Indiana University South Bend
Academic Senate Minutes –
February 28, 2015
Wiekamp Hall #1001
1:30 p.m.

In Attendance:

1. Call to order – 1:33

2. Approval of minutes of 21 November 2014 and 23 January 2015 meetings
November minutes: Motion to approve made and seconded. January minutes: Motion to approve made and seconded.

3. Campus Campaign
   Dave Vollrath gave a report; thanking the Chancellor for the refreshments. Hoping to broaden participation up to 15%. Perhaps begin with a $5 payroll deduction per pay period. Tracey Anderson on tax benefits if you itemize deductions. Need to use a CC40 Indiana College Credit form. [Can also take advantage of inheritance taxes.] Showed Campus Campaign video on the power
of scholarships.

4. Committee Reports

a. Athletics (Kelcey Ervick)

Report on the decision to support the Chancellor’s recommendation to add Holy Cross’s baseball team. Jan. 29 meeting with EVCAA Joseph on behalf of the Chancellor; Athletic Director Steve Bruce was there, too. Bruce presented financial statistics and Q and A. See “Senate Committee Actions” at the end of these minutes.

Time-sensitive; he committee only had a ½ hour to make a decision; EVCAA asked for our blessing. Committee said “Yes?” Then: Yes. Athletic Committee asked to pass along concerns; adding a women’s team to keep aligned with Title IX. Was this in the budget? Also, the opportunity hinges on a sweet deal with a particular person, a coach who is willing to be paid not much and do quite a bit of fundraising. Athletic Committee concerned that this was a lot to ask of a part-time person and may not be fair/transferrable to another coach. Better to be more institutionalized. Further concerns: After the EVCAA left, we generally think the expansion could be good, but worry that it will cost more than it benefits us. Also, the Committee would have liked more time to process the information and fully understand the numbers. Nevertheless, the committee did offer support. Binding? That’s for you to say.

Opasik: Reminder that committee recommendations are binding at the Senate unless formally overruled. Secretary will include in the minutes any decisions. No committee action becomes policy until published in minutes and passes without alteration of the action. Unique situation; the committee was put in a tight spot, but they made a recommendation.

Discussion: Ken Smith: I can’t tell if the figures are based on the emergency meetings and/or also take into account of the other expenses are included; can’t tell if expenses for a practice field are included, etc.

Chancellor: All finances refer to a men’s baseball team. If we added women’s softball, you could expect a similar cost and revenue. This program all based on concept that these students would not come here otherwise. This has been tested a couple of ways. For ex: no students already on campus responded to the opportunity to try out for golf and cross-country. The cost of facilities is figured in. There are legitimate concerns about pay, but college coaches do it for the love of the sport. Ken Smith: Concern that the meeting happened at the last minute in a crisis mode. Chancellor: Meeting was a regularly scheduled meeting, not an emergency meeting. Time concern was getting students to apply in time -- To my knowledge, 15 of the 19 students from the Holy Cross team have applied; we believe we can field a team in the fall.

Andrea Rusnock: Will we be keeping track of the numbers to see if this
meets the expected revenues.

**Chancellor:** Sure – we do this regularly with all our teams. Our conjectures are based on the record with Holy Cross.

**Ilan Levine** – if this is so good as a revenue builder, why is Holy Cross dropping it?

**Chancellor:** Their lower numbers and increasingly female student population means this is no longer strategic for them. Title IX coordinator is looking at whether we need to add one or two women’s teams. This is a good thing – we’ll get new students who would not have come to the campus otherwise.

**Cathy Borshuk:** I’m curious about process. If the Athletics Committee had not recommended this, would the conversation be over about the team?

**Chancellor:** Ultimately, the Administration takes these as recommendations. We had made no commitments to players or coaches before the meeting with the committee

**Susan Moore** – Timeline for coming up with women’s teams?

**Chancellor** – Complex timeline for demonstrating compliance. Having a plan in play for fall of 2016 and 2017; we’d look forward to the Athletic Committee about recommendations for teams.

**Cathy Buckman** – to confirm the Chancellor’s numbers; we’ve admitted 15 transfers and 6 first-time students.

**Ilan Levine** – all the revenue is from tuition?

**Chancellor** – from tuitions and fees and housing (based on polls on who will live in Housing). **Ilan Levine** – scholarships included? **Chancellor** – yes.

b. **Budget Committee**

a. Presentation by **Kyoko Takanashi:** Faculty members expressed possibility to move into an executive session before discussion.

**Moved and seconded.** What does this mean? **Scott:** anyone who is not a faculty appointee will be asked to leave so we can have a frank discussion

**Benjamin:** What’s the nature of the sensitive information? **Kyoko:** Personnel.

**Vote:** In favor of a session: 50  Opposed. 11.

**Ilene Sheffer** – won’t you need Bill O’Donnell? **Scott:** we discussed this; no; this is more philosophical than nuts and bolts.

**Steven Gerencser.** motioned and second to keep discussion to 20 minutes. Passes, one opposed.

**Kyoko and Andrea Rusnock sharing podium:** Examining recommended cuts to meet the projected shortfall.
Summary of the Budget Hearings, looking at flat budget and 5%. Budget Committee did not know that not every unit was asked to make a 5% cut. The 5% cut would not have met the projected deficit. Current proposed cuts do not meet projected deficit. Cuts have already been made.

This year, Scott Opasik set up an open forum for Friday, Feb. 20 open forum for faculty and staff. Some complained this not advertised well enough. 26 people attended forum before we made recommendations

Conclusions from hearings: faculty and administration not seeing eye to eye on many issues, including where to make cuts, and whether or not we are in a budget crisis. Administration focusing on efficiencies. From faculty: efficiencies such as raising course caps are not wise for retention. Disagreements about perception of changing procedures without faculty knowledge. Faculty described perceived lack of transparency. Administration focusing on Academic Master Plan; faculty feel we’re focusing too much on new programs at the expense of existing programs.

Budget Committee tried to take both sides into account after the hearings. We could not make the deficit. We made recommendations about what to cut and not cut and recommendations for the future. Committee went through each area to see where the cuts were, and to see if they agreed (for ex, did not agree with big cuts to library budget).

At forum, a faculty member pointed to when a non-reappointment can be made for a lecturer; we’d already passed the dates for cutting currently filled lines.

Budget Committee’s recommendations don’t meet deficit. 1) Committee wondered if it’s possible to use some of the reserves strategically to take planned measures over the next 2-3 years for longer-term planning and realigning. 2) Official Budget booklet provided by O’Donnell has a timeline and the Budget Committee wants future meetings to be made by those guidelines, not in a hurry. 3) Concerns about procedural issues; wondered if existing Senate committees could be used for decisions since the budget affects so many faculty aspects. The Faculty would like more voice in this process. 4) Committee would like to receive regular updates about strategic initiatives for the future. Faculty would like more “big picture.” The Committee would like a follow-up from the Administration on the cuts. [Applause]
5 minutes for questions: **Lee Kahan:** Want to reiterate a concern: I attended the hearings and thank Scott for arranging and conducting them. I heard repeatedly that the budget cuts being taken out of Liberal Arts are out of alignment with the Academic master Plan and compromise the mission of the Liberal Arts. I share the worry that the budget cuts are being used to alter the mission of the campus – whether this is the intent or a by-product, it’s concerning (ie.the cutting of the French line; losing the French program is not just a budget cut, it’s a shaping of the curriculum in a way that is out of alignment of our mission). The budget should not drive the mission; the mission should drive the budget.

**Rebecca Brittenham:** I sat through the hearings and heard over and over a worry about cuts that will impact the quality of our teaching; if we are really in such a crisis that we have to raise caps in courses with our most vulnerable students, I’d like to hear about the administration making similar cuts.

A. **Rusnock:** we took notes on those courses that are on the table

S. **Gerencer** – Concern that the course caps recommendations are coming from high up rather than the units making decisions about their own suggestions about raising caps. A. **Rusnock:** We heard this; raising course caps feels like its coming from above, by fiat

Move to extend by 10 minutes. Moved and seconded.

B. **Balthasar** – Not all departments asked to make the 5% cut. Not everyone gave the 5% cut.

EVCAA: There were difficult decisions to be made about the cuts. Doesn’t make sense to bring forward a budget cut we couldn’t support. We asked the deans to ask tough questions. Ask me if you like; I did tell a few units did not have to make 5% cuts. I protected my deans from presenting on cuts that the university cannot support. A. **Rusnock:** Perhaps next year all the cuts must be reasonable. EVCAA: That was my intent.

B. **Balthaser** – What rubric are we using to be valuable? Lecturers are valuable, and we’ve been asked to let go a lecturer.

C. **Borshuk:** Question about bigger picture of positions and hires in general. I was on a search committee for a position that was changed from TTrack position to lecturer. The decision about that was never clear. That’s just one small piece in the bigger picture. You hear about non-
standard hires, about people being let go, about people not being hired
who were going to be … what’s the bigger picture?

Jerry Hinnefeld: Academic Personnel committee has the charge of focus
on expansion or contraction of faculty. We should consult with the
EVCAA and initiate discussion about how to make those processes and
decisions clearer. C. Borshuk - would be helpful to have the big picture,
all campus

Lee Kahan – Expanding on Benjamin’s point on how we assign value to
faculty. In last self-study we saw that not only did IUSB but also the
Board of Trustees approved funds for growing lecturers and cutting
contingent faculty. The university instituted processes of senior lecturer to
provide job security and development. We have a history of thinking
about lecturers as part of our faculty. I question the value of pitting one
faculty member’s value against another.

Proposal to extend session for 5 minutes. Moved and seconded:

Jeff Wright: having served on the Budget Committee for three years, I
want to say how much better the hearings are going. For the most part
people are now proposing legitimate cuts. On idea of transparency; I feel
I’ve been inundated by numbers about enrollment. I hear: yes, but these
aren’t real enrollment numbers … not trusting the numbers.
R. Brittenham – I have to speak against that in terms of what I heard at
the hearings. It’s not that we distrust the numbers but that we are
suspicious of the way the numbers are being used to steamroll us into
decisions by the administration. For example, you’re not making a
strategic decision about cutting positions if you’re just taking advantage of
people retiring or moving on to another job.

A. Rusnock: The committee was not in favor of cutting people in existing
positions.

Anarag Pant: Why don’t we dip into the reserves today to do what we
should have done 5 years ago to do a proper marketing of the university
and programs. Chancellor: Our proposal is to increase our marketing,
If you spend the reserve money, it’s gone.

Scott Opasik: The time has elapsed. Thank you to Budget Committee.

c. Nominating Committee
Nominations from the floor. Nominate Karri Wilson to replace Yuri
Obata’s name on Executive Committee. Closed nominations. Ballot
because there are some contested.
Faculty Academic Senate
Slate of Candidates 2015-2016

*all names are listed alphabetically

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the SENATE

Vice President  Lee Kahn (CLAS)
Secretary       Nancy Colburn (LIB)

At-Large Members (need 3)
  Catherine Borshuk (CLAS)
  Peter Bushnell (CLAS)
  Gail McGuire (CLAS)
  Kari Wilson (ARTS)

UFC Rep          Neovi Karakatsanis (CLAS)

FACULTY BOARD of REVIEW (need 5 members; majority must be tenured)

Anne Brown (CLAS)
Marsha Heck (EDUC)
Terri Hebert (EDUC; non-tenured)
Beth Kern (B & E)
Monika Lynker (CLAS)
Murlidharan Nair (CLAS)
Micheline Nilsen (CLAS)
Anthony Smith (CLAS; non-tenured)

PTR VOTING MEMBERS
  (need 2, one-year term)
Gary Kern (B & E; professor) – 1 year term
Jake Mattox (CLAS) – 1 year

  (need 3, two-year term; 1 must be professor)
Christina Gerken (CLAS) – 2 year
Ann Grens (CLAS) – 2 year
Julio Hernando (CLAS) – 2 year
Michael Lasater (ARTS; professor) – 2 year
Monle Lee (B&E; professor) – 2 year
Morteza Shafi-Mousavi (CLAS; professor) – 2 year

PTR NON-VOTING MEMBERS (need 2 for two-year term)
Sue Anderson (CHS; non-voting)
Leon Schjoedt (B&E; non-voting)

ATHLETICS (need 3 members)
Bill Feighery (CLAS)
Amy Gretencord (CHS)
Sharon Jones (CHS)
Jeffrey Luppes (CLAS)
Allison Stankrauff (LIB)

FACULTY MISCONDUCT REVIEW (need 3 members and 5 alternates; all must be tenured)
Peter Aghimien (B&E)
Peter Bushnell (CLAS)
d. Library Affairs Committee
   a. Scott Opasik: The latest version of the budget offered by majority House Republicans this week restores the funding for Inspire that Pence had aimed to cut.

5. Other Reports
   A. English Department (Lee Kahan)
      We’ve already had a chance to speak on our concerns.
   B. AAUP chapter 5 mins.
      Bill Feighery: for AAUP: Context of chapters nationally and in IU. Have 2 dozen members and growing. Each chapter responsible for general AAUP mission but also the mission of the campus. As the last ½ hour has shown, we’re concerned about faculty governance and priorities as far as the budget is concerned. Many of you signed a petition about the status of associate faculty; we’ll be talking with the Chancellor about this. Recent actions, discussed in Executive Session, go against the mission of the campus. Troubling rhetoric blaming faculty; unnecessarily adversarial position. Faculty morale is at all-time low from many faculty’s perspective – the growth in class sizes, cutting faculty positions, crisis budget mode … we believe faculty need a stronger voice. AAUP is a vehicle for giving the faculty a stronger voice. Meeting next Friday, March 6, DW 1190 noon-2 – anyone can attend (don’t need to be a member). Come for a short time if you can come. Questions: Cynthia Sofhauser: How is AAUP working in relation to the Senate? Bill Feighery: Good question: Goal is not to take over the Senate but to work with the Senate; AAUP can offer places for faculty to voice concerns. We would not work against the Faculty Senate.

C. UFC Report (Alison Stankrauff) (See full report in the “Special Section” at the end of these minutes.
   Alison Stankrauff – IUPUI meeting on Feb. 24
   a. Proposed Amendments to the Trustees Teaching Award

(Anne Massey, Associate Vice President for University Academic Planning and Policy) [ACTION ITEM]

(Professor John Applegate, Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs; Professor Michael Rushton, Director, Strategic Planning, Office of the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs)

Revision to TTA: changes will be posted on Senate page.

FAR: New reporting system under consideration. More customizable, etc.

Sexual Misconduct policy: Use of the preponderance of evidence standard. Amendment introduced at the meeting; policy and amendment accepted by the committee (not by the university)

**D. President’s Report** – Opasik: from Torstrick about Degree Maps; please go in and audit your degree maps and look for problems and ambiguities. Look through the public site. One.iu.edu

**6. Administrative and Officer Reports**

**A. Chancellor Allison**

Want to acknowledge that today’s is an important day for Notre Dame; IU sends good wishes to ND on the occasion of Theodore Hesburgh’s death.

We’ll offer institutional scholarships for Pokagon Band citizens; paying Indiana rates even if MI residence; scholarships available.

March 31 official naming of Vera Dwyer School; will be a big event. Have had lunches with donors and students; moving occasions. Thank the donors and faculty for students.

We already talked about baseball.

Had a productive discussion about space and adjacencies. First floor of Admin and NS followed by former cheese factory. New studios for sculpture and ceramics/print to be determined by architects. Hope to dress up areas along Lincolnway to improve the neighborhood.

Article in newspaper about flood in Club Landing: waiting to see what will happen to see if we can use that space.
$4 mill in this biennium to address issues in Northside. Asked for $11 mill more in next biennium; that will still not be enough.

I appreciated the budget hearing process. From committee’s report, I appreciate the focus on a long-term view. I’m looking at 5-year development as Applegate comes on Monday. Challenge of a 5-year plan: we don’t know about tuition increases. I agree that we cannot be in a crisis every year, but many public universities like ours in the Midwest are facing a demographic shift, losing 2% of high school population. On the other hand, we have a lot of adults and a low percentage of local adults have a degree; working with industries like the RV businesses to encourage working adults to get college degrees.

Part of reason for the gap is that we’ve been going down in retention, class size. Some numbers getting better (moe grad students). General message: retention, retention, retention. If we could retain enough to get 40% gradation rate, it would address budget gap. I know many of you are working hard on that. We’re going out to local employers, increased marketing budget substantially and employer and alumni testimonials; building athletics; collaborating with IUB to recruit international students; working with Ivy Tech. We’re doing just about anything we can think of to recruit now. Need faculty to think about how better to connect with K-12 in area to improved pipeline in the community. We have to increase the number of students.

In discussion, I heard a lot about small class size. Neither I nor EVCAA want mega class size or say you have to have X number of students in a class or else. But: looking at peer institutions, their average of classes over 50 is 6%. Our percentage? 3%. Average percent of classes under 20 for peers is 40%; 44% here. We’d need to make very small shifts in class size to be where our peers are, but those small shifts will make the difference. We’re not talking about 1,000 seat lecture halls. But we do need to make a shift.

Same thing for online education; one of the reasons for our revenue problem. Shipping money to other campuses at expense of a 1% raise to faculty. Students are actively seeking and enrolling in online courses.

Rusnock: Where do we rank in salaries with those peer insitutions? Chancellor: we’re in middle/upper. However, we are at the bottom of IU’s pay scale. But our full time faculty teach fewer students. There’s been an implicit tradeoff between salary and efficiency. I want to make this transparent.

Lee Kahan: Two things: Faculty becoming more involved with K-12 students. Often asked to do these outreach activities; we need more support and structure for these activities. Secondly: course cap issue: I’m willing to have the discussion about the necessity of raising caps in some areas. What I’ve seen is not strategic. We were asked to raise our caps to higher than those in peer institutions. Chancellor: need to look at what is your end result two weeks into
class. Look at final enrollment data and not just the caps. That’s a decision for departments. **Brittenham:** Speaking to course caps in writing courses – directly impacting the quality of instruction. Chancellor: I’ve never heard anyone ask to raise the cap to 25. If you have a cap of 25 but keep 20 two weeks in, that’s not 25 students. I’ve probably left you equally unsatisfied, but I appreciate your time.

**B. EVCAA Joseph** – No report

7. **Announcements – Jim Yocom:** replacing tech desks with some touch pads. **Laura Whitney:** Office of Student Conduct is hosting faculty groups on student code procedures. **Deb Marr:** workshop March 6 is Joys of Teaching – pacing of classroom. **Joe Chaney:** Next Thursday at noon in 3260 a Fulbright fellow will be on campus. If you’re thinking about Fulbright, please come. **April Lidinsky:** March 6 talk by FFTF Dawn Rutecki at noon in DW 2260; final night of Michiana Monologues is March 7 on campus.

6. Adjournment 3:25 pm Motioned, seconded and adjourned.

Respectfully submitted, April Lidinsky, Faculty Senate Secretary

**Special Section:** (reports from the Senate Athletics Committee and the UFC)

**A. Senate Athletics Committee**

Meeting Minutes

January 29, 2015

9:00-10:00 a.m.

SAC Meeting Room

Present: Steve Bruce, Kelcey Ervick (Parker), J.R. Shrader, Josh Wells

Vice Chancellor Jann Joseph attended the meeting on behalf of the Chancellor to discuss the opportunity to acquire Holy Cross’s baseball program for IUSB.

Steve provided detailed information about the facilities, budget, student-athletes, and coaches, and we had a fruitful discussion/Q&A. Vice Chancellor Joseph asked us directly whether or not we supported the expansion, and the present members generally offered support based on the information that we had and according to the terms that were presented.

We also asked the Vice Chancellor to share with the Executive Committee and Chancellor our questions on two key issues:

1. Title IX will probably require that if we start this program, we will have to fund a comparable women’s sport/team. Is this in the budget?
2. This opportunity hinges upon a particular person working at a particular pay and promising a relatively high level of annual fundraising ($20,000). Is it reasonable to expect this from a part-time position? We feel that the position needs to be more institutionalized so that if this person leaves, the position could be successfully filled at a comparable level without a significant increase in the budget.

After VC Joseph left, we reiterated our support of the expansion according to the terms presented, but we are concerned, not only about the two issues we raised with the Vice Chancellor, but also about whether everything will happen “as planned.” Will it end up costing more? Will all of the students come to IUSB who promised to come? Also, we would have liked to have been given the information from Academic Affairs before the meeting so that we could have more time to process our decision.

B. University Faculty Council Meeting Report to IUSB Senate - February 2015

The UFC met at IUPUI on Tuesday, February 24th.

Presiding Officer’s Business (President McRobbie):

Overall, the University did well with performance budgeting: there’s been $24 million given to the University in a two year budget from the state.

Proposed Amendments to the Bylaws of the Indiana University Faculty Council:

Thus, going forward, the UFC Executive Committee consists of 14 members: The President of Indiana University, the three Co-Chairs of the UFC (one from IUB, one from IUPUI, one from the regional campuses). The five other heads of faculty governance bodies are from the remaining regional campuses. Five members elected from the incoming UFC (2 by IUB, 2 by IUPUI, 1 by the Regionals).

Proposed Amendments to the Trustees Teaching Award:

There are two additional stipulations being added to the language of the award description.

They now read:

(a) “The Trustees Teaching Award (TTA) honors outstanding teaching during the previous academic year. Awardees and review committees (e.g., P&T committees) should not
construe that a TTA is sufficient evidence of sustained teaching excellence. Rather, a TTA represents one piece of evidence to include in the teaching section of a P&T or promotion dossier.”

(b) To induce broader participation, we ask that the UFC resolve that a waiting period of 2 years before awardees are again eligible.

We will make this available from the IUSB Senate website.

**Update on the Faculty Annual Report Task Force:**

The University is in formal consideration with two companies currently for a new annual reporting system. The company discussed at the meeting was Digital Measures. By all accounts it was reported as a vast improvement over the current FAR. It has the ability to find and automatically load people’s scholarly publications into their reports, generate CVs to campus web content and other sites, an intuitive interface. It also is reported to be customizable and have better reporting functions than the current FAR.

**Sexual Misconduct Policy:**

This was discussed at length. The point discussed was the use of the preponderance of the evidence standard (more likely than not) in determining responsibility. There was an amendment that addressed the standard/preponderance of evidence introduced. The concern in introducing the amendment was representative that some have that the Office of Civil Rights is pressing a standard of evidence upon Indiana University. The policy – and the amendment – were accepted.

**Bicentennial Strategic Plan Implementation:**

The Plan brings attention to the Trustees’ requirement that the University administration reports on progress toward implementing the strategic plan and that the administration is tracking progress through the Strategic Plan Assignments documentation. The importance here is to bring attention to specific assignments for faculty governance organizations or school or department faculties.

For regional campuses, there particular points of interest in its priorities – including ones that speak to student success, creating a community of scholars, catalyzing research, reimagining education, health science research and initiatives, building a prosperous and innovative Indiana, science and technologies research and initiatives, facilities issues, funding issues.

* The Bicentennial Strategic Plan Assignments will be posted on the IUSB Senate website.