the March meeting.
 - Concern about what courses will be included for each category and clarification about how learning outcomes will be developed for each approved category with the possibility of redefining courses.
 - A reminder that all of the data is in the general education Box folder.
 - Question about whether any of these categories could be included as a tagged course.

- Motion to send motions 2a-d to a ballot, seconded.
- Motion to close discussion, seconded, approved by voice vote.
- A ballot will be sent out to submit the motion to a vote.

9. [10 Minutes] President's remarks

- Adaikkalavan explained that he recused himself from the general education discussion to avoid conflict of interest while computer literacy is under consideration. He will also recuse himself from administering the ballot. We did this for the last ballot when Vice President Vincci Kwong (Library) recused herself from administering the ballot containing information literacy.
- Congratulations to our colleagues!
 - Shahir Rizk (Chemistry and Biochemistry) won the prestigious Cottrell Scholar Award. This is the first time this award went to an IU faculty outside of Bloomington; it comes with a \$100,000 award.
 - April Lindinsky (WGS) has been named IU Bicentennial Professor
 - IUSB Legacy Award goes to Jay VanderVeen (Anthropology)
 - Excellence in Online Teaching Award goes to Haiyan Yin (B&E)
 - Teaching with Technology Award goes to Maryann Oake (Health Sciences)
- Please send committee minutes and reports; we will upload them to the Box folder.
- Susan Thomas has been appointed to be the IUSB rep for the UFC Budget committee.
- UFC Policy Review Committee will review policies and best practices across IU; Steven Gerencser will be one of two faculty members representing regional campuses.
- The Northside Hall Taskforce is up and running; there is a link where people can find all the members and other information.
- For the chancellor search, please be sure to submit feedback via the survey which closes on February 19. The links are provided in the chancellor search webpage.
 - Traditionally, chancellors at IU/IUSB have held tenured positions. One of the candidates is not seeking a tenured faculty appointment, so please be aware of this.
- IU Parking Restructuring – We have been working with the Faculty Welfare Committee on this. IU is reconfiguring how salary division happens, which could mean an increase in parking fees. IUSB faculty are already paying more for parking than other campuses. The Faculty Welfare Committee has a spreadsheet containing this information and they are already working on it.
- Executive Committee of UFC:
 - IU has submitted an official response to the Title IX Proposal.
 - A taskforce has been formed to look into a consensual relationships policy based on the national trend among higher education institutions. Please let Adaikkalavan know if you are interested in joining this taskforce.
 - A taskforce to look into student evaluations is being formed. We need 2 nominations from our campus; the goal is to have a mix of faculty from traditional, online, and clinical teaching – contact the Teaching Committee or Adaikkalavan if you are interested.
 - There have been preliminary discussions on revisiting intellectual property rights, especially for online course materials.

10. [5 Minutes] Announcements and motion to adjourn

- Announcements made:
 - SMART Summer Fellowship proposals are due March 22
- Motion to adjourn; seconded; approved by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 2:57pm