

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY SOUTH BEND ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
MARCH 23, 2018 * WIEKAMP HALL 1001**

IN ATTENDANCE: ADAIKKALAVAN, ALLISON, AMELLIO, BAKERSON, BENION, BLOOM, BLOUIN, BOTKIN, BREGU, BRITTENHAM, BRYANT, CAMPBELL, CHANEY, L CHEN, CLIFT, N COLBORN, L COLLINS, CRESS, CUBELIC, CURTIS, H DAVIS, DERANEK, DIELMAN, EDMONDSON, W FEIGHERY, J FEIGHERY, T FISHER, FROYSLAND, GERENCSEK, HAKIMZADEH, HE, HECK, HERNANDO, HOPKINS, HOTTOIS, J JOSEPH, KARAKATSANIS, G KERN, B KERN, KOLBE, KWONG, LABBE, LAMBERT, D LEE, LUCAL, LUPPES, LYNKER, MARR, MARTINEZ, MATTOX, MCGUIRE, MCINERNEY, MCLISTER, MCMILLEN, MELUCH, MERHI, METTETAL, MOCIULSKI, MOORE-BEYIOKU, J MUNIZ, NASHEL, OAKE, OBATA, OKRAH, PATHAK, QUIMBY, RANGLES, RESLER, RITCHIE, ROTH, RUSNOCK, SCHEESSELE, SCHIMMRIGK, SCHRANK, SCHULT, SCOTT, SERNAU, SHEPHERD, SCHOCKEY, J SMITH, SOFHAUSER, SULLIVAN, SURMA, SUTTMAN, TETZLAFF, THOMAS, THOMPSON, TORKZADEH, TOURTILLOTTE, VANDERVEEN, VOLLRATH, WELLS, WILKESZHANG, ZYNDA

- 1) Call to order: 1:31pm
- 2) Approval of minutes for January and February.
 - a) Approval of January minutes made without corrections or dissent
 - b) Approval of February minutes delayed because of web-hosting issues
- 3) Elected and appointed offices and committees.
 - a) K SMITH: We have the results of the ballots for elected committees. Thank you to all who have put themselves forward to serve.
 - i) Executive Committee, K McInerney and A Schnabel have been elected to two year terms. S Beauchamp and K Ervick will be elected to a one year term if the measure below (3b) succeeds next month.
 - ii) Athletics Committee, J Daranek, D Hopkins, and S Rizk have been elected
 - iii) Faculty Misconduct Committee, N Colborn and C Sofhauser have been elected, the remainder will serve as alternates.
 - iv) Board of Review, R Colborn, B Kern, K Ladd, A Savvopoulou, and F Shan have been elected
 - b) As discussed last meeting we have a pending constitutional amendment which will stagger the position of at-large members of the executive committee. That will change the number from three to four, recognizing that we no longer have two UFC representatives, so to instead have four at-large members. If that passes, we have sufficient candidates here to begin that staggering with probably the first and second vote recipients serving two-year terms and the third and fourth vote recipients probably serving one-year terms. If that passes, we will check with the four candidates to ascertain in what capacities they are able to serve. If that doesn't pass, the three top vote recipients will be elected in the usual way.
 - c) KS: I welcome to this body Professor Emeritus Patrick Furlong, the University Historian.
- 4) Next stage in updating and moving the Constitution to the new website.
 - a) K SMITH: We've been through a process that will continue into the fall of updating and correcting the academic constitution, so it can be moved in its best condition to the new university website. You've passed a version of a number of changes already. We've seen some slightly more complicated proposals in February. We've had a month to dwell on those.
 - b) S GERENCSEK: The document available on the Senate website for the last month has changes that come from various committees, regarding mission and membership. We have been in continuous contact with those committees. We hope to call a question and move to a vote on these changes, these will be done by ballot. We will continue have more votes as we address further substantive

changes and simpler, timely updates of responsibilities. The document before you is divided into sections for each of the various committees, showing the current language and the proposed new language. I'm happy to entertain comments now. [NO COMMENTS]. Okay, this process will continue through the next year, we will have opportunities to make further comments, and it is always easy to make mistakes so feedback is welcome.

- c) CALL TO CLOSE DISCUSSION AND MOVE TO A BALLOT VOTE ACCEPTED WITHOUT DISSENT
- d) SG: There are about half a dozen committees remaining to work on. Those include some in flux like the General Education committee, but also the Board of Review and Faculty Misconduct committee, PTR, Athletics, and Student Affairs all have work to do to review their charges. Some of those will come before you in April to vote upon prior to the Senate meeting in September.
- e) J CHANEY: May people who have previously served on committees chime in?
- f) SG: Yes, it would be most helpful to contact the committee themselves or myself, Ken Smith, or Doug McMillen who are the ad hoc committee for review if preferred.

5) Remarks from the President of the Senate.

- a) K SMITH: There is a great deal going on for our campus. We would be remiss not to pause and take notice of Chancellor Allison's announcement. Ordinarily in academic circles, speeches of gratitude and praise are extremely lengthy, but when they don't have a lot of time to prepare in advance of a suitably formal occasion I hope we may be permitted that they be suggestive rather than exhaustive. In my role as faculty president the Chancellor called me slightly before the announcement to talk about the news. I want to mention a few things that come to my mind at the spur of the moment, again suggestive, not exhaustive comments as we might make on other occasions. Although we have not always agreed I appreciate that we have always had congenial and constructive, fruitful conversations that have helped me try to do a good job on your behalf in our meetings and in our work. There is a generosity in the Chancellor's sharing of insight of experience, a behind the scenes thing you might guess at, but you might not know directly. I think all of us can probably think of things we know directly about the Chancellor's work, when you walk through the Administration Building and its newer more beautiful state you know you're encountering a portion of his work. There are many things that each of us could bring to mind. But I would like to speak of the things that are perhaps never to be known. You probably reached a point inside yourself at some point in your career where a leader working on your behalf needed to remain confidential, never to be credited. I believe that there was a good deal of that work going on and I am very grateful for it. I could make some guesses about a few things but I'm not sure that's useful. In any case, the Chancellor has served in a highly visible role on our behalf for almost five years. We all have done good work together with his assistance and his leadership. We have gone through this learning together and we are quite grateful. I hope that the campus will have a more formal appreciation, but because we are gathered here for the first time so soon after the announcement I would like to invite you join in a less formal appreciation. At this time I would like to thank and applaud Chancellor Allison.
- b) [STANDING OVATION ON BEHALF OF CHANCELLOR]
- c) KS: A quick remark about the last University Faculty Council meeting. There were many small agenda items, most not very important to us. There was one item of interest, a proposal for athletics committees on all the regional campuses to have a separate mode of development than on the central campuses, that mode was to be appointed by chancellors. It was good we had representation there that day, because we have a constitutional structure for the Athletics Committee. I questioned whether this was intended to make two athletics committees, or have one replace the constitutionally mandated faculty committee. That cause confusion as they appeared to not have expected that an athletics committee would be part of a constitution. A lawyer in the room suggested that these were not contradictory because a chancellor could appoint a committee that the Senate had named. The discussion did not go on much longer. I'm happy to say that because we try to do good work in the

UFC, that portion of the motion (that regional campuses needed a different system) was removed from the proposal. It then passed without it.

- 6) The [proposed position](#) of Director of General Education, including how it fits with the Constitutional charge for the Senate's General Education committee. The position draft will be posted shortly. **see note below.
- a) KS: The next item of business is the director of general education. In recent years we've tried to introduce a substantial item like this in one meeting to give people time to reflect on it and then have a discussion and vote in the next meeting. There is time pressure as well. I have consulted with EVCAA Joseph as to whether we could search as soon as possible if this is approved at the April Senate meeting. It is my hunch that there is widespread support for a stronger leadership and management role in general education. The HLC report that has reached our campus this week demands that we take a stronger hand leading or guiding general education. You have the proposal. I'd like to allow a few minutes for people to acquaint themselves with the points of it, we will return to the discussion in two minutes.
 - b) [BREAK]
 - c) KS: We have in front of us a substantial position to be held by a respected faculty member with sufficient release time. It may be necessary that the administration would find that release time would need to be larger at the outset. We properly allotted more release time for the last director at the time of the adoption of the current general education plan, but not too long after that transition we stopped having a director with release time. Some of the problems that the HLC report asked us to address in short order I think can be traced back to the fact that we have not had sufficient management of general education since that transition. One of the things I hope all the members of the General Education Task Force will write very clearly on their next annual report is that we helped solve a substantial gap in the structure of general education with our work with the establishment of a thoughtful version of this position, along with the shared understanding of Academic Affairs. I'll open the floor for discussion.
 - d) E BENNION: Point number five, to review syllabi periodically, one person's periodically is two years, one is five years, that should be specified. The travel requirements should be specified as a source of funding for that as travel money is a finite and dwindling amount
 - e) B LUCAL: As co-chair of the General Education committee we strongly endorse this position. We often have to deal with student petition reviews that really a director should be doing, those are not a part of our formal charge and there should be a person properly tasked with that.
 - f) KS: This is a complex set of operating instructions. How this position interoperates with the General Education committee will require adjustments along the way. I hope the General Education committee and Executive committee will work to have refinements to this proposal based upon today's discussion before the April meeting so we could perhaps begin a search immediately. If I remember correctly that person could be hired perhaps to begin July 1 because there's a lot of work ahead.
 - g) A RUSNOCK: Will there be secretarial support, new duties for an existing staff member? With the June and July work, what is the expectation of that. It looks like a 12-month position. What are the expectations, will that person get time off?
 - h) KS: The budget process proposes that committees with the greatest workload will have clerical resources. There is explicit understanding that this position will need administrative clerical report. This document was mainly produced by the General Education task force, including overlapping members of the General Education committee. The reason I suggest it be tuned by the Executive Committee with the Senate General Education Committee and the Executive Vice Chancellor is because there are questions of the kind you say that are unresolved.
 - i) S GERENCSEK: Regarding the General Education committee vis a vis this director reviewing syllabi, is there a way to streamline the process of petition by involving faculty?

- j) KS: The possibility that the petitioning process could become the role of an office ordinarily rather than a committee is very interesting. At the last UFC meeting I had lunch with other regional campus Presidents and they said that in the body of their Senate they review every curriculum proposal one at a time instead of delegating it to a committee. So I think there's a possibility to tinker this process.
 - k) BL: I'd like to point out that the General Education committee is in consultation with the VC of Student Affairs Porter and the Admissions Office to streamline the course transfer process. That's something that we're already trying. I'm not sure we want petitions to only be reviewed by one person. The periodic review of syllabi is intended to address issues of drift, courses that have drifted from their original adherence to requirements. You could have adhoc committees and subcommittees that could involve faculty in that process but not create extra work.
 - l) KS: I'd like to recall from another UFC meeting that the people responsible for transfer credit in the IU system have built a database of transfer credit decisions to see if some transfer decisions have been patterned to relieve us of such choices because they have been made many times before.
 - m) SPEAKER1: Having served on the Assessment Committee I'm curious why assessment of General Education is not listed by this person.
 - n) KS: That will be in discussion in very quickly, we are not voting on this today. We are instructing the Senate's General Education and Executive committees in what changes could be made. [INAUDIBLE] These will not be the final changes, it will take a long time, and be a very large project. Not to scare away applicants. This will be one of the best jobs of your career.
 - o) L COLLINS: A comment about point 14, to coordinate with the deans of all schools etc. To me it seems that a large challenge of this position will be the authority of the person to get tasks accomplished. I don't know how you put that in a position description, but we should flag that the person in this position will be negotiating with deans as having some authority over courses.
 - p) KS: It is a bit of terra incognita. Say there are 17 sections of A190 and enrollments seem to call for 14, some dean or chair needs to be urged to offer the course less often. Politeness and wishful thinking don't seem strong enough. Other comments.
 - q) J CHANEY: In the last instantiation of this job it wasn't difficult. Everybody was willing to do it. There were little exceptions that had to be made and for all of those I had to go to the vice chancellor and get his agreement. The VC had to let the dean know there was a problem to be solved. Regarding how many sections there were to be run, there was never a problem I had to solve. This sort of issue touches so many people's business.
 - r) KS: Other comments or concerns? Or instructions to the committee? This has been a very good run of suggestions. It seems to me the task force has prepared us for this with their good work. I don't run into anybody on this campus who doesn't see the need. The HLC this week has sent us a letter saying we need to see the need. That isn't alarming. Everybody who went to the HLC meetings was an advocate of the good and real things we are doing on this campus, but general education has dwindled without the guidance of a strong leader to help it. We will have a good discussion in April and perhaps that will be a great step forward. I will be surprised if it doesn't pass overwhelmingly, and the HLC has sent us a letter saying that we have a need for this. The need is real. The strengths of the old gen-ed were diminished by the loss of strong oversight. We need a strong committee and a strong director that have a healthy working relationship. I have trouble finding people who don't agree on this. I think we will have a good and perhaps brief discussion in April prior to a vote.
- 7) Discussion of the Higher Education Commission (HLC) Constraints on Campus-Wide General Education
- a) E BENNION: How many hours is general education including the campuswides?
 - b) K SMITH: Correct me if I'm wrong but if you exclude any test-out options for most people it comes out to 39. Is that correct Lyle and Bill?
 - c) L ZYNDA: Yes that's the maximum

- d) B FEIGHERY: Yes that's the maximum to take without some overlap. Some majors have slightly different needs but that's the maximum.
- e) KS: So if a major allows some of those courses it could be less.
- f) BF: Yes.
- g) LZ: Yes, for example you could take a B190 that counts for your major it could be less
- h) KS: I believe English does a little of that.
- i) KS: I'll walk us through this document that comes to us from the General Education Task Force. We are grateful for this handy digest. It is important for us to dwell on questions that some units have dwelled on, like the possibility we might end up with an 18 credit general education program. This document addresses some of those issues. We were required in 2000 to take on general education in a much more focused way. Vice Chancellor Guilloume asked us to create the most recent program and about a year later IU President Herbert asked all campuses to revisit their general education, except for ours since we had completed it the year before. It has been part of HLC responses that we continue to revisit general education. HLC explicitly requires at least 30 hours which lays to rest the possibility of an 18 hour program. Item 2 we will skip for the moment. Let's go down to item 4, it's not as clear to me in the first point of item 4, and perhaps someone could clarify, but the second part is very clear to me in that IUSB said a number of years ago that we have committed to having our campus follow the LEAP model, the IU system at large committed to that a year or two later. So although we were first we are now obliged to continue. The last item in number 4 is a direct answer to the question of an 18 hour program, and then the core transfer library of 30 credits I don't understand how direct an answer that is. In any case we have two or three very substantial reasons why the conversations about an 18 credit hour general education curriculum really have to be tabled. Nevertheless, I think it's important for us to say that in a shared forum and to allow a moment of comment if necessary.
- j) [NO COMMENTS]
- k) KS: No comments. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration. This document has other important uses for us. The five bullet points are pasted from our 88 page HLC report received this week. There are many criteria and examples for discussion, things they liked are given. In almost every case there is a bold note that lists goals that have been met. However there are two issues they say are met with concerns. One issue deals with programs that haven't kept up with assessment cycles and others, like certificate programs that haven't been assessed. It's a rather long list. It will be a lot of work, and it is important work to be done by our colleagues. The other issue has five points and a schedule for the work, so no matter what decision we make about general education old or new, whatever it is by January of 2020 every course in the general education curriculum and every section of every course must have in the syllabus the agreed upon shared learning outcomes for that category. That means that English department A190s should have the same language and outcomes as other departments' A190s. That has to be in the syllabi in January 2020 less than two years from now. A report is due a few months later not only showing those syllabi but showing that methods of assessment are underway for every category of general education course, that data is being gathered, and that the loop is being closed with deliberation and refinement. Whether we are changing nothing or everything in general education we have the same two year calendar in which to place an assessment program in every nook and cranny of general education. It seems likely that each kind of course will require a subcommittee of general education to shape an assessment and get it underway to share observations and needs. This is what happened the last time around and it was very productive at the launch of the last gen-ed. Not only have we considered a director today, with a substantial range of duties to be done, in consultation I hope with a strong Senate general education committee, but we have two concern areas that require a lot of work. We are up to it and will do well. I say that as a person whose department went kicking and screaming into assessment in the 1990s, but we have learned things and despite the strangeness of the methodology to us we have experienced virtue and improvement. Faculty service is a finite and nonrenewable resource, and these items are going to use up a lot of that resource over the

next two years. With that in mind the next question is, how ambitious should we be about changing portions of general education at the same time that we will be doing these things for two years. Because this will be very time consuming. This is a good time for me to be quiet and invite conversation.

- l) S GERENCSEK: I'm shocked by these five bullet points saying "met with concern". What would "unmet" mean since we are noted as having "met with concern"? This is a lot of work that HLC requires of us for our general education program. I feel overwhelmed by their demands here. Have they provided us with models of other institutions that they say have "met" without concern these goals that we could use for comparison?
 - m) KS: I don't have an answer but I'm sure Lyle does.
 - n) L ZYNDA: I have a list. The General Education Task Force has anticipated this and has developed a list of draft learning outcomes for all general education categories. It includes both items we have and items we might adopt. This is just a draft, but it is being distributed, and it's the basis for getting started on this big project.
 - o) KS: A clarifying question, does that include in the categories those that we might not vote to change but currently exist?
 - p) LZ: It includes both ones we currently have and ones we might adopt.
 - q) KS: Thank you.
 - r) D MCMILLEN: I think part of the response from HLC in answer to Steven's question, is that during their previous visit we were asked to both begin a general education program and an assessment process, so they were a little miffed that we did not follow the recommendation the first time. I think that's part of the reason we have these scores.
 - s) L CHEN: What Doug says is accurate regarding what we were instructed to do at the last reapplication 10 years ago. To Steven's question, there are many schools that have assessment plans for general education that have been met without concerns by the HLC. I have recently been trained as a reviewer for HLC and hope to guide us through this process. There are many examples at the HLC website of schools that have achieved it, public and elite private institutions. One of our challenges is to find a process that is not burdensome to faculty time but provides us with information about how to continue to transform general education and make it more effective. I note that 2/3 of all HLC reviews result in schools being evaluated as having being met with concerns, so we are not out there as total failures. We are in line with the majority of campuses that our accrediting agency assesses, and that's all we can know about.
 - t) DM: I want to thank Lyle Zynda and the task force for being proactive about this.
 - u) [APPLAUSE]
 - v) KS: I think in that point and in the establishment of a strong working draft of the director position setting us up to return to the question of assessment, to helping us look for a structure that we could have hope for as far as enrollment management goes so that we're offering the right number of sections and not wasting university resources on empty seats and classrooms. Then I think in helping set up a process of course renewal to deal with inevitable drift and the renewal of courses in general, in those things alone the Task Force deserves our praise. Other comments about the bullets coming our way?
 - w) [NO COMMENTS]
 - x) KS: Since the discussion seems to be pausing, with your permission we will take the promised 10 minute break. There will be snacks on the tables courtesy of the Executive Committee
- 8) General Education issues from the remaining proposals from the Task Force. This conversation will given almost the entirety of the second hour of the meeting, which will end at 3:30 or sooner rather than the usual 3:00 pm time.

- a) K SMITH: Thanks to our colleagues on the Executive Committee for that break. Thank you all for your work today. We will continue to discuss general education for a substantial portion of the April meeting, but let's see how far we can get today. I'd like to make a couple of contextualizing remarks. The purpose of general education is obviously for the benefit of students. There are lots of ways to theorize that. Students certainly sometimes think that it's not the central purpose of their education. But I think many of us would say that a major or professional education becomes a university education with the fullness and cultural perspectives of general education. General education makes a university education. General education makes a person educated. It is for the purposes of students, their families, and their communities, and our communities going forward. We need if at all possible to look for a 5-10 year period in which a great deal of work may be expected of us, especially if there may be changes or renewals that we will be giving of our limited faculty service for maintenance of general education. We need to believe in it. Nobody needs to spend the next part of our careers being bitter about their work. So we need to go quickly and slowly at the same time. We need to do our best to keep our colleagues from feeling that somebody used this for a budget grab. It seems to me that all our students will benefit if we do general education well and will take that into their personal and civic lives. They will be better in their work and their professions. There is a less discussed benefit of general education, and that is the more clearly we can make room for as many of our disciplines as possible, to make that opportunity, that those of us who enjoy teaching in general education will say that they are interested in teaching students, interested in interdisciplinary work, interested in formative work with young adults, but grateful for the acknowledgement that their discipline has a role to play in that multiperspective experience of general education. So as many of us as possible who are made to feel that there is a proper place for our disciplines, not just a sinecure, that make general education something we believe in, more than a theoretical construct, we can see how what we contributes adds value without being the whole. We understand the partialness of what we each contribute. I propose a theoretical construct, that we should not remove from the curriculum any disciplines lightly. There needs to be a very good reason to remove a discipline from the general education curriculum. If we're going to believe in it together and work in it together we need to find a way to feel our discipline is playing a role. We want as many people to feel ownership of this curriculum as possible. With that in mind I'd like to ask the question that I've already put to the EVCAA, and that is: part of the opportunity for interdisciplinary work, cross-cultural work, in innovative general education programs could be augmented on our campus if we get over a barrier to enable team teaching without somebody having to go without credit for a semester and then get paid back later in an awkward and uncertain way. If we could make team teaching systematic and normal so that there are more opportunities for more people. Even in disciplines where it's not so easy to find turf, there would be more opportunity for people to share the ownership and the creative progress of general education. I asked the EVCAA about the spirit and practicality of that, I would like to for a moment let her say what she thinks.
- b) A RUSNOCK: Could we hear from Lyle and table this for now in the interest of time? Until we know what the task force says and how we respond we don't really know what sort of team teaching options are possible. That will help the vice chancellor better understand the possible scenarios and what we're trying to get at. It's like asking her to talk about something beforehand, and if we had something more concrete that would help.
- c) K SMITH: I think the vice chancellor will say in about 45 seconds that she thinks it's possible.
- d) J JOSEPH: I have done it in the classroom. I have shared the classroom with my fellow faculty, and I have done it from the perspective of the one who is responsible for the scheduling. I think we should not be constrained by the way we have to record the workload. I note we already have for performing arts and other disciplines we have a way to allocate work time for the faculty that are not dependent on the credit hours of the students. So I believe we have models of how to do that. We should not let our worry that it will not be honored from thinking about general education in a way that we can offer team teaching or co-teaching in the process. We should honor team teaching.

- e) KS: With that in mind I would like to honor Prof. Rusnock's suggestion by turning to the question of the common core. The task force has summarized for us the feedback and I believe you all have it in front of you now. On the first page, in bold, common core, it says that a few departments had no preference, most expressed preference ...
- f) L ZYNDA: They don't have that. That's the half yellow sheet.
- g) SPEAKER: Some of us have that.
- h) KS: I'm sorry I thought it had been passed around. In any case it's the first paragraph on the screen. A few departments have no preference about the common core, many were interested in draft plan 1 or draft plan 2. Draft plan 1 is what we currently have. In that sense many departments expressed an interest in what we already have.
- i) LZ: Shall I go through the PowerPoint?
- j) KS: Not yet. One school has urged for substantial reduction in the core curriculum. and I would like to open a brief discussion of this by making one additional point: the core curriculum is the only place in the general education world, as it now stands or might stand through our decision, where for the time being we can expect there not to be poaching from online offerings at other campuses. These are courses we create. They bear the mark of the creativity of not only the people who design the general education but so many of you who have made these courses. If our gen ed is to bear the marks of the faculty and their creativity this may be the last place that it stands. So the question of this faculty's advice to the task force for gen ed is what I would like to have a few minutes of conversation.
- k) SPEAKER: About the core?
- l) KS: About the common core.
- m) D SURMA: Why do we have a common core, do you remember the historical purpose?
- n) KS: If there is anybody from the last task force I would yield to them. If no one is available I am willing to give it a try.
- o) SPEAKER: Give it a try and we'll tell you if you're right.
- p) KS: This is a world that will not be addressed without interdisciplinary methods, without awareness of different cultures, without awareness and practice in different kinds of research, communication, analyses, and skills. These core courses explicitly set out to give people experiences in all these areas across the university curriculum in those four areas. They are not narrowly disciplinary. They are not even disciplinary in the sense that "social sciences" will have this, they are more interdisciplinary than that. They are an attempt by this faculty to say that people need to have that kind of training and experience, and to grapple with problems that won't be solved by one perspective.
- q) DS: Isn't that just as applicable now if not more so?
- r) KS: I have my answer, and that's yes. But other people?
- s) M HECK: As a member of that committee, I think we were forward thinking, in that we were talking about what many of us are dealing with now with service learning. How do we want to prepare these human beings who walk out of our doors with diplomas into a world that is interdisciplinary. We want our students to leave as participants in a world of learning. The real world is interdisciplinary.
- t) KS: Other thoughts about the common core and what it means at this point?
- u) K RITCHIE: We have to not only demonstrate the interdisciplinary component we also have to show we're integrating some of those fundamental literacies in the class as well. That's another way of getting fundamental literacies within a context of content not in a specific course section. That is a very important part of that concord.
- v) KS: One thing I think is wise about what you just said is that sometimes we think that vital things can be learned through a brief inoculatory experience. If people could have 14 weeks of "x" they will have it. But actually we're saying, for example, critical thinking and writing are things that must be practiced. That is a very fine insight in the gen ed program.

- w) M TETZLAFF: Another aspect of the common core process is dealing with large ethical questions which rarely are encompassed by one silo of knowledge. Such as when I teach environmental history and we look at the scientific, spiritual, and social science aspects.
- x) KS: Other advice to the task force about the common core?
- y) SPEAKER: HLC seemed to appreciate the common core and indicated that it resonated with them. They appreciated what it stood for.
- z) KS: Although the task force recorded that at least one unit responded that we should have just one of these four courses I am not currently hearing a defense for reduction of the common core. So let me ask it there is one. PAUSE. Hearing none I'd like to recommend the advice to the task force on that particular item. Lyle which of these would you like to do next?
- aa) LZ: Are you going to go through the whole PowerPoint?
- bb) KS: I'd like to go through them this way, focusing on particular elements.
- cc) LZ: I'd like to give you the results. Should we go through the components one by one?
- dd) KS: Just as we just picked one for feedback, I'd like to do that for another one.
- ee) LZ: Great.
- ff) KS: Okay, so strong support for this component was expressed by some departments. Others suggested keeping everything which implies support. Four suggested that we continue to revise, therefore keep, some version of this. Most departments favored removing it if something must be removed, in other words it was their least favorite. This next part is not clear to me so I'll ask a clarifying question: This removal response was shared by all units outside CLAS and the arts, in other words CLAS and the arts were substantially in favor of this?
- gg) LZ: No, they were divided.
- hh) KS: Okay, and Education did not speak against it.
- ii) LZ: That's correct.
- jj) KS: Okay, so we have a few minutes to give guidance to the task force with the hope that at some point in the near future instead of having multiple proposals we will have a smaller number to approach a vote. Visual literacy is one of the seven original fundamental literacies, to return to the question Dave asked, "why do we have it in the first place?" Joe?
- kk) J CHANEY: Originally it was that the world is becoming much more visual in terms of representations of ideas and on the Internet we live in a visual culture. Students should not only learn how to read those visual signs, but also to produce them.
- ll) KS: So the idea that worthy but mixed messages are coming to us at all times through visual media and that an educated person had better have some skills.
- mm) E BENNION: I remember in our discussions that this was always very controversial. I never felt that it was clear that there was a consensus, or that there was a majority, or just eventually people became worn down in terms of whether or not that component was significant. [INAUDIBLE]
- nn) JC: What happened was with the original conception was that one is both a maker and someone who is inundated by this.
- oo) KS: I say that I believe the question in front of us right now is whether this category of study is a fundamental literacy that we value. A secondary question down the road is the maker component. I don't think we have time for that today.
- pp) J WELLS: I think the maker component stems from exposure and understanding of visual communication, I've never taught one of these courses so I don't have any skin in the game ...
- qq) KS: Let's not discuss that component yet.
- rr) JW: Nevermind
- ss) KS: Your point is well taken but we need to figure out whether the category is prior to the component of the category.

- tt) V BLOOM: I want to know the difference between visual literacy and making visual materials. I think any kind of literacy you hope, whether it's text or not, should be a lot better than just critical analysis and thinking about it.
- uu) KS: So you're in favor of the category?
- vv) VB: No, actually, not as it is here. I don't think you can only define creation as literacy either.
- ww) KS: So, I'd like to repeat that we're considering the category, not the subset of whether the courses should have a making component.
- xx) SPEAKER1: My question is how do we define this literacy currently? If we recommend keeping it or refurbishing it in several ways what would that mean?
- yy) SPEAKER2: Yes, those are retrievable
- zz) SPEAKER1: Yes, it would be nice to have those in front of me. Then we could respond to that with clear ideas about what it was. Without the document we're focusing on items without a clear definition of what they mean.
- aaa) KS: Apart from invoking the question of making, is there anybody who could provide a clarification of the original category.
- bbb) L CHEN: You could look at the original information on the General Education website. Then if you wanted further clarification you could look at the proposal forms created by faculty, for when you want to submit a course to fulfill the visual literacy requirement. That is online.
- ccc) L ZYNDA: Look at the gen ed page for how to apply for a gen ed proposal and it will list all the fundamental literacies and everything else and tell you all the definitions that there are.
- ddd) KS: Okay are there any other clarifications of the category right now?
- eee) J FEIGHERY: Students should be able to demonstrate critical thinking in creation context by identifying cultural, historical, and social factors pertinent to the production of visual artifacts. Demonstrate appropriate vocabulary of formal visual qualities, narrate composition, contrast style and expressive potential. Critically analyze visual artifacts from their role in communication of ideas. Produce or critique visual media such as photographs, sculpture, video, film, or other visual means.
- fff) KS: So it's a massive body of cultural material that surrounds us at all times that is sometimes propagandist and we need critical skills to deal with.
- ggg) M HECK: The fact that this is a literacy that has been debatable and people want to get rid of, speaks to the reason to keep it. This is something that the General Education committee has talked about in several iterations over the years. We need to have a conversation to understand it more. We should do a better job of explaining it.
- hhh) C SCHULT: At the open sessions for gen ed discussions, this came up. Some of the people from the arts that were there realized that their courses could fit very easily into the critical thinking area. So keeping in mind that we shouldn't be removing departments from the gen ed could we possibly invite the visual literacy courses into other areas of general education?
- iii) KS: Is there a direct answer to that question?
- jjj) J CHANEY: This is something we've always encouraged, no discipline is barred from developing a course. There may be people who have something to contribute to that area.
- kkk) KS: I think next is in the back there.
- lll) SPEAKER1: If I could just simplify, perhaps at the risk of being too simple, if we were to encapsulate visual literacy into a phrase, "the more you know, the more you see," so therefore what you know is all about visual analysis. We are bombarded by visuals day in and day out. If there's ever a time to need visual literacy and if our students have a need, it's now.
- mmm) SPEAKER2: I'd also like to add onto that, especially from a civic angle, an example is that students feel we shouldn't remove Confederate symbols because people are simply offended. Visual literacy helps them understand what this actual statue really represents in the context in which it was created and what it does stand for. It's a huge thing beyond just critical thinking but how these visual things create structure and pressure in different ways.

- nnn) B KERN: I'm from Business, where we did the 18 hours. For the professional schools there is a real issue with regulatory requirements for what students need to take. That they are mandated to take. Plus they have to fit them in 120 hours. So all I want to let people know is that I sat on the general education task force for quite a while. We've got choices we have to make. Currently in Business the only way accountants can graduate in 120 hours is that three courses overlap with general education. There are important choices to be made, we can't just add to make a gen ed that makes everybody happy in the way we have. We can't just say we will keep this, add this, and add this. We will present problems for our students. If you add up all the majors and students in the professional schools, it may be over half the students on campus. These are real issues and hundreds of students, and we are operating with real constraints. As we have these discussions keep in mind that we have to find a way to find what's important to the body and get that into our gen ed. If there are things that fit in that don't create creep that's important to hundreds of our students.
- ooo) KS: I think everything you said is true. Although I think we're looking at a category that already exists. So it would add nothing to the gen ed.
- ppp) BK: But there are other new things that people also want.
- qqq) KS: I understand.
- rrr) BK: And there was the request to lower the credit hours in English, so that implies you need to prioritize what you want.
- sss)KS: We will be voting on that.
- ttt) BK: Yes, I'm just putting that out there.
- uuu) KS: Absolutely, and one thing I respect about B&E in this discussion is that I've heard multiple times that you all are doing work to reduce the load of coursework in some or all of your majors so that it isn't as tight. I think that's a great thing. The load of B&E coursework, not gen ed coursework.
- vvv) C SOFHAUSER: I want to dovetail on what Beth brought up. For instance in visual literacy courses you see nursing data analysis, it's a stats course that our RN and BSN take. Currently that is considered a visual literacy course [INAUDIBLE CROSSTALK] But my point about that is going to be that when we look at visual literacy in a broader sense, courses may be able to fit under it. What I'm getting concerned about is if the HLC says you must have these learning outcomes, when I look at the four learning outcomes for visual literacy I'm not so sure that we would have a course that would possibly fit if we must meet all four of those learning outcomes to meet the gen ed requirements. So I think it's going to be harder for the professional schools to be able address the general education when we add those very specific outcomes because as I read this one point it says that the syllabi for the sections of the course will have the appropriate general education outcomes clearly identified in the syllabus. Now I don't know exactly what, does that mean all ...
- www) KS: Every single section.
- xxx) CS: Therein lies a problem when I look at visuals. [INAUDIBLE CROSSTALK]. Okay, that may be a problem, that's what I'm saying. How many courses may fall by the wayside when enforcing those learning outcomes?
- yyy) KS: Please understand that those SLOs have been in public for the last 20 minutes
- zzz)CS: I know that it is just a draft. I'm not saying that this is what we're going to eventually have. But the point is that we have to be very careful when we think about the professional schools.
- aaaa) KS: Okay, it's 3:24. I'd love us to try to give any remaining advice about visual literacy to the task force in the remaining couple of minutes.
- bbbb) B BALTHAZAR: It seems odd we are starting this conversation with general education and not the curriculum throughout the university in different departments. Some have greater expression and stakes in general education. A lot of these problems are being foisted on gen ed which seems misplaced.
- cccc) L CHEN: I'm doing some detailed analyses of how many sections of gen ed classes are offered and who is teaching them. Most visual literacy classes are FINA-A109. In the last four years, ending this

Spring (FA14 to SP18), there were 80 sections of this course offered in those four years, and 73 of those sections were taught by adjunct faculty. Use the information as you will, but that is the reality of who's been teaching A109 over the last few years.

dddd) J JOSEPH: It comes down to us taking ownership of something that's very important. The data being presented over who is teaching our general education is telling. About 74% of our 100-200 courses are taught by part-time instructors or lecturers. We don't want these discussions to be about protecting classes or people being nervous about losing our faculty. We want these discussions to be about the outcomes for our students, that as a campus we can all agree upon. Which comes through the gen ed in addition to our regular majors. Keeping that focus helps us to have a conversation. What I'm saying is that we fight for it but we aren't doing it, and then we have sort of a transient come and teach it so that students can fulfill it to check a box. It is important that you all grapple with this, but let's not be sour about something that is very important, around the gen ed. We fight for it, but how do we engage in it on a daily basis. How important is it to us when we confront our students and ask them to become better because they've come to IU South Bend? That is crucial. This is an example of a good struggle because it's making us think outside the box, can we fit visual literacy into things we are already doing in our classes? Or do we want to have it all fall into A109 as a specific class and have people coming through every semester teaching it? That's a question we have to ask.

eeee) KS: Thank you.

ffff) E BENNION: It's interesting when we think about visual literacy we immediately think of marketing and how visual images are used to appeal to people. Or financial literacy and how charts and graphs are helping people make sense of numbers. I also wonder, how do we think about general education? Is it that every school and department offers it? Or in especially liberal arts college settings, and some regionals as well, there is this liberal arts core that is the gen ed and then the professional schools and majors are layered outside of that. It seems that's not the way we see it here.

gggg) KS: I think there are courses outside of liberal arts already in existence.

hhhh) LC: We have a general education task force that has been working diligently, I mean really diligently for 3 1/2 years. They have found out everything they could about the national state of gen ed around our country. They've gone to workshops. They've met every two weeks. They've met with faculty groups of all sorts from academic units. They've done surveys. They've mined written comments. It would be nice if we could let the task force that's worked so hard on all this give us a sense of what they've found from all we told them. Right now we're all sitting here, not even a majority of the faculty, we have 300-400 faculty and some people don't have time to come to this meeting. The gen ed task force made it a point to have open discussions about the state of gen ed and what form we want, and they've been doing it for two years and I think it behooves us to give our colleagues the opportunity to tell the rest of the faculty what we all said collectively and individually, and whatever recommendations they've developed so that we can discuss them.

iiii) KS: At the moment we're doing them one at a time.

jjjj) SPEAKER: I'd also like to know, since we've done this research, we've made all this effort, do they save some input into this process? I'd like to know for example, who else has similar categories? Is this particular to us? Are we visionary because we have visual literacy? I'd like to get that context.

kkkk) [INAUDIBLE]

llll) LZ: Regarding visual literacy, as we've discussed in open forums, it's a requirement, on the other hand we have this real need to compress and reduce things. When we had the open forums a lot of people who teach it thought we could have critical thinking about visual media and that would be one way of including it in there. We thought that was a reasonable thing. Not every visual literacy class would have that happen. So that's one concrete way. Also, whether you're for it or against it, visual literacy is kind of unique, no one else has it.

mmmm) E ROTH: Lots of gen ed programs have visual literacy but it's not in LEAP. So it's not a literacy there.

- nxxx) LZ: It's not a LEAP learning outcome and if we have to make choices we have to listen to what our faculty say and what LEAP says and we do have to make choices about combining etc.
- oooo) JJ: In my experience, it exists but it tends to be about aesthetics and such. I think where we differ is in some of the doing. I would say that for the life of me I could not do it, but I could be taught, and I could be taught to appreciate what others can do. So I can see both sides. Our campus has a little extra with the doing, and I'm not saying yes or no, but it puts us in a bind.
- pppp) KS: We're going to quit very soon.
- qqqq) C SCHULT: All the fundamental literacies involve doing because it's a fundamental literacy. It's not a subset, it's an overarching thing. All of them are teaching not just to appreciate but to do. So the visual literacy doing part is because it is a fundamental literacy.
- rrrr) KS: That is correct.
- ssss) SPEAKER: I agree with the need to get feedback about what has been said. Reading this I don't really understand everything that's been said. It would be nice to see some of the hard data, the quantitative stuff. When I was at the forums I found a lot of us don't understand what the other courses do. For a lot of these courses we think well our students don't need that. But you don't really know what they're learning in there. I didn't know a lot about the writing program and English. As an S121 person, I found I had to explain S121 to a lot of people. There are misconceptions about how knowledgeable we are about our own general education.
- tttt) KS: Most of the April meeting will be available for general education discussion. This is a question, would you all advise the task force to have more publication of their findings in more venues before the next meeting?
- uuuu) J MCLISTER: So we've received feedback from all the different departments on the assumption that there's some sense of confidentiality. So being able to share the numbers might require some agreement from the various departments.
- vvvv) A RUSNOCK: We have had a good job of open forums. The big call was to get everybody together at one time, a Friday afternoon when most of us could make it. To have them do smaller meetings again is spinning our wheels. We've tried it. We need to have a bigger discussion if possible. I think we also need to think about their time and the onus it puts on them when we were supposed to be discussing a lot of this today. I feel they've done their duty.
- wwww) J MATTOX: I appreciate this type of venue. I sympathize that it's a lot of PowerPoint. We've talked about visual literacy for 15 minutes, and I think that's necessary and good. So I appreciate the ability to do that. I know there are a lot more slides and I know we are all shuddering because that means at this rate how many more meetings will it be? But we've got to talk about these things. We've got to find out the detail. I appreciate that we do slow down.
- xxxx) KS: Okay, the bulk of the April meeting will continue this discussion. Most of the handouts you've had today are the fruits of Lyle and the task force and I am very grateful for them. It is true that as a group we have not addressed all of the materials they prepared. I apologize for that. I don't know how we could have done. If the task force feels the April meeting will be sufficient for the next four weeks, or if they want to publish materials, or if you want to reach out to the task force to tell them what you want I urge you to do so.
- yyyy) AR: Then that discussion really needs to be the bulk of the meeting. My understanding is that it was to be so today but was not. So if we are going forward with that we must make sure it is the bulk of the meeting.
- zzzz) KS: I respect the feeling that it might have seemed there was a lot of prologue today. It was a judgement call on my part and I respectfully disagree.
- aaaa) AR: Lyle, could you send out those materials?
- bbbb) LZ: Sure. I'll put it all on Box early next week.
- cccc) LC: There will be a link on the gen ed reform web page.
- dddd) [INAUDIBLE]

eeeeee) KS: Okay, we're almost done. It's time for announcements.

9) Announcements.

- a) G KERN: Friday, April 6 is the Midwest SOTL Conference.
- b) E BENNION: Tuesday at 6pm in this room there will be another candidate debate. The top three Democrats running in our Congressional district hoping to challenge Jackie Walorski in the fall. There will also be overflow rooms, and you are welcome to stay for a reception with the candidates afterward. There is also information on the American Democracy Project's Facebook page, no login is necessary.
- c) T WILLIG: Thursday at 7pm in this room the History Club will be showing the movie Excalibur. All are invited.
- d) K BAILEY: Next week, on Wednesday, in this room, the Sustainability and Innovation series will host the chief innovation officer for the City of South Bend, and Sam Centellas from La Casa de Amistad will share the stage.
- e) M TETZLAFF: Next Thursday, 7pm in Education and Arts Lecture Hall, the Lundquist Lecture by April Lidinsky: "Truth-Telling as a Feminist Act"
- f) E ROTH: Two events in April, this time in Education and Arts. On April 11 is a fabulous lecture by Dr. Aaron Magnan-Park, of University of Hong Kong, will be presenting on Whitewashing in Hollywood Films. On April 13 we have a horror writer named Michael Arnzen, winner of four Bram Stoker prizes.
- g) V BLOOM: The next meeting of the Veterans Book Club will be Wednesday, April 4 at 5:30 in the Schurz Library 3rd floor conference room to discuss War is a Force that Gives Us Meaning by Chris Hedges.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:40PM