CALL TO ORDER 10:09 AM

1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 2017
   a. Deferred until November, approved by voice vote without dissent
   b. Pant, without dissenting, comments that “the minutes do not reflect accurately what was discussed”

2) PRESIDENT’S REMARKS
   a. President asks for approval of the agenda as organized below, approved by voice vote without dissent
   b. Report of Executive Committee (EC) meeting with VP Applegate
      i) Best Practices and Teaching Document
         (1) KS: EC sought to clarify intent of language in teaching document, expressed by IUSB EVC to not deal with tenure and promotion, however Applegate suggested that although it is not directed at PTR currently it could be in the future.
         (2) KS: EC was asked for greater consideration of limits of faculty time and energy in development of policy statements that create expectations of action and attention.
         (3) KS: EC suggested, in response to inquiry from Applegate for editorial commentary, that the document would be better served to focus on concerns of university sustainability and reputation for teaching, research, and service to our region, these are important issues to faculty, and this could be explicitly reflected in such documents.
         (4) COMMENT BY JAKE MATTOX REGARDING AAUP that the organization encourages faculty to promote shared governance and that the IUSB faculty may seek guidance and support from AAUP in their expression of these issues
         (5) COMMENT BY GWYNN METTETAL is still seeking input for a campus response document regarding the interdependent nature of research and teaching on our campus and with other IU regional campuses, this document development process is supported by EVC Joseph
         (6) KS: It is worth considering how the deprecated "balanced case" for tenure could be reinstated to allow a consideration of teaching and research excellence in a regional campus where such a mixture is a better fit for faculty. EVCAA Joseph has also expressed willingness to investigate this possibility
         (7) COMMENT BY B FEIGHERY: Was there any acknowledgement by the group of chancellors that if this document has PTR implications that it would create policy changes?
         (8) KS: Not that I recall. However if the faculty is passive then best practice documents may become policy
KS: The Chancellor has also been open to amending the best practices document.

COMMENT BY R. TORSTRICK: Higher levels of the university do understand that PTR is a faculty responsibility. President McRobbie’s recent state of the university message has asked the UFC to develop better standards for promotion and tenure in teaching because standards are unclear in some areas, which may be the case in Bloomington more than anywhere else.

COMMENT BY EVC JOSEPH: Campuses have differently chosen policies regarding shared governance and PTR and this campus should exercise its choice [spontaneous applause]

3) PRESIDENT SMITH REPORT OF UFC VIDEOCONFERENCE WITH REGIONAL VP OFFICE SENIOR ADVISOR FOR REGIONAL CAMPUS AFFAIRS MCKINNEY
   a. KS: Meeting with VP McKinney contained a large emphasis on online education, potentially to the exclusion of criticism of online education design and outcomes, and the campus will need to be more explicit and deliberative regarding critique of development and expansion of online teaching activities since the terms and information currently being provided by the IU Online Education system are not clearly representative of needs assessments made by departments at our campus.
      i) SPEAKER1: Are you saying that the central system is not interested in general critiques of online learning or critiques particular to our campus?
      ii) KS: There was no particular study rebutted.
      iii) SPEAKER1: Can we create online success statistics for our own online courses?
      iv) SPEAKER2: I’ve been keeping online success statistics for speech classes (drop rates, quality of work), which are generally poorer than face-to-face options. I propose that we have a faculty group that compiles and communicates these sorts of outcomes to create policy suggestions.
      v) SPEAKER3: We have locked ourselves in a binary model of discussion, built a wall between those who support distance education and those who don’t. We need to break down that wall and learn what a successful online course looks like. There are people on campus doing great work on both sides and we need to all observe these different class environments and talk to people to discern what distance education means today. It’s not until these practices enter our consciousness that we understand what these studies mean in terms of what we can and can’t accomplish in distance education. For instance there are some topics I won’t teach in distance education because I need to have a physical person in front of me, but if we lock ourselves in absolute principles we can’t come to a consensus. Until we get to that point we are making assessments about things we don’t know about.
      vi) KS: Positive steps in that regard are going to come from our campus, and not downstate.
      vii) SPEAKER4: The administration has provided reports that it’s been demonstrated that our students do best in online courses taught by our faculty, because of access to faculty, familiarity with programs, and personal attention of local faculty.
      viii) SPEAKER1: Our data on student success need to come from our campus to be used for the benefit of our student success, not generalized national data.
      ix) SPEAKERS5: I have taught economics courses for years and an online environment has driven students to conduct work more completely on their own time, with greater success, and I would like to know from my colleagues if they have seen similar results.
      x) J MATTOX: Nobody is saying that we need to destroy online education as a concept, but faculty need to have meaningful say in what is taught online and how. Colleagues with data need to have the wherewithal and power to say what is not working. We need to look at where online teaching is appropriate or not.
xi) SPEAKER6: I was against online teaching for years but once I started teaching online I realized that the complementary relationship of online and face-to-face courses in the careers of students can be important.

xii) A RUSNOCK: I believe the study that showed our students do better in our online courses also showed they do best in face-to-face courses with us.

xiii) KS: I also asked the question of how our online budgets and offerings have been stabilized, and we were told that there is now a more intentional program of budgeting and scheduling online summer courses but there has not been such an intentional procedure for the regular year, and we need to keep pushing for that to avoid chaotic scheduling which wastes faculty effort.

xiv) M. CASTANO-BISHOP: The center for online education has conducted institutional research conversations to investigate how our faculty are experiencing online vs. face-to-face courses and that should have some products by next year.

xv) KS: Could I suggest a motion to urge one or more Senate committees to follow up on this conversation?

(1) A PANT: So moved
(2) VOICE: Perhaps the Teaching and IT committees

xvi) J WRIGHT: We can't overcome the IUOCC because there will be other courses taught at other campuses and we need to consider what resources we want to expend to fight this battle before we task committees with investigating this subject again.

xvii) SPEAKER2: Many online classes are taught by adjuncts who don't have strong ties to the faculty base, in our speech program here we try to keep this to a minimum in our program, but we do not have control over this at other campuses which may get a reputation for easiness due to lack of rigor and it’s important that we use our voice to help solve this situation.

xviii) L ZYNDA: It could be worth having the Curriculum Committee review this topic. World Languages has also dealt with this problem recently.

xix) KS: I would like to ask the four committees for Curriculum, IT, Teaching, and Assessment to speak with one another to see what they may come up with regarding this topic. The Executive Committee will follow up on this.

4) PRESIDENT SMITH COMMENTS ABOUT OFFER OF SENATE SECRETARIAL HELP FROM ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
   a. KS: The Senate has been offered addition of a budget line (possibly up to 50% of a new or repurposed hire) for secretarial help from the clerical pool of Academic Affairs to help with clerical work for Senate committees. This is a great, positive, and practical step.

5) MOTION TO APPROVE PROPOSAL FOR CERES RESEARCH CENTER
   a. KS: We have a motion to approve this proposal presented in the September meeting, “The Senate supports the creation of a Center for Excellence in Research and Scholarship as described in the proposal presented and distributed at the September 2017 meeting.”
   b. KS: Any questions or comments? [none]
   c. Moved and seconded, approved by voice vote without dissent
   d. KS: This will be a very interesting and positive development. Thanks to EVCAA Joseph and J Wells for their efforts.

6) REPORT OF BALLOT FOR PTR AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES
   a. A total of 65 ballots were cast: Nashel: 33 (full term PTR); Okrah: 31 (half term PTR); Smith: 59 (at-large Executive Committee); Wells: 59 (secretary Executive Committee)
7) CONSTITUTION OF ACADEMIC SENATE PROPOSED CHANGES
   a. UPDATING TITLES
      i) STEVEN GERENCSER: Changes in terminology have been identified and will be distributed through the Senate website. Three versions of the Constitution will be provided: the original Constitution, a version with tracked changes, and a final version with changes incorporated. We will have a month to review these and then vote on approval at the December meeting. If successful we will move on to more complex edits in the spring, for instance committee membership that requires a seat for an office that no longer exists, which will require greater consideration about where that seat should be allocated.
      ii) No discussion
      iii) KS/SG: If you notice any changes that have been missed which should be made, the committee working on this includes Smith, Gerenscer, and Doug McMillen
   b. ADD ITEM 2.2.C
      i) “Standards and procedures for creation, reorganization, merger, and elimination of academic programs and units.” This would become the ninth item in that list, with the intention of following this change with a consideration of existing IU policies for these kinds of changes, such as ACA-79.
      ii) KS: Without such a policy, as exists on most other campuses in the IU system, such decisions may be taken on a more ad hoc basis. This language allows a more deliberate process between administration and faculty.
      iii) COMMENTS
           (1) J HINNEFELD: Speaks in support of the change, it is appropriate to amend the Constitution in advance of policies.
           (2) S GERENCSER: Speaks in support of the change

8) APPROVE THIS YEAR’S SENATE VOTING MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATE FACULTY COLLEAGUES
   a. Moved, seconded, and approved by voice vote without dissent.

9) UPDATE ON SHARED CALENDAR
   a. The IU system would like to have non-contradictory calendars, although there are disparate elements, one campus would like to have a full week off at Thanksgiving, another campus would like to have a fall break in the manner of IUSB, but all campuses are interested in making certain that the number of contact classes per semester remains the same across the system.
   b. COMMENTS
      i) K RITCHIE: It is important that particular campus calendars match the contextual needs of each campus, for instance matching our spring break with that of local schools
      ii) A PANT: Bloomington has a whole week at Thanksgiving and a fall break
      iii) D MCMILLEN: The Bloomington fall break is one Friday

10) UPDATE FROM GENERAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE BY LYLE ZYNDA
    a. L ZYNDA: Three draft proposals for revising General Education will be released next week: CONSERVATIVE, DIRECT LEAP, and FLEXIBLE CHOICE, each is a distinct vision of what could be done. This is now Stage 1 with a timetable is for discussion over the next two months for commentary in January, and then revisions for Stage 2 decisions in April 2018. Each plan must make use of existing resources and tenured faculty in order to represent the capabilities of our campus. It is desired that these plans create
integration and reinforcement of skills at multiple stages. Complete PowerPoint slides will be provided as an addendum to these minutes, as well as the detailed plans, and an executive summary.

b. No further discussion due to time constraints

11) UPDATE ON ENGAGED FACULTY FELLOWS PROGRAM
   a. PRESENTED BY EVCAA JOSEPH ON BEHALF OF GAIL McGUIRE:
      i) This is an update on our efforts to obtain certification as a Carnegie Engaged Campus Classification. We announce our first Engaged Faculty Fellows and mentors. Fellows will spend a year learning to integrate community engagement into their courses and mentors will assist with service learning. This comes from the Carnegie Engaged Campus Task Force and is funded by the office of the EVCAA, it deepens our commitment to community based learning. The fellows for this year are: J Deranek, J Smith, H Jones. Mentors are: A Lidinsky, D Blouin, K McInerney.

12) COMMITTEE ON TEACHING DISCUSSION OF PTR/AWARDS DATA
   a. KS: We have only enough time to note the problem provided in the agenda and will table it for the next meeting
   b. G METTETAL: Please consider the issue and discuss it in advance of the next meeting

13) DISCUSSION OF CAMPUS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
   a. KS: At the next meeting we will have a fuller discussion of the campus community engagement process that animates the Carnegie activities on campus. Elizabeth Bennion will provide a brief statement about key elements
   b. E BENNION: Our definition is about connecting to the larger world in which we exist doing teaching, research, and service. When you think about your own work, think about reciprocal engagements with the community or where your students can engage with the community. It is especially important to check the box in your annual report on civic engagement so that we can get the most complete set of information possible to determine what community engagement is being conducted on our campus.

14) ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. ILAN LEVINE: October 31 is "Dark Matter Day" and there will be an event at the IUSB Grill from 7-9pm with talks by Lynker, Martin, and Levine, followed by a panel of experts including IUSB faculty as well as Notre Dame and Ohio State University.
   b. JOSH WELLS:
   c. SPEAKER6: The IUSB Art Gallery will be having a sale on campus and at the University Park Mall the 2, 4, 5 of November
   d. SUSAN CRESS: We need to have all the HLC reporting in before the system closes on 11:59pm on 23 October, it may be accessed through ONE.IU
   e. TAMMY FONG-MORGAN: Free sushi giveaway at the Grill on Monday, 23 October
   f. SPEAKER7: 26 November 4-6pm, Communication Studies Open House

15) ADJOURNMENT
   a. KS: Do we have a motion to adjourn?
   b. Made, seconded, approved without dissent