

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY SOUTH BEND ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
JANUARY 19, 2018 * WIEKAMP HALL 1001**

IN ATTENDANCE: ADAIKKALAVAN, ANANTH, BENNION, BINDROO, BLOOM, BRYANT, CAMPBELL, L CHEN, N COLBORN, L COLLINS, CONNOR, CRESS, CURTIS, DIELMAN, EDMONDSON, L FISHER, T FISHER, GIROD, GRETTENCORD, HAKIMZADEH, HE, HERNANDO, HINNEFELD, HOPKINS, HORWAT, HOTTOIS, JANG, H JONES, S JONES, KARAKATSANIS, B KERN, G KERN, KOLBE, KWONG, LAMBERT, LIDINSKY, LUCAL, MARR, MARTINEZ, MATTOX, MCGUIRE, MCINERNEY, MCLISTER, MCMILLEN, MELUCH, METTETAL, MLOTSHWA, MOCIULSKI, MOORE, JENNIFER MUNIZ, OAKE, OKRAH, OPASIK, PARK, PATHAK, QUIMBY, REDDY, ROGALLA, ROSSOW, ROTH, RUSNOCK, SCHEESSELE, SCOTT, SHOCKEY, SOFHAUSER, SUTTMAN, THOMAS, THOMPSON, TORKZADEH, TOURTILLOTTE, VALENCIA, VANDERVEEN, VOLLRATH, WELLS, WRIGHT, ZYNDA

CALL TO ORDER: 1:31pm

- 1) Call to order.
- 2) Approval of minutes for November
 - a) Approved without dissent
- 3) Agreement to Change Order of Meeting
 - a) Meeting minutes follow a different order from published order
 - b) Approved without dissent
- 4) Moving the Senate Constitution and the Handbook to the web. Progress and a report on the votes from the last meeting.
 - a) Both votes passed with large majorities.
 - b) S. GERENCSEK: I would like to begin by thanking those working on committees responding to the requests from the ad hoc committee on these revisions. As you know for all of you serve on senate committees or requested the senate to review your charge in the constitution, we've had a response from a majority of the senate committees and appreciate the work you've put in. We will continue to be in a dialogue with you about some of those changes. We have minor adjustments or clarifications we want to make. For those of you who have not responded if the reason is that you see no need for change in your committee, we need to know that as well. Otherwise we have hanging commitments and we are glad to answer any questions you have regarding your contributions. We will at the next meeting bring the first set of committees with changes forward, and this will entail an introduction of the changes, you will have a month to review the changes, and then at the subsequent meeting we will introduce those as constitutional amendments taking into account the month for people to review the details and bring concerns or changes or questions to us. Finally, I'd like to remind you that this is in the initial stage, the constitutional review is significantly important and it is not just about updating the constitution but adapting it to a more flexible format so that going forward we won't fall as far out of date as easily or as often. Secondly, from many of your committees there will be a next stage during which we will be asking you to review certain policies in the current handbook that attend to your committees. In many cases this might be perfectly fine, you'll say "yes these are the policies we use and they make sense." In other cases there will be policies where there have been changes that come to us either from IU actual or from our own changes in procedures over the last several years. We will ask you to amend those policies or to recognize those policies regarding language in the handbook. In some cases we will recognize that language may be out of date and ask you to review that this is in fact what you do, or do you see other needs that should be reviewed? As in this process if there is low hanging fruit or more complicated issues, we will take on more difficult topics down the line, the handbook revisions will follow this process as well. So once your committee is done with the descriptions of your authorities and the constitution then we will look at some of the policies and procedures you undertake as defined in the handbook. I wanted to update you on that, where we stand, and where we will go next. Thank you for all the work you've done, this will be a good process throughout this year, perhaps leaking into next year, but we will have a better handbook and a more up-to-date constitution.

We will continue to be in contact regarding minor modifications. If you feel there is no need for changes regarding your committee, please let us know that as well.

- 5) Higher Learning Commission visit. Overview of the schedule and opportunities for participating. How to make the most of these opportunities.
 - a) G. METTETAL: There are two sets of events that are happening. One is the focus groups for roles on campus that are more or less required, for groups like the Chancellor's cabinet, the Assessment Committee, the Campus Directions Committee. Then there are the open sessions, those are for anybody and everybody. The problem with these being open is that everybody feels like everybody is going so nobody shows up and it looks like nobody cares. The chair has asked several times for these meetings to be advertised so that people will attend. So although nobody has to attend the open sessions, we have made them topical, with particular areas of interest, so we invited not just the criterion teams who wrote up the self study sessions, but various committees that we thought were relevant. For instance criteria one and two meetings, one of the meetings is 'mission and integrity', so we thought the Campus Directions Committee and the Diversity Leadership Committee would be relevant. Everyone else is welcome and we'd love to have you. Criteria three and four are the Teaching and Assessment Committees, that should be of very wide interest but we are particularly interested in those committees. Criterion five, resources and institutional priorities, we thought Campus Directions, Academic Personnel, and Budget. We would love to have lots of people there. You don't have to even speak, you can sit and enjoy. This shows that people on our campus care, and you can learn a lot. As I said at the all-campus meeting, I've been here a long time but there a lot of things that I realize I didn't really know. So you are more than welcome to come to any and all of those meetings. For focus group meetings, those are special invitation only but if you feel that based on topics of interest that you should have been invited, let me know. Sometimes they were very specific as to who should come. After this Senate meeting today we will have an information session about the HLC visit, I have a more detailed schedule. We will talk about what sorts of things will be discussed in different committees. Some of you may have multiple invitations that you plan to prioritize, if so the special invitation focus groups are of higher importance than open sessions. The open session need people to attend, but if you only have time for one and you were invited to a focus session that is more important. Again, check with me if you're not sure. For the open sessions, if you want to talk to the accreditors about subjects that are not part of the main topics of the session, there are two short drop in sessions that are for any other sort of topic. Because they don't always ask about everything. The open sessions and drop-in sessions do not require RSVPs or signup, just show up. The big ones are in the Alumni Room and the two drop-ins are in a seminar room in Education and Arts. The HLC team seems very nice. They seem very interested. Just to name drop a little, lunch is with some of the Trustees and they invited the University Advisory Board. We have Mayor Pete coming, Joe Kernan, Jeff Rea, Amish Shah, and more. We've been overwhelmed by how many board members were very eager to come. That is pretty cool!
 - b) K. SMITH: Do you have any suggestions for best behaviors in these meetings?
 - c) GM: We want to show that we're good, but we don't have to pretend that we're perfect. We don't want to just brag and deny, but neither to whine and complain, they will have a list of questions and prompts that will help them get us to talk. If you look at hlc.iusb.edu it will redirect you to the HCL page and you can download the hundred page self-study report. There are nice summaries at the end of each section regarding strengths and opportunities. We don't need to be defensive, but to be open to things we need to improve and they will have probing questions. The last time I spoke to you, I mentioned that I had a lot of requests for federal compliance materials which we have uploaded. Within an hour of finishing that the visit team sent me another list of things they needed from the assurance side of things. I want to thank everybody for getting back to me quickly, it's been very helpful and I haven't had time to thank everybody. Everybody has been really great. I think part of what they want to see is that we continue to have the whole campus pull together to do this, which is what we have been doing. It's been fabulous, and I think overall we will look very good.
- 6) Carnegie Task Force. Making the most of faculty annual reports.
 - a) K. SMITH: One of the great things about being a professor at a campus like this one, is seeing ideas that colleagues have come up with that have turned out to be wonderful program opportunities, creative opportunities for the campus. They've heard about and seen the potential in our campus, and brought it to fruition, and I'll bet in a couple of years we're going to think that one of the best of those is the Carnegie

initiative. We need to hear how to make the most of our annual reports this weekend, and we have a brief piece of advice about that.

- b) G. MCGUIRE: There might be a few of you who haven't finished your annual report yet so I'm speaking to you. There is a way to identify if you're doing community engaged teaching, service, or research. If you remember from last year in the Web screen you can find the appropriate boxes in our annual report. There are the "service learning" and "civic engagement" boxes available as designated by the IU system, either box is helpful for Carnegie application purposes. Faculty will not be identified by name in the report, information will be used in aggregate, however several faculty will be asked to serve as exemplars of these activities.
 - c) E. ROTH: You had a nice description in the daily digest about what work in your class might look like if you were going to check one of those boxes. Might that be similar to the service-learning or community-engagement general education proposal?
 - d) GM: Our terms come from the Carnegie application itself.
 - e) ER: What we're talking about in the three general education models involves a community engagement component and I was wondering what that might look like. Maybe it will look like your description of what your course looks like if you're checking one of those boxes. Is that true? Does that make sense?
 - f) GM: We would have to have that conversation as a campus, as to how we define this, but hopefully yes.
 - g) ER: Okay.
- 7) General Education Task Force. Questions that can guide unit-level conversations going toward an eventual vote on general education. Opportunities needed for discussion to prepare for a campus decision on general education.
- a) K. SMITH: The director of the task force is hear to answer questions, we would prefer not to have a discussion about the preferences for any particular plan, but to use today to inform faculty and deans about issues involved with the decision-making process and to inform the task force about preferred practices for developing input from the faculty.
 - b) L. ZYNDA: An information sheet is making the rounds [see addendum]. In the last senate meeting we released three draft models and distributed them around the campus. Here now are draft plans for how we might revise general education. The intention is for discussion, not long discussion, as these must be revised prior to any vote. So today we want to talk about what we would like to see. The first thing on the information sheet is a set of questions that could be useful in departments. Question one, do you have a preference between these three draft plans? Because this intended to be a movable structure, you'll notice on the other side of the information sheet is a chart comparing all the changes and additions that are made between the three draft plans. The second question asks if there are any attributes of other plans which your department likes, even if the general consensus is for a different plan. Questions three and four have to do with deletions and additions, we want to know whether you consider some particular changes in any plan appropriate or not. For instance, the deletion of health and wellness in some cases, if you are in a department like sociology that doesn't teach health and wellness we still want to know what you think, we want to know what psychology thinks about computer literacy, etc. Hopefully you will consider this as a whole. Then there are open-ended questions such as, do you need more information about some of these things, and any other comments you might have (those are questions six and seven). Returning to the chart, it only includes possible changes, it doesn't include things that people generally agreed should be kept such as writing, we didn't see that people really wanted to change that. The full plans have greater detail as well but this is good for a broad glance at once. At the bottom of the chart are items which would be brand new to general education, such as financial literacy.
 - c) B. LUCAL: The chart on this yellow sheet does not include First Year Seminars.
 - d) L. ZYNDA: That is a mistake, we meant to have it on there, thank you for pointing that out. It should be listed for all three plans, we are suggesting it for all of them. Please discuss whether you feel it is worth it for all three plans. We want to hear what you have to say through the questions on these sheets regarding the best ways to do this. We would also like to have topical open forums on particular components to learn: What are your thoughts and concerns about the process, and how can we make certain we've heard all voices and suggestions as we make these decisions?
 - e) E. BENNION: Is there a way to post U100 and FYS guidelines, and also the new revised information literacy, so we can discern what the plans are providing for them? Can we see some example learning outcomes from some of these categories?

- f) LZ: Yes, we can provide lists of bulleted items regarding what does it mean to have a class of type "blank" and what are the learning outcomes for that, and we can make those public.
- g) E. ROTH: Could we get that also for community engagement?
- h) LZ: The first suggestion is that we want a whole set of learning outcomes for categories of classes. We'll do that. What other things would you like to see?
- i) J. HINNEFELD: To follow-up on your Q110 example I think it might be good in an open forum for units to have the opportunity to make their case for particular categories.
- j) LZ: I invite these stakeholders to come discuss these guidelines so they can say whatever they want. Does that sound like something that would be good?
- k) JH: It would be helpful to me to know what some of those topics are.
- l) LZ: That sounds right. We want to make sure we invite stakeholders to be heard.
- m) S. GERENCSEK: I'm not sure who would speak to it, but what about U100? It's a required course. I know little about it, who teaches it, what the outcomes are, who is assessing it. It's something I feel I have a general idea about but I have no specific information about it if it's going to be required in these plans.
- n) LZ: We can certainly ask the Education Department to provide us that sort of information
- o) SPEAKER1: Isn't U100 required of conditional admission students?
- p) LZ: Yes, not universally but some units do for conditional admits. It's not required but has become de facto in many cases and we'd like to make that official because it's a good idea. But everybody should know what it involves, you want to know what you're getting into.
- q) L. COLLINS: A process question: I hope we can find some Senate time to have this sort of conversation as a whole. I find it very valuable to hear what colleagues from across the university think of these issues. Regarding open forums, I want us to have a very clear timetable of the numbers of events and their times, so that everybody knows when is the time to speak.
- r) LZ: You would like the semester schedule laid out right away.
- s) LC: Yes.
- t) SPEAKER1: I agree, I feel like this whole issue has fallen from the sky and it is taking a large effort to understand it.
- u) LZ: We need to have lots of discussion. Months worth.
- v) SPEAKER2: How do we come to a decision, will there be a vote in the Senate?
- w) LZ: Anything that gets passed will be made by a vote through the Academic Senate.
- x) SPEAKER3: As the person in charge of oral communication classes across the university I would like to know what departments across the university feel about these plans because some of them are beyond our current scope. We would not be able to do the third option. I would like to be heard as someone who is part of these programs that then might be affected.
- y) LEE KAHAN: Did the task force consider including a fourth option which would be the current general education program?
- z) LZ: No, but we could all decide that.
- aa) S4: Could we have pieces of three of them?
- bb) LZ: Yes. This is not an inviolable set, these are just ways to prepare programs that we want you to consider. As examples, each of these three does health and wellness, and financial literacy very differently. You might like plan three but you think that it omits health and wellness and you're not okay with that.
- cc) G. MCGUIRE: If we follow the suggestion that we devote a senate meeting to this, I recommend that we not have a full senate deliberation but break into interdisciplinary small groups
- dd) LZ: That seems to go against the suggestion that we all hear each other.
- ee) GM: But we don't all teach individually, that's why I say interdisciplinary groups.
- ff) LZ: That's what this is for now
- gg) GM: But for instance, biology people need to hear political science people.
- hh) LZ: Yes, we want to have open forums so that everybody hears one another. I have no control over this but the senate might devote some time.
- ii) GM: I just think you'll get more voices heard and more meaningful discussion if we broke into small interdisciplinary groups. Otherwise in the full senate we'll only hear from about five people.
- jj) LZ: Okay that's an idea, we can have interdisciplinary focus groups instead of all of us together talking.

- kk) KS: I suggest that if the conversations outside the senate are rich and varied enough that a senate discussion would be very good. But if it's mainly a senate discussion I have little hope of it being as good as it needs to be.
- ll) S. GERENCSEK: I have a quick comment on the question regarding voting. I encourage the task force to help determine how voting will occur and what will count as a win, I would encourage everybody to do a quick Google search on "Arrow's theorem". It is very hard to vote on three things and actually have something that is popular. It is important to consider what we'll do if the best plan gets 38% of the vote, we don't have an electoral college.
- mm) LZ: That is definitely a concern. We want any change to be made by a majority not by a plurality. It may be apparent if we find how all the departments are thinking that one of these plans is a non-starter we can just eliminate it now, or which ones we can eliminate in March. At that point it may be clear that most people don't like plan three. In the end we need to have a majority, I agree on that.
- nn) N. KARAKATSANIS: Two points. First, we're not voting immediately on one of these three plans, we're going to have a discussion which will narrow down the plans we want to vote on. It's not like we must select from among these three. The second thing I'd like to say, I do think having interdisciplinary groups that are smaller is a good idea. I also think it's a very good idea for all of us to have at least one session where we are able to hear our colleagues across schools and across disciplines in a forum like this to discuss what we're thinking before we actually decide on what plans we want to bring to a vote.
- oo) R. BRITTENHAM: If people are not able to get to open forums we should have some sort of online survey to get feedback.
- pp) LZ: Should we have something available for individuals as well as at the departmental level, is that what you had in mind?
- qq) RB: yes
- rr) SPEAKER5: At a gen-ed conference I attended while I was on the committee and it was discussed that some schools have meetings for people in student services, for example. We might also be interested in the opinions of advisors.
- ss) LZ: Yes, we're already going to do that. We will also go back to student government
- tt) L. CHEN: I think it's really heartening that we're having these discussions, and I want to note that it is possible to have special Senate meetings if we feel it's important enough to have more discussions like this, and not feel tied to the set monthly Senate meetings.
- uu) LZ: Yes, that is another option.
- vv) J. WRIGHT: With respect to voting I prefer avoiding a simple majority vote. I don't want a plan that one school might completely vote against but because of the size of their school it doesn't matter. I want to make sure that every school, despite the size of their faculty have a chance to weigh in.
- ww) LZ: What would you suggest
- xx) JW: I would like us to investigate models for such things.
- yy) LZ: Yes, we can talk about that. The scale of schools as groups of people. CLAS is a big group, it's sometimes the majority at senate meetings so if we decided something for a simple majority that might not be fair. So we can talk about that, some sort of fairness built into the system.
- zz) S. CRESS: A long time ago we adopted LEAP essential learning outcomes for our university. How are we going to guarantee that these plans meet our desired outcomes?
- aaa) LZ: One of these models is called direct LEAP.
- bbb) SC: Yes, but if we don't choose that plan, where does that leave us?
- ccc) LZ: All three of these are designed to address LEAP in one way or another. Some are more obvious in mirroring the language. I agree that our current general education meets LEAP guidelines pretty well. But there are some things LEAP specifies that we don't have explicitly. That was a guiding point for items we decided to keep. For example, computer literacy and visual literacy are not LEAP outcomes that we require and if we feel they're important we should make certain they're done in a LEAP compliant way.

- 8) Report and motion on childcare from the Faculty Working Group on Childcare at IUSB. Report in the document area below. Motion: Be it resolved that: The Faculty affirms that campus-supported childcare is of great importance to the university community and that an affordable, high quality child care facility should be available to students, staff, and faculty.

- a) A. LIDINSKY: Our working group has been seeking to find whether we can support child care on our campus. Members include Josh Wells, Peter Connor, Jay VanderVeen, Susan Cress, Gwynn Mettetal. I thank also Louise Collins for her input. Jay VanderVeen updated people in November about the findings of our survey that was sent out last fall, in the context of the sudden closure of our childcare center on campus last summer. That electronic survey had a resounding 887 responses, 95% of respondents, including faculty, staff, and students, responded that campus supported childcare was very important or important to our climate on campus and important in student success. We know that we need to think about the family needs of our students if we want them to succeed, and I know we all do. Simply, the purpose of this resolution is to declare the concerns and desires of this faculty working group and also the Vendor Review Board which has endorsed this, the chair of that committee may say something in a moment. To pass this resolution in the faculty senate as a way of adding some weight to ongoing work to design something for our campus. The chair of the Vendor Review Board is Jake Mattox who will now speak.
 - b) J. MATTOX: I represent the Vendor Review Board and our charge on campus has been to consider the relationship between campus values statements and the services that are provided. So values such as inclusivity, serving greater social needs, things like that. So the board is happy to consider and support this resolution as a body, and we would ask our colleagues to do the same.
 - c) AL: So the resolution is brief, and we'll have an opportunity for some discussion: Be it resolved that the faculty affirms that campus supported child care is of great importance to the university community and that an affordable high quality child care facility should be available to students, staff, and faculty. Any questions, discussion?
 - d) J. HINNEFELD: I'd like to thank you for crafting such a succinct, direct motion and I speak in favor of it.
 - e) E. BENNION: Clarification, what is meant by campus supported? Does that mean both financially supported and supported in a sort of moral sense, or less tangible sense? What does that mean? AL: We are thinking capaciously about this and also we wanted the wording to be broad and inviting enough because we don't know what this will look like, so we are hoping that this will add some weight to a broad and diverse conversation about what this looks like on our campus.
 - f) J. WELLS: The original information we brought to the campus last semester described a number of different scenarios. Some universities provide child care as we used to, some provide expense accounts for students to shop elsewhere, some provide cooperative models that are housed on campus and given campus financial incentives as well, there's a range of what is possible.
 - g) T FISCHER: I have a process question. If we affirm this, what is the next step? There is no action that the administration should do something. Is this just to say what faculty thinks? Will the staff council get a look at this? The students?
 - h) J. VANDERVEEN: This will be brought to the Student Government Association next week.
 - i) AL: Yes, it is vague about what happens next but we wanted to have resounding support from the faculty senate as well as others.
 - j) K. SMITH: A motion to close discussion. Made. Seconded.
 - k) Vote: Approved without dissent
- 9) Report from the University Faculty Council meeting in November.
- a) K. SMITH: Elaine Roth and I are the representatives to the University Faculty Council and we would like to report on the November meeting.
 - b) E. ROTH: Ken and I went to IUPUI in November, I'm the University Faculty campus representative. We went to the UFC meeting of all the campuses. The first meeting was a lunch session to consider President McRobbie's teaching initiatives set forward in his state of the university address in the fall. It seemed to me that Gwynn Mettetal is providing excellent support to our campus through UCET, other campuses seem to be quite surprised by these conversations. One initiative is about non-tenure track faculty. Not all campuses are complying with the five-year mandatory up-or-out model of lecturers. IUPUI and IU South Bend do, but most of the other regionals do not. IUN appears to use lecturers as contingent faculty hiring and letting them go based on enrollment numbers on a semester by semester basis. I felt that we at IUSB have an equitable system. But, the range of policy implementation among the campuses was notable and interesting. As part of this discussion was consideration of a third level beyond senior lecturer, so a lecturer would be promoted to senior lecturer, and

then there was a suggestion that there could be another rank. Like full professor for tenure line faculty. As part of this discussion the term 'master teacher' came up. There was also proposed the term 'distinguished lecturer' which went over very well. The Regional Faculty Caucus will be taking up the discussion of the master teacher. Then we moved to discussion with President McRobbie and his team, including their discussion of graduate student tuition taxation. He had met with Speaker of the House, Paul Ryan, and the other Big 10 presidents. McRobbie announced the new vice president of international affairs, Hannah Buxbaum. There was an interesting discussion of creating a budget advisory committee to consider the adoption of responsibility centered management on the IUB campus. There was a quick suggestion that a standing budget advisory committee would have the same membership: two from IUB, two from IUPUI, two from the regionals. The regionals did not like this and spoke up for more comprehensive representation. It was eventually referred back to the executive committee and they will report back in February. The committee all adopted new revisions to the sexual misconduct and faculty board review hearing procedures. They people who spent a lot of time on the revisions seemed to think it would be fraught. It was not. They had worked extensively with campus Title IX staff. This all seems to be keeping with a motion from the Department of Education about the implementation of Title IX. The upshot is that the board of review policy statement stands, but for faculty sexual misconduct there's a slightly different sequence than other board of review policies. This concludes my report, any questions?

- c) E. BENNION: Is that new policy posted somewhere?
- d) ER: It should be. I have a copy you can review, but it should be disseminated.
- e) EB: Another comment on the use of the term "distinguished" which could be potentially confusing in that it is also used for faculty and I don't know whether that would ever be a cause for concern.
- f) ER: I think they wanted that parallel

10) Brief items: a) Faculty position: Murli Nair. b) News of the statewide progress on the teacher-scholar model of teaching excellence, following up on the Senate's November motion. c) Nominating committee work is underway. Continuities, faculty development, Practical philosophy. d) Budget hearings.

- a) L. CHEN: I'm here to introduce two new appointments. We have a new faculty program associate for online education, and that is Dr. Murli Nair. Dr. Nair is an associate professor of bioinformatics with joint positions in the biology and computer science / informatics departments. Prior to joining IUSB in 2006, he was a scientist at the University of California San Diego supercomputer center. With his interdisciplinary background he has taught introductory and advanced courses for both departments. Dr. Nair has introduced several new courses including biostatistics, bioinformatics, genomics, biology of cancer, and introduction to data mining. He regularly teaches online courses and has developed and taught three of them: biostatistics, introduction to data mining, and genomics. He received funding to develop online courses from the Center for Online Education as well as SEED grants for computer equipment. He recently received an NSF grant to procure a server for research and for teaching data intensive courses. Dr. Nair's core research area is cancer genomics. Congratulations, Dr. Nair. Academic Affairs is also pleased to announce the new director for the Center for Excellence in Research and Scholarship which will organize and house programs to promote research and scholarship. That decision goes to Dr. Joshua Wells. Dr. Wells is an associate professor of anthropology and social informatics. He teaches a number of courses including several that he created for this campus, including geographic information systems, anthropology of science fiction, anthropology of violence, and science/technology and society. Dr. Wells has been very successful at obtaining competitive research funding from organizations such as the IMLS, the NSF, and the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. Dr. Wells has more publications than I can mention, several of his publications have been co-authored with students whom he has mentored. He also has a number of government funded research reports and monographs, and in addition he has published in the area of scholarship of teaching and learning. Congratulations Dr. Wells.

11) President's remarks.

- a) K. SMITH: A quick report, the Nominating Committee is doing the important work of building a slate for the elected positions for the academic senate elected committees for next year. I believe they are close to full slates and I thank them for that work. For those who might still be wondering about roles, who are

interested in helping faculty find their own voice, it would be a great thing to speak with the committee co-chairs of Deb Marr, Sharon Jones, and Jeremy Linton. A quick word about looking forward to budget hearings.

- b) J. HINNEFELD: I'm chairing the Budget Committee this year. Budget hearings will be held on the mornings of Monday and Tuesday, February 12 and 13. I'll ask the schedule to be posted on the Senate website and the Daily Titan. There will be 25-minute presentations from the deans and the various vice chancellors. The budget hearings are open to anyone in the campus community, in the Alumni Room. The schedule should not be taken too literally, last year we progressed rapidly through the presentations, so if you're interested in a particular presentation you may want to come early.
- c) KS: In this morning's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences meeting there was a discussion of the new service expectations that students can expect of all the people who work at the university and that we can expect of students. Of those who spoke, there was a concern that the document was not clear enough to make its purpose known so that it could guide us rather than gather dust. I will discuss it with the Executive Committee and invite input from colleagues elsewhere.
- d) KS: I overlooked Gwynn Mettetal who should have been introduced to discuss the teacher-scholar model earlier.
- e) G METTETAL: Our teacher-scholar model is being used as a model for a lot of other campuses. IUSB, IU Southeast, and IU Kokomo now have individual teacher-scholar models developed, we're waiting on the others. We will be meeting in February, the center directors, to see what we can agree upon for a simple model after we see what everybody has. We've been asked to say what we do to help people and to reward them. I'm not sure how it will end up, but if our model isn't the main one it will be influential because of other campuses using it.

12) Announcements and motion to adjourn.

- a) H. SMITH DAVIS: Many of you, especially in CLAS may have known Jake Eason, who was a secondary education, social studies major, who passed away after an accident during finals week. Students in the School of Education have asked that we have a memorial for him, and I wanted to invite any of you who would like to attend or who may have known Jake from classes. February 8th, 5:30-7pm, in the Alumni Offices, downstairs on the main floor where the gateway used to be.
- b) E. BENNION: It is primary election season, there will be a raft of new candidates, you will need identification to vote. The American Democracy Project has been negotiating with the congressional candidates, at this moment there are no Republican challengers to Jackie Walorski, but there are three candidates on the Democratic side. We have scheduled four events, two forums (one co-sponsored with the League of Women Voters of South bend and the other with the St. Joe County Public Library). Also two candidate debates, one here co-sponsored with the LWVSB on campus and another at our Elkhart Center sponsored with the LWV of Elkhart. We will have meet the candidate events in February, and on April 24th. The St. Joseph Sheriff race is also hotly contested and may be of interest to Criminal Justice and other disciplines. Keep an eye out for our events in the Daily Titan and in our social media and in the local newspaper.
- c) SPEAKER: The Communication Studies Dept. is hosting Mayor Pete Buttigieg at 5pm on Monday, 29 January, in the arts lecture series. He will briefly speak and then have an open Q&A session. Tickets are free to students.
- d) G. METTETAL: UCET deadline for SOTL Conference proposals is February 1.
- e) SPEAKER: The deadline for the Library Research Prize is February 16.
- f) J. WRIGHT: We have a piano fellowship candidate on campus next week, conducting master classes and presentations throughout the week. It culminates with a recital Friday night at 7pm in the recital hall.
- g) SPEAKER: Senior and junior sport and exercise students are starting the "Ready to Move" program on our campus. It has been very successful at IUB and IUPUI. That link can often be found in the Daily Titan. Please support any staff that have signed up, and we are looking for a few more people.
- h) K. SMITH: International bestselling author, James Rebanks, will be speaking here on Monday night in Joshi Hall at 7pm. We are very fortunate to have a large grant from the Indiana Humanities Commission as well as several academic units and the Wolfson Scholar Fund and the Academic Affairs office. This bestselling author has had his work translated into twelve languages.
- i) Motion made to adjourn, seconded.

Guiding Questions for Departments - General Education Revision

The General Education Task Force is requesting that each department (or equivalent unit, e.g., an unofficial subunit that holds regular meetings) consider the three draft plans for revising General Education made public in November 2017 and answer the following questions to the best of its ability. The responses to these questions will be collected and used in the revision process. Please return your responses to the Gen Ed Task Force no later than February 9, 2018 if possible. (If your unit needs longer, please let us know. It is more important to have good and thoroughly considered information than to produce brief answers merely to meet an arbitrary deadline.)

Department (or equivalent): _____

Number of faculty: _____

Contact Person (e.g., chair or coordinator): _____

1. Does your department have a preference between the three draft plans released in the Fall 2017 term? If so, which plan do you all prefer and why? If not, what advantages or disadvantages do you see in each of the plans?
2. Would your department have a stronger preference for its preferred plan if it included one or more elements from either of the other two plans? If so, which elements would those be?
3. Some current elements of General Education are reduced, eliminated, or altered in the three draft plans, including visual literacy, computer literacy, information literacy, health and wellness, and non-Western cultures. Which of these proposed changes seem appropriate to you and which do not? Why? (Note: See chart on the reverse summarizing which changes are made in each model.)
4. Some suggested additions to General Education in all or some of the draft models include the integrative upper-level seminars, financial literacy, contemporary global cultures (replacing non-Western cultures), first-year seminars, ethical reasoning, and community engagement. Which of these proposed additions does your department deem most appropriate and desirable, and why? (Note: See chart on the reverse.)
5. Is there any information lacking in the current draft proposals that you would like to see addressed before assessing them?
6. Is there anything essential to General Education that you think is not addressed in any of the current proposed draft plans? If so, what are these?
7. Finally, are there any other suggestions or comments about either the specific draft plans, the General Education program in general, or the current process of revising Gen Ed that you would like to make?

Current Gen Ed Elements That Are Altered in at Least One Draft Plan			
	Draft Plan 1 (Conservative)	Draft Plan 2 (Direct LEAP)	Draft Plan 3 (Flexible Choice)
Visual Literacy	Removed	Removed	Reduced; available as a single option (Visual Communication)
Information Literacy	Required (tagged course)	Same as now (but for freshmen only & linked)	Same as now (but for freshmen only & linked)
Computer Literacy	Limited; no longer required of most students	Limited; no longer required of most students	Limited; no longer required of most students
Health & Wellness	Expanded to 3 credits w/ options	Replaced with 1-credit Nutrition & Health	Removed
Common Core	Same as now	Replaced with interdisciplinary courses in Social Sciences, Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences and Mathematics	Replaced with standard, traditional introductory courses in disciplines
Non-Western Cultures	Replaced with Contemporary Global Cultures	Replaced with single Intercultural Knowledge course	Replaced with Contemporary Global Cultures (and grouped under "Intercultural Knowledge")
Diversity in US Society	Same as now		Same as now (but grouped under "Intercultural Knowledge")
Oral Communication	Same as now (Public speaking)	Public Speaking or Interpersonal	Public Speaking, Interpersonal, or Visual
Brand New Gen Ed Elements (Added in at least one Draft Plan)			
	Draft Plan 1 (Conservative)	Draft Plan 2 (Direct LEAP)	Draft Plan 3 (Flexible Choice)
Community Engagement	Required (tagged course)	Required (tagged course)	Not present
U100	Required (conditional admits only)	Required (conditional admits only)	Required (conditional admits only)
Financial Literacy	Not present	Required (1 credit)	Not present
Ethical Reasoning	Not present	Required (3 credits)	Required (3 credits)
Upper-level Integrative Course	Required (all students; in their units)	Required (all students; in their units)	Required (all students; in their units)
Other	All Fundamental Literacies taken before junior year	All Intellectual and Practical Skills taken before junior year	All Intellectual and Practical Skills taken before junior year
	Overall structure the same as now	New structure taken from LEAP	New structure taken from LEAP