

Faculty Organization Executive Committee Meeting
September 6, 2019
Hawthorn Hall 469
12-2 pm
Minutes

In Attendance: Susan Zinner (President), Kris Huysken (Vice President), Bill Dorin (COAS), Axel Schulze-Halberg (COAS), Surekha Rao (SOBE), Vesna Balac (CHHS), Marshelia Harris (CHHS), Alicia Wright (SOA), Sharon Pratt (SOE), Scott Hudnall (Library), Mark Baer (At Large), Crystal Shannon (At Large), Andrea Griffin (UFC), David Parnell (Secretary)

1. Called to order at 12:07pm.
2. Approval of minutes: April 5, 2019
 - a. Approved without amendment.
3. Susan Zinner, President
 - a. Welcome to new members of the committee: Axel, Alicia, and Vesna. Thanks to Bill Allegrezza and Dorinda Sattler for their service on the committee – they have now cycled off.
 - b. Chancellor Lowe and Executive Vice Chancellor Roman-Lagunas are in IU Kokomo for a meeting and will not be able to attend today.
 - c. Third tier of lecturer: At the UFC meeting in April, a third tier for lecturer was created and the name “Teaching Professor” was selected, despite none of the regional campuses (save Kokomo) voting for it. Susan will ask the chair of Academic Affairs committee to create requirements for this going up for this position. Question: Is each campus going to develop its own standards for this position? Answer: As far as I know, yes. Faculty Comment: The FACET steering committee has created a document clarifying what the position of “Teaching Professor” could mean and I can distribute it. Question: We have standards for other positions in the university handbook, so will the university provide suggested standards for this position? Answer: I think the guidelines will be written at the campus level only. Comment: It is worth finding out whether the university will create a document before we make our own.
 - d. Committee Service: Susan and Kris are working on the Faculty Organization committee assignments and hope they will be ready soon. Between 20% and 50% of the full-time faculty responded to Kris’ request to select committees. Various comments expressed dismay that this number was not higher.
 - e. Pending Issues before the Academic Affairs Committee: Academic Forgiveness Policy Name Change, Probation and Dismissal Policy, Class Audit Policy, Amendment of Academic Dishonesty Policy, Undergraduate/Graduate Level Sections Policy (discussed at the April 2019 Executive Committee meeting).

- f. Administrators as Ex-Officio members of Committees: Can Cynthia and Dorothy Frink sit on the Admissions Committee this year? Several committee members agreed that this would be reasonable.
- g. Curriculum changes: Currently some changes made to degrees happen at the department and school level. The EVCAA has suggested that the Survey and Curriculum Committee take on a more active role in curricular decisions that currently stop at the unit level this year. Faculty Comment: In SOBE, we also send our changes to the campus-wide curriculum committee. So it is currently inconsistent. Susan says that it would be helpful to have a consistent program of approving all changes at both school and campus-wide curriculum committee levels. Cynthia O'Dell suggested this. Faculty Question: Why is this proposal being made? Is it meant to solve a particular problem? Answer: I think it is just to provide consistency. Faculty Comment: Why have a campus-wide curriculum committee if it does not do this? Faculty Comment: I believe all new courses have to go through school and campus committees and then to remonstrance at other campuses. Faculty Comment: Maybe the Survey and Curriculum Committee could write up some procedures for this. Faculty Question: If Communication wanted to rearrange the areas of emphasis in the major, would it have to get that approved through the curriculum committees? Answer: Yes, that would have to go through campus-wide curriculum committee. Faculty Comment: Anything in the bulletin has to go through this approval process.
- h. The UFC Trustees' Teaching Award Policy was amended at the April UFC meeting. 6% of the tenure-track faculty may receive a Trustees Teaching Award, and 6% of the non tenure-track faculty may receive it. Faculty Question: Is this a guideline or a requirement that this many awards must be given? Answer: There are criteria, so I cannot imagine they expect us to give awards to people that do not meet the criteria. Faculty Comment: it seems like the 6% is the maximum amount of awards that can be given, not a minimum. Susan: I think they want to have an equal number of awards given to each group so that it will show the campus values each group of faculty equally. Faculty Comment: I think this is a problem because it shows that the school believes that the total number of tenure-track faculty will be declining and non tenure-track faculty will increase. Faculty Comment: I am fine with having a target number of awards to give out, and having criteria for awards, but the problem seems to be the idea that the number of awards should end up equal at the end of the process. Faculty Comment: Well, that is one interpretation of the guideline and we do not have to follow it. Faculty Question: Should we complain about this? Faculty Comment: It is an IU policy, so it is what it is. Faculty Comment: I would like to see the actual policy so we know the exact way it is worded and we can figure out how it will affect us from there. Faculty Comment: I am fine with saying we will strive to award 6% of eligible faculty each year, but sometimes that will not happen. Faculty Question: Is there a rule on going up for Trustees? Answer: Yes, you can only go up twice in a rank. Faculty Comment: These two policies seem to be opposed to one another, must award 6% of eligible faculty, but faculty only eligible twice a rank. Faculty Comment: The study of going up for excellence in teaching is ongoing this year.

- i. Excellence in teaching: Susan and Chris Young have been meeting with several others (including Kris Huysken, Jennifer Greenberg, Micah Pollak, Mark Thomas and Sharon Pratt) on a committee looking at the definition of excellence in teaching for promotion and tenure on our campus. Micah has created a spreadsheet to help the committee compare how each department or school defines excellence in teaching. The committee will be creating a document that looks at current standards and proposes some suggested criteria for the whole campus. The report is due to John Applegate by October 31st.
 - j. Deans Review Committee: The Deans Review Committees are working on the surveys for their reviews. The CHHS Deans Review survey already went out this week, and the COAS Deans Review survey will go out on Monday.
 - k. Admissions: At an online UFC meeting earlier this week there was a discussion about going to a test-optional admissions policy. The rationale behind this proposal is to increase diversity – Ball State and Indiana State already make these tests optional. There is some question about scholarships because some of them look at test scores as part of their standards. There is a desire for the Trustees to vote on this in December, so the issue will come up for a UFC vote in November. The proposal is simply to change the IU policy from “students must take” a test to “students may take” a test. This will allow the no-test policy to be optional on each campus/school. Faculty Question: Would this get us more students? Answer: Southeast has been doing this for several years and their enrollment has gone up but it is not clear if there is a causal link between the policy and increased enrollment. Faculty Comment: I thought a point of emphasis was actually going to be raising admissions standards. Faculty Comment: A test-optional admissions policy is not necessarily contradicting such a focus. Faculty Comment: I think there is research on high school GPA being more predictive of college success than test scores. Faculty Question: Who was chair of Admissions last year? Answer: Micah Pollak.
 - l. Calendar Issues: October Executive Committee will be Wednesday October 9, 9-11am. January Executive Committee cannot be on first or second Friday, so we will need to find a new date for that month. This will be announced later.
4. Online Teaching Policy Proposal (Monica Solinas-Saunders and Chris Young) – See Attachment #1
- a. In Fall 2017, Vicki charged an ad hoc Online Committee with thinking about online education and how to determine quality in online teaching. This was in response to rumors that IU administration was thinking about creating a university-wide quality assurance program for online classes. This proposal is created by faculty for faculty.
 - b. The policy proposal suggests that everyone who teaches online should either have some experience teaching online or some training credential to teach online. In addition, it encourages those teaching online to go through peer mentoring to improve their courses.
 - c. Faculty Question: How does the peer mentoring work? Answer: It is a campus-wide program in which faculty can request review of their courses through CISTL

by peer mentors who have been trained by Quality Matters. It would really be up to department chairs and deans to encourage their faculty to sign up for the program and get reviewed. Faculty Question: How long would the mentoring last? Answer: It would depend on the participants; it could be a one off review, or a lasting partnership. This is all a new idea so it is not clear how each mentorship would work in practice yet. Faculty Question: How would instructors get training on online teaching? Answer: Through an online teaching course by CISTL. Faculty Question: How do we bring adjuncts into training for online courses? Most of our adjuncts come in during the evening. Answer: The online training course takes place online, so they would not have to be here. The QM training is a daylong thing, so that is more difficult and may be something that we will have to address.

- d. Monica: This policy would be for our campus and regulates us, but it does not apply to the university-wide IU online office. We need to address teaching courses on IU online, because currently instructors invited to teach on IU online find that their courses are “owned” by IU online course designers after the instructor designs them. I would ask this body and President Zinner to look into this. Faculty Question: How is it that you do not own the content that you are creating? Answer: Because you are required to agree to this when you create a class for IU online. They then own the course and can hire other instructors to teach the course you have created. Faculty Question: What could stop some other instructor from going up for promotion based on your own course? Faculty Comment: I think they are more interested in having adjuncts teach the courses. Faculty Comment: Either way, IU owns the material and the instructor who creates it does not have to be credited. Faculty Comment: A lot of pressure coming from downstate to standardize experiences. Faculty Comment: This is a place for our upper administration to fight for us and for our independence. Faculty Comment: Perhaps we could push for a way to indicate on the course itself who was the course lead so that they get credit even when someone else is teaching the course. Faculty Comment: I think we should ask this to be done, and include it in our own policy, and bring it up at Faculty Organization. Monica: IU online course designers can control design of a course and stay in the course while it is being taught watching everything. This is unacceptable and faculty should be aware of it. Faculty Comment: I am a representative to the IU Online Committee, and they are very sensitive to federal requirements about interaction, and that is why the designers do this. Faculty Comment: There is a question of respect in visitations. Faculty Comment: This is about federal guidelines. Faculty Comment: This is about academic freedom. Faculty Comment: Course designers are not peers so they cannot peer review. Faculty Comment: This is really an issue with IU online. Susan will talk to Vicki and ask her to bring this up at the meeting of Vice Chancellors from all campuses in two weeks. Faculty Comment: Faculty should not feel as if someone is sitting in their class and spying on them.
- e. Faculty Question: Where are the federal guidelines? Answer: They are linked in the online education proposal: <https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?rgn=div8&node=34:3.1.3.1.1.1.23.2>. Faculty Comment: Perhaps there should

- be a discussion with the IU online designers about the expectations for working with faculty and how faculty expect to be treated in their classes.
- f. Faculty Question: How much of this proposed policy would be mandatory?
 Answer: It is up to us to police the quality of our online classes. This would be presented to deans and department chairs and would be up to them to put these into effect. I think rules would trend in this direction over time. Faculty Comment: I like that the policy is set up in terms of what faculty must and should do. Faculty Question: So someone hired cannot teach online until they take the CISTL online training course? Answer: Common sense would have to be used and potential exceptions could be made to allow training concurrently with teaching. Faculty Comment: If we want to improve all online course offerings, then the question of last-minute hires and how they teach is of considerable importance. If we want to solve the problem of overall quality, we will have to accept that some things will need to be mandatory. This might result in some loss of academic freedom. Faculty Comment: It is also about not getting sued for having courses that fail to meet federal guidelines. Chris: By writing this ourselves, we set our own expectations. Faculty Question: How many of our courses at IUN are taught by adjuncts? Nobody is sure. Faculty Comment: Perhaps departments and schools need to think about their onboarding process for new adjuncts.
- g. Faculty Question: Where does this policy go next? Susan: It needs to be voted on by Executive Committee and then it goes before Faculty Organization for a vote to determine if it becomes a faculty policy. It could go on the Faculty Organization agenda for September 20. Faculty Comment: Perhaps it should be called recommendations rather than policy. Faculty Comment: Calling it a recommendation would allow the possibility of it being ignored and possibly having classes not meet federal guidelines. Faculty Comment: Perhaps we should introduce it at Faculty Organization on the 20th but not have a vote until October to give schools time to think about it. Faculty Question: Was the charge for this committee to create best practices or a policy? Chris: I believe that it was a charge to begin to establish a policy, but I am not sure I remember Vicki's exact words.
- h. Susan: Do we want to vote on this before it goes to Faculty Organization? Faculty Comment: First we have to think about whether this is a policy or a best practices recommendation. Faculty Comment: Vicki's original charge asked the ad hoc committee to think about standards, so maybe it should not be a policy. Faculty Comment: If we change it from being a policy, we have to send it back to the ad hoc committee so they can change the title. Faculty Comment: I don't want to slow this down, but technically Academic Affairs Committee should review this because an ad hoc committee created it. Faculty Comment: Can we keep it on our agenda for October so we can discuss it again? Faculty Comment: I think it would be good to present it to Academic Affairs as well, because I would be ticked if I was chair of that committee and this did not come to me. Then we could eventually present it to Faculty Org seconded by both Academic Affairs and Executive Committee. Susan: Okay, we will table this issue until the October Executive Committee meeting and will not put it on Faculty Org agenda this month.

5. Agenda items for September 20, 2019 Faculty Org meeting

- a. Aneesah Ali will talk about Equity Advisor training
- b. New library request form (Nico Casas)
- c. Introduction of Grammarly (Ranjan Kini)
- d. IUPUI Symposium (Surekha)
- e. Update on Chancellor's Search – schedule is set with dates for meetings with campus stakeholders and interviews. The job advertisement has been posted.

6. New Business

- a. Arts & Sciences classrooms: There was a flurry of activity in the first week of the semester and classes were moved into and around the Arts & Sciences building. Vicki told Susan this was because Ivy Tech contacted her and asked to use some of the classrooms in the building. She moved classes into these classrooms to “defend territory.” Faculty Question: Did Ivy Tech ask to rent these classrooms? It seems like we should not have to defend our own classrooms. What is in the agreement between Ivy Tech and IU Northwest? Faculty Comment: We have lost this transition to Ivy Tech. They had better signage and a reception desk. Faculty Comment: The agreement between us and Ivy Tech can be summed up in terms of “be good neighbors.” Susan: What do we want to ask Vicki to do? Talk about this at Faculty Organization? Faculty Comment: The reason she comes to Executive Committee is to avoid having to talk about this in front of Faculty Organization. Susan: Okay, should we have her come to Executive Committee in October to talk about this? Faculty Comment: Yes.
- b. The faculty passed around a picture on the Arts & Sciences webpage that shows a sign that says “College of Arts and Sciences, Ivy Tech Community College.” There was general dismay about this. Faculty Comment: It's not Ivy Tech's fault we lost, it's ours. Faculty Comment: Did we lose? We do not know what is in the agreement with Ivy Tech because it was never presented to us. Why were we not allowed to read it? Faculty Comment: Last April we said we wanted to see more of the school's budget, so how can we get access to these numbers? Faculty Comment: It would be good to see more numbers and to know how cases are made for adding or replacing faculty lines. Faculty Question: What is a workable model in which we can get more access? Faculty Comment: There is not a lot of transparency and we would like to know more about the building agreement, the budget, and our construction projects.
- c. One Book Event (Crystal): Thursday October 17, 1-3pm in Bergland Auditorium. There is also a Spotify Playlist for the One Book, One Campus focus: tiny.cc/OneBookPlaylist. This will be announced to campus and will play on the IQ wall. Feel free to share this information. The Chancellor purchased 1,000 copies of the book so all students in ENG W130 and W131 will get a copy. For the next book, the committee will attempt to get an NEA grant for the activities, but this will require a book from a very specific list, which is being examined right now.

- d. Beyond Boundaries (Surekha): A large symposium will take place on April 3-4 in Indianapolis. 1,800 students and faculty across 15 different statewide societies are expected to participate. Surekha will present on this at the Faculty Org meeting.
7. Old Business
- a. None was presented.
8. Adjourned at 2:27pm.

Attachment 1:
Online Teaching Policy Proposal

See the following pages.

Creating an IU Northwest Online Education Policy

Online Education Guidelines Rationale

Creating a clear standard for expectations in online education allows IU Northwest to maintain our high standards in academic quality, inspire excellence in teaching, and achieve student learning outcomes on par with our traditional face-to-face courses. Furthermore, the institution seeks to continue with the integration of best practices by improving on technologies and online course development as appropriate. This document describes the recommended policies and operating procedures for the development, delivery, and evaluation of 100% online courses at IU Northwest. This policy applies to the faculty of all ranks including tenured/tenure-track, lecturer, clinical, and adjunct. In the event an online course is offered through Indiana [University Online Class Connect \(IUOCC\)](#), or is a part of an [online collaborative program](#), those policies override this document.

Definition of Online Education

[IU Online](#) defines online education as a subset of distance education that uses Internet technologies to deliver instruction to students who are physically separated from the instructor and to support [regular and substantive interaction](#). In online education, instructional content is intentionally designed and delivered asynchronously on the Internet to replace classroom instruction time (contact hours) between the student and instructor.

Faculty Qualifications for Online Education

As with traditional courses, instructors of online education courses will meet the expectations regarding the qualifications of faculty outlined in the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) [guidelines](#). Faculty requesting to teach online courses must show competence in online instruction through prior training in teaching online or by completing the [Online Teaching Course offered by the Center for Innovation and Scholarship in Teaching and Learning \(CISTL\)](#). The general standards regarding faculty conduct, office hours, and faculty responsibilities also apply in the online education setting. Deans and/or Chairs should consider evidence of prior online teaching and/or online training prior to scheduling teaching assignments. Deans and/or Chairs, in consultation with each faculty member, will determine the precise terms and conditions of every academic appointment and teaching load. It is highly recommended that faculty complete [IU's Teaching Online Series](#) before teaching online. It is recommended that new and adjunct faculty share with their deans (or chairs or program directors when appropriate) any previous online training and experience. If prior training exists, new faculty are encouraged to complete [IU's Teaching Online Series](#) before assigned courses begin and the Online Certification Course within the first semester at IU Northwest.

Before teaching online, faculty must/should:

- Be trained in IU Northwest's adopted Learning Management System (i.e. Canvas)
- Complete the Online Teaching Course (OTC) offered by IU Northwest's Center for Innovation and Scholarship in Teaching and Learning or equivalent (within the first semester of teaching online)
- Complete Quality Matters (QM)--Applying the Standards at IU course within three years of first teaching online. This course requires a full day to complete.
- Renew their OTC and QM training every three years.
- Have their course reviewed by an IU Northwest Peer Mentor (arranged through CISTL in partnership with both the faculty member and the peer mentor). Peer Mentors are certified by Quality Matters after completing a rigorous three-week course.
- Discuss with their Dean and/or Chair other relevant online training while at Indiana University (e.g. working closely with designers at eDS as part of a collaborative degree program).

In addition, it is highly recommended that the faculty:

- Complete [CISTL's Online Course Development Grant program](#)
- Remain current with emerging methods and new technological avenues that may promote greater student success in online education.
- Meet with the campus's Instructional Design Specialist

It is expected that all new faculty will take the Online Teaching Course offered by CISTL before or soon after the start of their first semester as they were informed in their appointment letter from their Dean.

Adjunct faculty are also required to take the Online Teaching Course offered by CISTL and will be paid a stipend of \$250.00 upon completion.

Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Online Courses

It is recommended that faculty members not yet promoted or tenured plan to have [a formative review done of their teaching](#). Observations of online courses and face-to-face courses should be included in the promotion and tenure dossier. It is recommended that academic units incorporate these recommendations in their definition of excellence for teaching in the [annual report](#) for all faculty ranks.

Deans and Chairs retain the right to "visit" or enter an instructor's online course, but the faculty member must be first notified of such a visit. Extraordinary cases in which an egregious lack of regular and substantive interaction is demonstrated may provide an exception to this rule.

Faculty Peer Mentoring

In consultation with CISTL, faculty members will play an important role in determining who will serve as their Peer Mentor for online teaching. Peer Mentors come from a variety of academic ranks and units. To become a Peer Mentor, faculty must be recommended to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by the deans of each academic unit and then become certified reviewers by completing an intensive three-week training course offered by Quality Matters.

Quality Assurance of Course Design

IU Northwest is committed to adhering to the highest possible standards in online education. Online education courses should be subject to regular ongoing assessment by the academic unit. If a course is offered at the campus level both online and face-to-face, learning outcomes must be identical. Online courses must adhere to the rules of conduct as outlined in the [Code of Academic Ethics](#), which includes clear course goals and liberal contact hours. Online courses should parallel instructional time commitments required for face-to-face courses.

In accordance with the [Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education Programs](#) developed by the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (C-RAC), IU Northwest faculty engaged in online teaching should ensure curricula for online learning are “coherent, cohesive, and comparable in academic rigor to programs offered in traditional instructional formats.” More specifically:

- The curricular goals and course objectives show that the faculty member has knowledge of the best uses of online learning in different disciplines and settings.
- The curriculum is coherent in its content and sequencing of courses.

The IU Northwest center for teaching and learning, CISTL, provides training regarding course design and implementation. Training is provided online, in onsite workshops, and through individual consultations in a format that prepares faculty to develop courses that are in accordance with [Quality Matters Rubric](#), IU's chosen quality assurance process for online and blended courses.

Regular and Substantive Interaction

Faculty members engaged in online education courses must adhere to the Federal Interaction Standards for regular and substantive faculty-to-student interaction. Indiana University has developed a policy for regular and substantive interaction based on the [Federal Interaction Guidelines](#) (see also the following two sources: [source](#) and [source](#)).

This policy requires regular (repeated) and substantive instructor-initiated interactions that are related to the academic subject matter. This interaction must be more than giving a numerical grade or providing feedback on student work. In addition, grading of student submissions cannot be the sole form of instructor interaction in the course.

The following examples are provided as a suggestion of ways a course and instructor could meet the interaction standard. The course should include evidence of multiple methods and multiple instances.

Course Examples

- Planned, weekly announcements or other communication that directly address student contributions to the course, including challenges and successes. Students should have a channel to respond to announcements.
- Create a syllabus that meets or exceeds accessibility standards.
- A general open discussion thread is available for students to post questions on muddy points. The instructor encourages learners to participate and answer their peers' queries.
- If grading rubrics are used, the rubrics should include clear, thorough descriptions for each criterion reference point.
- Respond to all students in the course's welcoming introductions.
- In a discussion thread, the instructor responds with formative coaching to at least 25% of student posts.
- The instructor allows for iterative submissions (ie. rough drafts) and provides feedback on the submissions.
- The instructor provides opportunities for students to engage in reflection on aspects of their learning and provides responses to such reflections.
- The instructor provides a mechanism for students to provide feedback on the course experience regularly and articulates a plan to respond to this student communication.
- Instructor requires students to meet during office hours (virtual or otherwise, at least once during the semester).
- A structure is in place to facilitate ongoing conversations around assignment feedback, and learners are encouraged to reflect on and respond to this feedback.
- The course includes synchronous group critique sessions via video conference or other meeting technology. Should an instructor pursue this option, it is recommended that the synchronous meeting be recorded so others may watch at another time.

To meet this standard a course may include:

- course policies or syllabus statements around interaction plans;
- assignments that include planned interaction in their design.