Indiana University South Bend

Academic Senate meeting – April 24, 2015. Wiekamp 1011, 1:30 pm.

Attending:

1. Call to order at 1:33

2. Approval of minutes
   27 March 2014
   Motion to approve, seconded, approved.

1. Committee Reports

A. Common Questions for Student Evaluations Task Force
   • Yuri Obata: [post the handout]: Gave a presentation on the two months of work on recommended questions. Collected information from multiple sources, as described in the handout. Received comments on feedback from many individuals on campus. There are 7 very general questions, and each unit/department can add additional information. Discussion of rationale of each questions. Rating scale is 5 points; some discussion of whether we need a midpoint to provide a neutral point. Questions:
     o Carolyn Schult: Please include Oxford commas consistently.
     o Anurag Pant: 3 and 5 are compound questions that ask more than one point.
     o Gretchen Anderson: 3, 4 and 5, you’re asking multiple things in these questions. Are students going to be able to interpret this, and will the their answers be clear to us?
     o Beth Kern: From the instructor’s point of view, it’s not clear what we should fix, if we get negative feedback on one of these in compound questions.
     o Joe Chaney: similar challenge in 4; this could affect people coming up for tenure.
     o Gwynn Mettetal: Wondering what people think is the better thing to do – to turn these into individual questions, or do we prioritize and simplify these, and bring out the details within each unit?
Carolyn Schult: Another idea: use the word “overall” at the start of each questions. Also – ask for individualized responses in a box after all questions? Or just at the end.

Johnnie McIntosh: We’re developing this; there might be room to write additional comments after each one.

Julio Hernando: Concern about number 1; are we assuming that students know and understand our teaching methods are?

Gail McGuire: if “3” on the scale is really neutral, label it clearly.

Anurag Pant: could we have two reverse coded items? Better methodologically? Gwynn Mettetal: No; not for tenure.

Scott Opasik: it looks like these aren’t quite ready to be approved

Johnnie McIntosh: We can pilot these in the summer; these need to be finalized in December.

Scott Opasik: We’ll send this back to committee and bring it back for approval in the fall.

Schimmerigk: What’s the directive to the committee? Do we agree that compound questions are problematic? General: YES.

Gary Kern: Could the committee rewrite the compound ones as more general and we could test0drive those this summer?)

Nancy Colborn: There may be ways that the product can offer individualized responses to multiple questions.

Joe Chaney: Another way to revise: choosing one word that students are likely to understand number 3: Fair.

Susan Moore: #6 is nebulous. What do we want to know? We need to figure that out and revise question accordingly

Gail McGuire: Will students understand what constructive feedback means. Maybe “helpful” feedback is better? General: “useful” -- That might be better.

Pant: It’s hard to write these by consensus. We need 2-3 people who are willing to help us before fall.

Obata: Do we need approval for the floor for the pilot program

Johnnie McIntosh: It’s not necessary but wouldn’t be bad to have approval for the pilot; we’ll be working with a committee.

Jeff Wright: I’m concerned about what a piloting for those coming up for tenure.

Johnnie McIntosh – only tenured and volunteers will do the pilot.

Gail McGuire: Did we look at other university’s tools? Surely other universities have figured these out. Committee: We looked at many.

Mettetal: Reminder: these are just a small number of general questions to use across the campus for trends; individual units will develop more detailed questions. Do keep that in mind.

Pant: Did the committee do any factor analysis on existing data by school? Answer: No.
• EVCAA: Michelle Bakerson is not here but emailed about compound questions. I’ll have her send that response and suggestions to the committee. Scott Opasik: She did send that already.

Scott Opasik: I thank the committee; they worked in a short amount of time.

B. Budget Committee
• Takanashi and Rusnock: We don’t have a lengthy presentation; we’re here to report back on what we’ve learned and what we presented. We will not be doing into a lot of detail about the revised budget

• We’re here to provide broad strokes. In the February meeting presentation, we’d done only half of the work; we’d calculated the cuts, but not what needs to be added. We wanted to discuss the strategic initiatives. What the committee would like to recommend to the exec committee and campus leaders is that we have a committee to centralize these discussions. It’s difficult for the budget committee to keep a pulse on everything when we’ve mostly only seen the cuts side. Cuts are an ongoing process, so how do we balance the need to cut and the need to add?

• When we looked at the additions that were approved, we had no problem with them. The additions are geared toward increasing enrollment and retention. How do we balance saving and spending – perhaps a committee could look at all of these, including looking at academic personnel, looking at the strategic initiatives, campus directions, etc., and try to cross-reference all the information to see if we can do all these things at the pace things are happening now.

• Questions: J Hinnefeld: One approach would be to take a fresh look at the charge of the Campus Directions committee. What you’re describing sounds like the charge of the Campus Directions committee. [General agreement.]

• Scott Opasik: Thank you to the budget committee

4. Other Reports
A. Campus Procedural Update Committee (Student Code Procedures)
   Laura Whitney (attach handout?) Quick overview of who is on the committee (PN Saksena, Doug McMillan, Scott Opasik, Carol Massatt). We built a new charge to implement in 2014-16. Our procedures hadn’t been updated since 2007. There was confusion from faculty and students about our process. The language has changed from Judicial Affairs to Student Conduct. We started meeting Fall 2014; we met every two weeks for a year. We found best practices and other models; we looked at IUPUI’s procedures because they were most recent in IU, so we knew what General Counsel had approved. Jan and February we sent out surveys; in March, we started drafting. Today, we’re presenting on feedback, and then we’ll talk about next steps.
Feedback: better readability, clear and concise instructions, clear expectations of faculty and students; marketing and education needs to be increased.

Discussion of PPoint ([Posted underneath minutes] [Attach her PPoint])

Overall: We worked on both academic and personal misconduct focusing on clarity and readability. What we found when we walked through procedures, at the dean’s level, the dean had no ability to increase the sanction. We felt strongly that if an instructor didn’t assign an sanction, that the dean could increase the sanction. This is a new option. We clarified students’ rights, and the appeal criteria. The biggest change, and very intentional: We have to move from a “clear and convincing” model to a “preponderance of information.”

Next steps: Submission to legal counsel; approval by Board of Trustees, and then implementation and education. We’ll work with marketing on posters, online, tutorials, videos, brochures.

  • Dean Dunn: Great job; have we figured out how to handle online courses? If the student is enrolled in a course on another campus … LW: The campus hosting the course will be responsible.

  • Rusnock: Can the dean also reduce sanctions? What can the faculty member do? LW: when the dean reviews an appeal, they can send it to a department chair. Rusnock: What recourse does the faculty member have? Doug McMillan: it’s always been the case that when the dean reviews, the dean’s already been able to decrease it; if the faculty member disagrees, they’d go to the EVCAA.

  • Anurag Pant: If we allow deans to make it worse than the faculty recommendation, could that leave to the equivalent of “grade inflation”? Doug McMillan: Dean’s cannot dismiss students; LW: That would be me who can do this. AP: Then why give the dean the opportunity? LW: to level the playing field for student treatment. Doug McMillan: within a unit, they can have a hearing board.

Matt Shockey: Is someone looking at patterns of behavior in students? LW: Yes. MS: Is it the same procedure, that we’re filling out a form? LW: No, it would only come to me if you find them responsible. MS: what if I’m not quite convinced that someone’s done something wrong, but I want you to keep an eye on someone. LW: We don’t really have a Flag system for misconduct, but if you’ve sent me an email about a student, I can keep an eye on that if a student is called into my office. Joe Chaney: To clarify: there’s still a reason to report plagiarism, even if we’re not going impose a sanction? LW: Yes, it’s important that students learn from their behavior.

Anurag Pant: What’s the time commitment? LW: it depends on the faculty approach. Doug McMillan: You do the informal conference; if you find them guilty, it does to LW; at that point, when you meet with her, it’s done, unless students appeal, which can take
more time.

Larry Lambert: A positive aspect of this is that it offers a range of sanctions, from very
minor to more major.

Laura Whitney: Thank you for your time and support; the committee has been wonderful.

Scott Opasik: Student Affairs committee has looked at these and approved. Now, they’re
being brought to the Senate for approval.

SO: Motion to approve the personal misconduct procedures. Moved and seconded.
Discussion? Motion to close, made and seconded, none opposed. Motion: All those in
favor of accepting personal misconduct: passes with all ayes.

Motion to approved academic misconduct. Motion to approve the academic misconduct
procedures. Moved and seconded. Discussion? Motion to close, made and seconded,
none apposed. Motion: All those in favor of accepting academic misconduct: passes with
all ayes.

C. President’s Report
Scott: regional faculty council: Given an update on single articulation pathway for
associates degrees before a student transfers to 4-year campus. Document is on the Senate
website.

Working to coordinate study abroad trips among the regionals. Office of online
education will be making campus visits this spring. Chris Foley is new director of online
education; he’ll be here on June 2.

UFC meeting: Talked about various campus’ concerns; a number of regionals expressed
concerns about their budget and online education and faculty voice in that process. Also a
general discussion about Indiana House appropriation bill: Did away with educational
roundtable, and would give those to the Commission of higher education

Still haven’t received all committee assignment requests; if you haven’t sent yours in,
please send in your top three choices with the first starred. Thanked the executive
committee; Henry; filling all the committees; April for secretarial duties; thanking you
for your attendance and your work.

5. Administrative and Officer Reports

A. Chancellor Allison

I thank Scott for his leadership. So many events on campus today; a great time to
celebrate students, faculty, and staff. If you want a student featured in graduation, contact
Ken Baierl. I hope you will come to commencement.

Regional chancellors, like UFC, are very stressed about budget situation. We now start every year in deficit; we’re in a cutting mode. Our 5 million request to the legislature didn’t get into any house or senate version; it’s basically dead. I contacted many legislators to explain how underfunded we are, but it didn’t go anywhere.

Capital request: regionals requested 11 mill. We need more than the 4-5 million that it looks like we might get. We’re still actively looking for that money; there hasn’t yet been a final vote. Please contact assembly members if you like.

Space: Where are we? New map. Saw a group of education faculty holding an impromptu ceremony to say goodbye to Greenlawn Hall. When you return in the fall it will be gone. (General applause). Riverside Hall – Health and Wellness Center will be there, as well as providing opportunities for students (clinical lab science and radiography) and community there. Administration building: finalizing program for student success center and student service spaces. Still working on some shifts on second floor. Fine Arts; Concept is that we’ll expand space for student government and perhaps a cinema, coffee shop, etc. Finalizing plans for a sculpture studio; discussing bringing ceramics back, and moving printmaking there. Will probably tear down Club Landing after a flood.

Questions: Anurag Pant: Do we have cost estimates for all? CA: Yes. AP: Cost of repairs? $300,000 just for repairs. We did have money set aside to work on it; we’ll use that to tear it down. AP: longterm plans for the 2-acre plot? CA: Not exactly. For housing, it’s a desirable space … no real plan now. AP: plans for engineering? CA: No.

Enrollment: good news for fall; doing well for first-time freshman. We hope our expanded marketing is working. Admits are up. Students applying are more qualified. Students of color applications are up 20%; reaching a wider pool, also up are high SAT and honors students. Still projecting fairly flat enrollments (graduating a lot). This fall, welcoming new athletic teams and entering bicentennial campaign.

Finally: Next Week, first Chancellor’s Professor lecture, Mike Keen on April 28th. Worked on a number of projects over the year. We have excellent nominations this year. Announcing second chancellor professor, Professor Jerry Hinnefeld. (Sustained applause.)

Questions? Joe Chaney: Mike’s Talk?: April 28, 7 pm in EA 1011.

Anurag Pant: Flat enrollment? CA: Enrollments down in transfers and students who are not new freshmen beginners; doing well in new admits, but going down in working adult students. Housing should be full, but we’re graduating a lot of students; have smaller junior and senior classes coming in.
Thank you and have a great summer.

**B. EVCAA Joseph**

Good afternoon; I have two big things. I’m giving out some awards, and then sharing a revised and revamped freshmen orientation.

Yesterday, James Houghton was given merit status for associate faculty. Jay VanderVeen has been selected for the Herman Frederic Lieber Memorial Award, an IU-wide award.

Two awards: First for outstanding work and scholarship; Distinguished Research Award to Micheline Nilsen. And the 2015 Eldon Lundquist Fellow: Dave Vollrath.

Thanks for your patience and understanding this year; I’m glad I have a chance to learn; we had a good year. Have a good summer.

**Orientation:** Rick Denney and Ezella McPherson on new orientation. More faculty volunteered for summer orientation than we expected; we found the money to support everyone.

Orientation has been a full-day experience. We’ve enhanced the experience this year: 2-part approach; 8 full-day events for new students. 3½ day programs for transfers. More programs for non-traditional students and veterans. Smaller numbers, more personal attention. Capping them at 150. Morning session: welcome and remarks from administration, ice-breakers. Parents will have separate orientation program. Discussion in the Grill. Lunch. Afternoon – on building schedule and registration. Optional campus tour and housing visit.

Questions? None.

**6. Announcements:**

After meeting, if you’d like to stick around; representative is here from IUB on transitioning us away from OneStart to One.IU.edu Very student centered system

Lidinsky: showing of *The Hunting Grounds* on April 28; Vollrath: AAUP: Meeting at May 4 at 6 pm to wrap up this year and make plans for next.

Tuesday May 5 is give local day; raising money for two scholarships. Direct link will be on Daily Titan.

7. Adjournment Moved and seconded. 3:14 pm.

Respectfully Submitted, Senate Secretary April Lidinsky