

Minutes for Academic Senate Meeting  
April 19, 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, Allison, Ananth, Bakerson, Bennion, Bloom, Blouin, Borshuk, Bushnell, Chaney, Y. Cheng, Clark, N. Colborn, Collins, H. Davis, Deranek, Dielman, Ervick, J. Feighery, W. Feighery, Fong-Morgan, Froysland, Ganoë, Gerencser, Gretencord, Haithcox, Hakimzadeh, He, Heck, Holland, Hopkins, Jang, Kahan, Karakatsanis, Kelley, B. Kern, G. Kern, Kolbe, Kwong, LaLime, Lambert, Langton, Levine, Lidinsky, Lucal, Luppès, Lynker, Marr, Martinez, McGuire, McInerney, Meisami, Merhi, Merken, K. Miller, Mociulski, Moore, Je. Muñiz, Jo. Muñiz, Nashel, Oake, Pant, Park, Pathak, Popescu, Quimby, Resler, Roth, Rusnock, Savvopoulou, Schimmrigk, Schmitz, Schnabel, Schult, Scott, Sernau, Shlapentokh, Shockey, Shrader, J. Smith, K. Smith, Sofhauser, Spinda, Surma, Takanashi, Tetzlaff, Thomas, Thompson, Tourtillotte, VanderVeen, Vrajitoru, Wells, Willig, Zhang, Zwicker, Zynda

1. Call to order at 1:30pm
2. [3 Minutes] Approval of March 2019 Senate Meeting Minutes
  - No corrections or modifications from the floor; minutes stand approved.
3. [10 Minutes] Constitution Updates – Steven Gerencser
  - Steven Gerencser opened the discussion regarding the three items for constitutional updates that were introduced in March, including updates to section five of the Constitution, updates to the Academic Personnel Committee, and the creation of a Policy Committee.
  - Gerencser provided further explanation of the Policy Committee, since it is a new committee. This new committee will work primarily as an advisory committee to the Executive Committee and other senate committees to ensure that the Academic Constitution, Handbook, and policies are regularly updated to reflect ongoing changes.
  - One significant change made since it was originally introduced is the inclusion of “an ex officio representative appointed by the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.” It has been important for the work of the ad-hoc constitution committee to have a representative from Academic Affairs. Also, a missing word has been inserted to read “work with the senate president.”
  - If voted on and approved, this policy will come into effect on July 1 when the full constitution will be updated to reflect all changes that were voted on and approved this academic year.
  - Discussion included the following:
    - Concern about the language restricting participation in the Academic Personnel Committee to faculty with 50% administrative appointment or less, since this would exclude the participation of those who hold director positions.
  - Motion to close discussion; seconded; approved by voice vote; the motion will be submitted to a vote through electronic ballot.

- Adaikkalavan thanked Gerencser, Ken Smith, and Doug McMillen for serving on the ad-hoc constitution update committee.
4. [2 Minutes] Voting Updates – General Education Motion 2e – Vincci Kwong
    - There were 193 votes. 55.96% voted for the 33 credit-hour option; 44.04% voted for the 36 credit-hour option. The 33 credit-hour option passed.
  5. [3 Minutes] Distinguished Research Award – AVCAA Michelle Bakerson
    - AVCAA Bakerson presented the Distinguished Research Award to Jorge Muñiz from the Music Department. Muñiz has established international reputation as a composer and has produced more than 130 compositions many of which have been performed by various prestigious orchestras across the globe. Muñiz’s notable works include the wedding march for a Spanish royal wedding commissioned in 2003 as well as Fuenteovejuna, an opera commissioned by Opera de Oviedo that premiered September 2008. Muñiz focuses on producing change in the world through composition.
  6. [15 Minutes] General Education Motion 2f – Lyle Zynda
    - Jennifer Muñiz explained that we are close to concluding the general education reform process that we have been working on for the past 3 years. The final item to discuss is the possibility of an exemption policy.
    - Cathy Borshuk explained that the motion addresses a request by some senate members to create an automatic exemption policy. It addresses common core courses specifically and provides the possibility of exempting students from a certain category if they have 15 credit hours or more from specified departments that represent that category. With the latest vote to limit General Education credits to 33 credit hours, there may be less pressure on high-credit-hour programs, so the exemptions may or may not be a pressing issue.
    - Borshuk opened the floor for discussion about whether or not we should proceed with the motion. Discussions included the following:
      - Clarification that there is currently no motion on the floor.
      - Concern that the list does not include every major offer on campus.
      - Clarification that students can only be exempted from one common core category; they cannot be exempted from other categories even if they have more than 15 credit hours in that area. In addition, the exemption policy will not impact the 300-level common core requirement.
      - Argument against moving forward with the policy, since disciplinary content is different from the interdisciplinary inquiry that takes place in common core courses.
      - Clarification regarding the terms “discipline” and “areas.”
      - Support of argument against moving forward with the policy, since it will create a problem with state-wide transfer core that requires general education courses from all of these areas.
      - Clarification that students can opt out of the policy and take more common core as electives.
      - Support of argument against moving forward with the policy, since common core learning outcomes includes not just interdisciplinarity but also consideration of ethics, which is not necessarily covered by disciplines.

- Clarification that the goal of the exemption policy was to ensure that we have a truly shared general education curriculum, which would not be the case if we allowed individual exemptions for different majors.
- Further opposition on the grounds of protecting learning outcomes, concern about the role of the 300-level course, compliance with state-wide transfer core, as well as curricular complexity and advising challenges.
- Possibility that benefits may include more enrollment in major courses.
- Further clarifications regarding the number of credit hours required, number of allowed exemptions, possibility of individual exemptions, and continued role of the senate general education committee.
- Adaikkalavan asked all General Education Taskforce members to stand and be acknowledged.

7. [8 Minutes] Third Lecturer Rank – Raman Adaikkalavan and Kim McInerney

- Adaikkalavan explained that there will be a vote at UFC next week regarding the third lecturer rank and provided a brief summary of the survey results from the UFC taskforce that he had shared previously at the March academic senate meeting. Adaikkalavan and Elaine Roth will be at UFC to vote. The question will be whether or not we should have a third rank and whether we should have the title “teaching professor vs. senior lecturer with distinction.” The goal of this discussion is to provide campus input for the UFC representative.
- Discussion and comments included the following:
  - Problem of symmetry (use of “lecturer” for the first two ranks as opposed to “professor” for the third rank); there was discussion in the UFC taskforce about creating “teaching professor” ranks that mirror the current tenure ranks of assistant, associate, and full. There will be no further discussion of this issue until after the title for the third lecturer rank has been determined.
  - Concern that the title of professor seems to indicate the inclusion of research in the position responsibilities; there are lecturers who hold Ph.D.s and continue to do research.
  - Clarification about how to read the survey; “teaching professor” is the most controversial option, while “senior lecturer with distinction” is less controversial and more generally favored.
  - Question about whether this applies to senior clinical lecturer; this is not clear right now, but Adaikkalavan and Roth will raise this question at UFC.
  - Concern that the title “teaching professor” gives the impression to students and community members that “professors” do not teach.
  - Question about preference on the part of lecturers; lecturers want a third rank and the title does not matter as much, especially for the regionals. Only 87 faculty members from our campus responded to the survey, so we have a very small sample size of responses from this campus.
  - Question about whether or not titles are related to degrees.
  - Question about trends outside of IU; “teaching professor” is widely used nationally, which is why it was listed as one of the choices in the survey.
  - Suggestion to consider a system such as that used by Rice University, where where lecturers can get on a teaching professor track.

- Further request to hear from lecturers; clunky title might be an issue, but it is more important to have a third rank.
- Please email Adaikkalavan or Roth with further input.

## 8. Senate Committees

- [8 Minutes] Curriculum Committee: New Policy regarding Interim Approvals – David Blouin
  - Adaikkalavan provided context, explaining that some tasks have to happen during the summer such as curricular approvals. This is an issue because faculty are not around during the summer, which means faculty governance procedures are sometimes bypassed administratively during the summer.
  - Blouin introduced a proposal for a new policy regarding interim approvals from the senate curriculum committee and provided background for the proposal which is submitted for approval by the senate. A few years ago, the senate curriculum committee noticed that some proposals, such as proposals for new courses and course changes, had already gained interim approvals. The committee no longer has a backlog and yet proposals are still coming through with interim approvals; the committee learned that when approval is needed in a hurry, the person initiating the proposal can call downstate and get interim approvals.
  - In response, the Curriculum Committee proposes a new policy, which will route all interim approvals through the senate curriculum committee. The policy recognizes that interim approvals are sometimes necessary but clarifies the need for formal approval by the senate curriculum committee upon full review of the proposal. The policy reads as follows:

### **Policy change for interim approval:**

All requests for interim course approval shall be submitted to, and approved by, a majority of the Senate Curriculum Committee. Those seeking interim approval for a course (that has not yet passed through all required levels of review) shall submit the request via email to the Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee. The request should include a copy of the original CARMin request document, a course syllabus, and an explanation of why interim approval is desired. The Chair will submit the materials to the committee for review. The request will be reviewed at the next scheduled meeting or submitted to members for electronic review if the request is particularly time sensitive. Interim approval does not guarantee the course will be approved upon full review.

Please note that with the exception of course changes (e.g., credit hrs. course descriptions, etc.) and name changes, requests submitted after the end of April may not be reviewed until the August/September meeting. During the committee's summer recess, interim approvals for name and course changes may be granted, if approved by the Department/Unit Chair, Dean, and Academic Affairs.

- The committee guideline/timeline will be shared (it is included in the Senate Box folder along with the policy) so that people can plan ahead. The only tricky thing is summer, since the committee stops working at the end of exam week and does not meet again until the first week of class. The committee's position is that interim approvals for new course proposals should be suspended during that time, though proposals for minor changes could continue.
  - The Curriculum Committee has already moved and seconded the approval of the new policy regarding interim approvals. Floor opened for discussion; discussion included the following:
    - Clarification that interim approval requires the approval of the dean; the problem is that the curriculum committee is not in the loop.
    - Explanation that approvals will take place within 30 days with the exception of summer, according to the schedule that the committee has proposed.
    - Concern about whether courses that are already being offered with interim approval can be denied; this puts the committee in a difficult position.
    - The current understanding is that interim approvals are often granted to get the courses on the schedule; if course is disapproved later, the course would be removed.
    - Clarification that interim approval is a parallel process, so it does not circumvent the existing approval process.
    - Concern about summer work; Adaikkalavan explained that next year we will be discussing the issue of faculty committee work during the summer.
  - Motion to close discussion; seconded; approved by voice vote.
  - Vote to approve policy; approved by voice vote.
- [8 Minutes] Academic Affairs Committee – Amy Gretencord and Keith Dawson
    - Gretencord introduced updates to the Late Registration Form, also known as the Long Form. Adding a deadline to the Late Registration Form will help prevent students from submitting requests to add courses long after the semester is over. The committee proposal reads as follows:

#### **Update to Late Registration Form**

The Late Registration Form is used when students register for classes after the registration period has ended. Currently, the form does not have a deadline, which presents additional work with the Registrar's office if the student registers for a course, especially after the semester has ended. The Academic Affairs Committee discussed the form with the Registrar and has recommended the deadline on the form as the **last day of class**.

Examples of when this form is used are listed below:

- An instructor will add a student to Canvas but will not tell the student that they need to register for the class in SIS (most common reason).
- The student is either mis-advised or not advised that they need to take a class for graduation until later in the semester.
- The student drops a class but needs to enroll in another to maintain full time status for financial aid reasons.

**\*\*We are asking for the Senate to approve the Late Registration Form to have a deadline for the last day of class.**

- The committee has already moved and seconded the approval of updates to the Late Registration Form. Floor opened for discussion; discussion included the following:
  - Clarification that the form requires signatures, including one from the instructor.
  - Discussion of cases where students were added to Canvas but did not realize that they were not officially enrolled in the course.
  - Clarification that the current form has no deadline; this update will help put a limit to late registration requests and close at least some loopholes.
  - Debate about the benefits and drawbacks of making the date the last day of class: benefits include applicability to non-standard courses, giving students credit for work already performed, and long enough time to allow for extenuating circumstances; drawbacks include teaching student responsibility, faculty may not notice that the student is missing from SIS roster until grading, interaction with Financial Aid and other policies.
  - Question regarding frequency of cases; it happens every year but not often, the policy just makes it possible to manage emergency situations.
  - Whether or not students recognize the situation when they receive tuition bills.
- Motion to close discussion; seconded; approved by voice vote.
- Vote to approve update to the Late Registration Form; approved by voice vote.
  
- Gretencord next introduced the update to the Grade Grievance Policy. The committee has received grade grievances from students who could not submit grievances in a timely fashion because of extenuating circumstances. This policy update will allow a longer timeframe for such cases. The policy will limit such requests for up to 3 years after grades were assigned. The committee's proposal reads as follows:

#### **Update to Grade Grievance Policy**

The Academic Affairs Committee receives grade appeals from students after the grievance deadline (end of the next regular semester). On occasion, these appeals are due to extremely emergent circumstances (i.e. hospitalization). The committee would like to set a deadline for such documented circumstances for up to 3 years. This extension for these instances will be consistent with other IU campuses.

**\*\*\*We are asking the Senate to approve the below changes in red reflecting the 3-year deadline for appeals that are considered extremely emergent circumstances.**

#### **Grade Grievance Policy**

If a student disputes his/her final course grade, the student must discuss the matter with the faculty member assigning the grade no later than the end of the next regular semester. **Grade appeals submitted for semesters beyond that deadline and up to 3 years after the grade was originally assigned will only be considered in extremely serious and documented circumstances (e.g., prolonged hospitalization, military deployment) that prevented the student from filing the petition or the**

faculty member from responding within the stated time period. Grade appeals after the end of the next regular semester and up to 3 years will only be considered for grade changes to W, FN, or FNN. Grade appeals will not be accepted beyond the 3-year period.

If the faculty member disagrees with the student's case for changing the grade, the student may appeal to the Chairperson of the Department that offered the course. If the Chairperson of the Department disagrees, the student may appeal to the Dean or Program Director of the area that offered the course. If the faculty member, Chairperson, Dean or Program Director all disagree with the student's request, the student may then appeal to the Academic Affairs Committee of the IU South Bend Academic Senate. That Committee then makes its recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who makes a final resolution.

In those instances where either the faculty member, Chairperson, or Dean or Program Director supports the student's appeal, the student and the person supporting the appeal must submit a written appeal to the Academic Affairs Committee of the IU South Bend Academic Senate. If the course instructor is unable to submit the support documentation, the next level (department Chair, Dean) is acceptable. That Committee will review the appeal and make a recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who makes a final resolution. (approved by Academic Senate 2/24/95)

- The committee has already moved and seconded the approval of updates to the Grade Grievance Policy. Floor opened for discussion; discussion included the following:
  - Question regarding use of FN or FNN; instructor can give last date of attendance.
  - Clarification that this is for student grade appeals, not administrative adjustments.
  - Currently, in extenuating circumstances, the committee receives all the documentation and makes case-by-case decisions; this policy will provide a better guideline.
  - Question about whether this policy will become effective for students who have a grade grievance for a course from two years ago.
  - Concern that instructors may not be able to retrieve student records from several years ago; instructors can disapprove.
  - Explanation that a similar policy exists on other campuses.
  - Clarification that this is for cases of grade change restricted to extreme cases asking for changes to W, FN, or FNN.
  - Clarification that changing the grade from F to a W falls under grade grievance.
  - Suggestion to take the policy one step further and enable administrative withdrawal without the need for instructor signatures for students who experienced extenuating circumstances; a policy like this is currently in the works.
  - Question about how this policy works with incompletes; students can ask the instructor to extend the incomplete.
- Motion to close discussion; seconded; approved by voice vote.

- Vote to approve update to the Grade Grievance Policy; approved by voice vote.
- [8 Minutes] Teaching Committee – Anna Savvopoulou
  - Savvopoulou introduced the Policy Regarding Using Data from Course Questionnaires that was brought to the February senate meeting. The committee asked other campuses how they handle course questionnaire data in DMAI and there was no consistency. To address faculty concerns, the committee revised the policy and added a section discussing how evaluation data for annual reports should be handled. The revised policy reads as follows:

**Policy Regarding Using Data from Course Questionnaires**

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. Student course questionnaires are required material for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. They may also be used for faculty annual evaluations 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). Each unit on campus is encouraged to develop policies regarding the use of student course questionnaires in annual faculty evaluations and the personnel who have access to the data. Policies regarding access and usage may differ among units but will adhere to the policies listed below. Faculty members, at their discretion, may share their own 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 will adhere to the following policies:

1. The evaluation data shall not be made public.
2. 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.

- The committee has already moved and seconded the approval of the policy. Floor opened for discussion; discussion included the following:
  - Clarification that this policy applies to annual evaluations and does not impact PTR policies and procedures.
- Motion to close discussion; seconded; approved by voice vote.
- Vote to approve the new Policy Regarding Using Data from Course Questionnaires; approved by voice vote.
- [7 Minutes] Budget Committee – Susan Thomas and Maryann Oake



- The budget committee met with the chair of the academic personnel committee as well as VC Phil Iapalucci and Lars Schlereth and reviewed the budget reduction scenarios. The committee provided a recommendation that ranked reduction priorities should a budget reduction become necessary.
- The committee also provided additional recommendations that include developing assessment plans for all student success initiatives on campus, performing an internal review of campus 23 accounts, and base-budgeting items that should be in the base budget, such as athletics. The incoming chancellor has been provided with this list of recommendations.
- In addition, the committee addressed the issue of summer availability to continue to provide input to the chancellor regarding the budget as needed. Many budget committee members will be available for consultation in person or via email over the summer.
- Complete recommendations from the senate budget committee will be posted to the senate website in the next couple of weeks.
- There is no current update on proposals for one-time expenditures; the amount of funds available for one-time expenditures will not be determined until July 15<sup>th</sup>.

9. [7 Minutes] Carnegie Task Force Updates – Gail McGuire

- McGuire provided an update from the Carnegie Engaged Campus Taskforce. The Carnegie Engaged Campus Taskforce was created by the academic senate executive committee in May 2016. The taskforce had two charges. The first charge was to begin the process of institutionalizing community engagement on the IU South Bend campus and the second charge was to submit an application for the Carnegie Engaged Campus Classification. The application was submitted at 10:40pm last Saturday.
- McGuire thanked everyone who contributed. The campus will receive a decision by December 2019. The application is 87 pages single-spaced; over the next month, McGuire will produce a condensed report to share with the campus community.
- Some highlights from the report include the following:
  - Deb Marr has worked for the last 10 years with Elkhart Public Works office to measure water quality in the St. Joseph River
  - The IU South Bend Children’s Theatre recently celebrated 55 years. Since 2004, 85,000 children from the local community have visited campus to enjoy productions.
  - Our librarian Sue Thomas started a collaboration with Better World Books in 2008 that supports the National Center for Family Literacy.
  - The honors program has a five-year relationship with St. Margaret’s House. They have played an active role in helping to raise thousands of dollars through their annual winter walks.
  - Rick Kolbe recently organized a symposium with business leaders and neighborhood residents of the River Park district for future neighborhood planning.
  - Terry Hebert has worked with the South Bend Community School Corporation for the last five years to use place-based learning to strengthen science teaching.
  - Just last year, our Dental program provided \$34,000 in free treatments and supplies to community members through programs like Operation Smile for Veterans and Give Kids a Smile.

- The Latino Student Union with Cynthia Murphy hosted the DACA/Dreamers Art Project to show community support of DACA students across the region.
- The taskforce has also made steady progress on institutionalization of community engagement. The campus added questions about community engagement in program assessments in Taskstream last year; the Engaged Faculty Fellows program just finished its second year; the taskforce worked with Gary Kern on a six-week Active Learning Institute on community engaged teaching and learning; and the taskforce created a process for designating community engaged courses and there are 33 community engaged courses so far this year.
- Next year, support through the Academic Affairs office and an IU Bicentennial grant will allow McGuire to continue her work as director of community engagement, not only to continue initiatives like the Engaged Faculty Fellows Program but also to address areas such as assessment, coordination, and celebration of community engagement.
- The taskforce will conclude its activities at the end of this semester and will form sub-groups to create new structures and continue the work of institutionalizing community engagement on the IU South Bend campus.
- McGuire concluded by thanking to members of the taskforce who worked diligently for three years not only by attending regular meeting but also performing numerous other tasks. She also thanked EVCAA Jann Joseph and later IEVCAA Linda Chen for their strong support that made this work possible and for recognizing the importance of community engagement for this regional campus and for our students' success.
- Adaikkalavan thanked McGuire for her leadership and the taskforce.

10. [9 Minutes] President's remarks – Raman Adaikkalavan

- Congratulations to Cathy Borshuk, Professor of Psychology, for being named the Lundquist Fellow for next year.
- The Board of Trustees officially approved Dr. Susan Elrod as the new chancellor for IU South Bend. She will officially begin July 1<sup>st</sup>; she has already been on campus and has an office.
- Our CIO Beth Van Gordon retired; Nick Ray (formerly executive director of IT at IU Southeast) has been named Regional CIO.
- An update on the Chancellor's taskforce on faculty salaries; Beth Kern from the School of Business has been added to the taskforce.
- Adaikkalavan thanked Interim Chancellor Jann Joseph, who will be leaving IU South Bend at end of June, for her service and leadership over the last several years and wished her the best as the next president of Georgia Gwinnett College. Adaikkalavan thanked Deans and others for sending a list of Dr. Joseph's accomplishments at IU South Bend. Here are some highlights:
  - Provided the opportunity to support the development of an initiative in the Leighton School of Business to enhance student learning.
  - Supported the library to establish the Affordable Educational Resources Course Redesign Summer Institute (the first in the IU system) and faculty grants to develop open access textbooks.
  - Supported the growth of new degree programs in the College of Health Sciences.
  - Helped to establish and promote the under-represented teacher scholarship fund to address critical teacher shortage in Indiana.

- Increased the development of partnerships with local schools, particularly through collaborative and customized course delivery structures with innovative funding models.
- Instrumental in developing the partnership with University of Notre Dame for the Bowman Creek initiative.
- Advocated for economically marginalized students.
- Steadfast support of the Civil Rights Heritage Center.
- Made significant improvements in raising the salary of lowest paid faculty members.
- Brought back many donors to the table, especially for the School of Arts.
- Efforts to allow 34 faculty and staff to attend the musical Hamilton in Chicago.
- Unprecedented commitment to student success on campus where students face multiple life stresses.
- Supported the creation of the Early Start Summer Academy for our most at-risk students as well as the work-study grants to support our students.
- Supported the Carnegie Engaged Campus initiative.
- Established CERES, to recognize research activities on campus.
- Support for the tremendous growth of the Honors Program.
- Support of UCET Learn and Earn program to increase Associate Faculty attendance at UCET.
- Support for Undergraduate Research grants and funding.
- Advocated for regional campuses at IU and showed support for teacher-scholars.
- Thanks to all current executive committee members for their support and brainstorming; all motions that came to the senate floor have been vetted by the executive committee through multiple iterations. Thanks to Vice President Vincci Kwong for handling the senate committee communications, reports, and other tasks and for being so responsive at all times of the day. Thanks to Kyoko Takanashi for recording the minutes with attention to the numerous discussions and motions. Thanks to both Kwong and Takanashi for administering the ballots every month; around 1,400 votes were cast this year and we were able to handle it through Qualtrics. All Executive Committee members were asked to stand and be acknowledged.
  - Thanks to Adaikkalavan for his leadership.
- There were more than 80 responses volunteering for 2019-2020 senate standing committees; Adaikkalavan and Kwong worked for several hours to make appointments and we have full membership on all standing committees. Kwong will be in touch about committee memberships. Appointments were prioritized for faculty who are currently not serving on committees; the goal was to maximize broad faculty representation on committees. This means that requests to serve on multiple committees could not always be granted. Thanks to everyone who volunteered.
- Update on the 2019-20 interim EVCAA and EVCAA search. Incoming Chancellor Elrod has not yet decided about the interim position. For the search, 2/3 of the representation on the committee for hiring in an academic administrative position will need to be faculty members. We will need broad representation from units and ranks. Please contact Adaikkalavan if you are interested in serving on the hiring committee.
  - Brief discussion regarding the interim appointment for EVCAA. Some faculty were concerned about the possibility of bringing in an external interim. Pros and cons of this option were weighed. Please contact Adaikkalavan with further comments.

- UFC Meeting is scheduled for next Tuesday; please let Adaikkalavan know if you have any questions.
- Thanks to senate committee chairs for their service; please send annual reports so that they can be uploaded to the Box folder.

11. [2 Minutes] Announcements and motion to adjourn

- The following announcements were made:
  - Please send FACET nominations to Nancy Colborn by May 17<sup>th</sup>.
  - FACET Bender Joy of Teaching Event on using virtual reality in the classroom next Thursday, April 25<sup>th</sup> 11:30-12:30 at Fireside.
  - The Library is going through a serials cancellation project; the list was sent out via Daily Titan. Please submit feedback by 22<sup>nd</sup>.
  - Cyndi Sofhauser has earned full professorship and has accepted the position of the Undergraduate Director for Nursing.
  - Next Friday 1-2pm in the Boardroom, there will be a CERES Pivot Workshop.
  - Please remember to submit your vote for the constitution updates; the ballots will be sent out next week.
- Motion to adjourn; seconded; approved by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 3:12pm.