**Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting, January 20th 2017.**

**Attending:**

Adaikkalavan, S. Anderson, Balmer, Barrau, Bennion, Bloom, Blouin, Borshuk, Bowyer, Brittenham, Bushnell, Castano-Bishop, Chaney, Clift, L. Collins, Curtis, Davis, Dielman, Dobrzykowsi, Dunn, Feighery, Froysland, Gerencser, Hakimzadeh, He, Hernando, Hinnefeld, Holland, Hottois, Jang, Jones S., Joseph J., Karakatsanis, Kolbe, Kwong, LaLime, Lambert, Levine, Lidinsky, Lisoni, Luppes, Lynn, McGuire, Merhi, Mettetal, Mociulski, Muniz Jo., Murphy, Nilsen, Oake, Opasik, Pant, Popescu, Quimby, Roth, Rusnock, Saksena, Schult, K. Smith, Sofhauser, Stankrauff, Suttman, Takanashi, Tetzlaff, Tourtillote, VanderVeen, Vlaeminck, Vollrath, B. White, Zwicker, Zynda L.

1. Call to order at 1:34 pm.
2. Minutes from the November 18, 2016 meeting were approved.
3. Opasik: New [online](http://institutionalmemory.iu.edu/aim/handle/10333/3376) [archive](http://blogs.iu.edu/senate/2017/01/23/a-better-senate-documents-archive/) of major Senate records has been created to maintain institutional memory and enhance search. This was done because often new software may not open some older documents. The new site also permits global search of all documents in one stroke. This new archive can be accessed via the library page or the senate blog. The senate applauded this work.
4. Ken: EVCAA has approved release time for Steve Gerencser for doing work on the updates of the IUSB Constitution and Academic Handbook and Doug McMillen from her office is also collaborating on this. These documents are going online, with all the review and updates. In the next meetings of the senate, there will be many sections presented that may require a vote, so please speak up if you disagree with anything you see.
   1. Gerencser: We want to take advantage of your leadership and are depending on the committees to provide their expertise. Please let us know if anything in your areas may be affect something in the academic handbook or vice-versa.
   2. Ken: The committees will hear from us occasionally for clarification. Thank you vice chancellor for this nice step forward.
5. The [nominations for elected positions](http://blogs.iu.edu/senate/2017/01/20/senate-elected-committees-slate-of-nominees-for-2017-2018/) for 2017-2018 were presented and accepted. In addition to this complete slate, there was one nomination from the floor of Eric Souter to the Board of Review. An election will be held to decide this.
6. McGuire: The launch of the Carnegie initiative will be held in the Civil Rights Heritage center. More than 90 persons have RSVPed, and we have no spots left. But please come if you can.
7. Karkatsanis gave the report from the University Faculty Council’s November 29th meeting.
   1. There was a two hours brainstorming session prior to the actual meeting to discuss Priority 2 of the Blueprint 2.0 to build a community of scholars across all regional campuses. The grand challenges projects was brought up as an example of faculty engaging across campuses.
   2. There were comments that this does not quite fit regional campuses as well as it does the larger campuses.
   3. There was also discussion of the substantive faculty presence policy being developed. More than just physically, there is also need to have faculty who are more metaphorically present and engaged on campus. There was a lot of time spent on what seems to be a breakdown of community on some campuses. There was much discussion to find a way to address this and this discussion will continue in the future.
   4. The formal meeting began with McRobbie’s presentation where he repeated his emailed remarks that IU has said repeatedly that it will not tolerate any form of intimidation or harassment. The Pomona declaration has been signed by over 500 university presidents (President McRobbie and Chancellor Alison have signed it as well) about DACA students and other topics from that meeting. It states among other things that DACA students are exemplary and that DACA should be upheld and expanded.
   5. In response to a question about whether IU would turn over DACA students’ information to government, McRobbie said that we do not collect any information that the government does not already own. He also said that we comply fully with the law.
   6. After that, there were three action items taken up. The first had to do with the completion of 100/200 level credits at other institutions. Any credits from this level from other 2-year or 4-year institutions can transfer to only the same level at IU. At 4-year institutions, departments and faculty do have some discretion. At 2-year institutions, it is automatic.
   7. The second item was the change to the Nepotism policy: Members of IU board of trustees should not recommend for employment at IU anyone with whom they have a familial relationship.
   8. The third item was changes to the Sexual Misconduct Policy:
      1. Clarifying language on non-consensual sexual contact and penetration.
      2. University can now make 3rd party complaints to police when the victim is not willing to do so. University now has the right to do this if it decides there is greater harm by not doing so. Efforts will be made to notify victims when this policy is invoked.
      3. Prior misconduct information from any campus may be brought to bear in any other campus incident.
      4. University can now also reopen any case that was previously considered closed in the event there was some new information.
   9. Lynn: Regarding 100/200 level transfer courses, was there any talk of articulation agreements?
   10. Neovi: I don’t think so. This was primarily focused on courses that transfer from Ivy Tech rather than 4-year institutions.
   11. Ken: This action was directed more towards, for example, a lower level course in business writing taken at Ivy Tech not being able to be used to set off a business writing 300 level course at Bloomington.
   12. Neovi: But for a 4-year institution, we have discretion if we wish it to be used.
   13. Anurag: Would the information of a DACA student who may have changed their contact information on Canvas to maintain contact with faculty be given to the government?
   14. Ken and Neovi: The spirit of McRobbie was that we would comply with the government.
   15. Anurag: We should warn our DACA students suitably about this possibility then.
   16. Ken: We should probably check to see if our understanding of the spirit of his remarks is consistent with this interpretation.
   17. Feighery: In the two hour pre session discussion, was everyone beating about the bush about online courses?
   18. Neovi: No. It had primarily to do with an expert brought in by IU to address the breakdown of campus community, especially at IUPUI School of medicine.
   19. Feighery: I automatically think that as some campuses push more online courses, the loss of community would be obvious.
   20. Neovi: While some people raised that focus, this was not the only reason at this point in the conversation.
   21. Ken: UFC meeting structure is tightly governed and narrow; besides approving agenda, they cannot do much.
   22. Feighery: A complication to this rule is the (State) mandated TSAPs (Transfer Single Articulation Pathways). While the TSAP requirements are based on competencies and not directly on courses, we may effectively accept a 200-level course as fulfilling a 300-level requirement.  This opens up the possibility that one student from IVY Tech will be able to transfer a course (because they have followed the TSAP), while another student (who has not yet finished her Associates) will not.
   23. Ken: Transfer associates college policy is online on policies.iu.edu
8. Ken: New online annual report form is changing policy and prior procedure.
   1. Bushnell: Course evaluations in the past never went beyond chair but now it will automatically go forward.
   2. Feighery: One committee should look at standardizing reappointment requirements. Now syllabi needs to be included in annual reports.
   3. Gerencser: On our PTR page, there is no format for reappointment dossiers.
   4. Bushnell: That is not current practice.
   5. Feighery: This needs to be discussed.
   6. Bennion: What is the process for changing the annual report form?
   7. Kyoko: There is a tension between practice and policy.
   8. Ken: Which committee would be the best to look into this issue?
   9. Gerencser: PTR
   10. Ken: PTR and Welfare, perhaps?
   11. Anurag: PTR reappointment document was given to me when I was going up for reappointment.
   12. Bushnell/Metetal: It was only a school of business document.
9. Ken: Regarding Domestic Partner Benefits, how do we keep the heat on?
   1. Ken: We should research what other institutions like IU are doing to extend this benefit.
   2. Rusnoff: Would the domestic partner benefits apply to any person, regardless of orientation?
   3. Ken: Yes it would.
   4. Anurag: There should be no new cost to extending this benefit to same sex couples as this was already being done in the past.
   5. Dunn: The cost would be minimal.
   6. Ken: It also affects the hiring of quality faculty. The conversation downstate is that it costs too much but we are not part of the conversation and we should try to get into that conversation.
   7. Zynda L.: How many campuses passed our domestic partner resolution?
   8. Ken: 3 regional campuses have passed it so far.
   9. Zynda L.: Have the IUPUI and IUB faculty not taken up this resolution.
   10. Ken: Not that I recall. One way to proceed may be that we entertain a resolution at this point.
   11. Neovi: Could we ask the vice president, who has been put in charge of this issue to share some numbers with us?
   12. Ken: That would be great.
   13. Feighery: I move to ask the welfare committee to widen the representation beyond their current members to discuss this issue and to research about other university cases and to then report back to the senate.
   14. Ken: I thank Margaret Fosmoe for her careful and thoughtful article on this issue last week.
10. Ken: Applegate emailed me after our fortuitous meeting at the RFC and suggested that we should have a conversation about major initiatives for regional campuses. Gail suggested that we should ask for something.
    1. Bill Mckinney’s job is to cultivate regional relationships.
    2. University wants all regionals to apply for Carnegie designation jointly.
    3. Blueprint 2.0 is desiring collaborative proposals from across regional campuses. We desired that couple of Carnegie experts from all campuses be brought together to see how all regional campuses can make a joint application. In that case we would be a consortium of universities putting together a joint application and we would be different than other campuses going solo.
    4. The second proposal was that Blueprint item 5c says that regional campuses should be outward facing multidisciplinary problem solving labs in our region. Go ahead and bus a bunch of us down to one location and let us work on something collaborative.
    5. Our third proposal was that we should be quickly responsive towards better performance when it is identified. For example, our honors program has grown incredibly. Why don’t we have more responsiveness and resources for progress like that?
    6. A fourth proposal we have put to Applegate is to provide every full-time faculty 2 students who will work 5 hours of work study every week of the year with them on research. This would allow 150 students at least to become fellows conducting research. This is of course a big money proposal and will need to be worked out with administrators.
    7. The proposals were well received and we will know more in the next RFC meeting.
    8. Gerencser: Was this what the other RFC members wanted as well?
11. Ken: We wish to increase faculty involvement in the budget process. [Budget template](http://blogs.iu.edu/senate/2017/01/20/budget-hearings-template/). To this end, Phil can give a presentation on IU’s budgeting process and system to whoever is interested. Please attend the budget hearings, if you can.
    1. Roth: When and where are the budget hearings this year?
    2. Ken: January 30 (8:00 am to 12:30 pm) / January 31 (12:30 to 5:00 pm) in the Board Room.
    3. Feighery: Can we ask questions and participate during the budget hearings?
    4. Hinnefeld: Participation is limited to budget committee members and those presenting the budgets. Others can make their thoughts known to the budget committee members.
    5. Feighery: We should have a bigger room than the board room.
    6. Ken: People generally and understandably attend to support their own units but let’s try to be more broadly focused this time.
    7. Rusnoff: We should all be supporting the library.
    8. Kyoko: What does cultural assessment mean on the budget template?
    9. Vollrath: It means “a culture of assessment”.
    10. Nilsen: There is nothing on research as a strategic objective in the budget template.
    11. Anurag: Do we know how much the incremental budget is being apportioned over the various strategic objectives?
    12. Ken: I want you to say which proposals beyond your units do you support?
    13. We should be able to see the proposals to know which ones we can broadly support.
    14. Dunn: The CLAS proposals went out to all CLAS faculty.
    15. Ken: We will try to do so for other proposals as well.
    16. Jann: In the spirit of faculty governance, the whole cabinet is depending on the budget committee to engage the whole faculty and then make recommendations back to us.
    17. Hinnefeld: We will make all budget proposals public after this weekend on Monday.
    18. Anurag: There are three vacancies on the budget committee.
    19. Ken: That will be taken care of soon.
12. Ken: Who can volunteer to present in February senate meeting the review of the Blueprint 2.0 strategic documents? Each volunteer will need to review only 1 or 2 pages at a time and needs to assess how these documents either provide an opportunity or a threat to IUSB. Discuss it with a couple of other colleagues and report back to the senate. Ken presented a sample.
13. Announcements.
    1. Muniz: the first issue of the center for online education is now available. He also announced the creation of two awards for excellence in teaching with technology and excellence in online teaching award of $1000 each.
    2. Bloom: Veterans book club is reading “The White Donkey: Terminal Lance” next Thursday at 5:00 pm at Fireside.
    3. Curtis: Dance at Harlem demonstration on Tuesday 11:00 to 12:00 noon in the auditorium sponsored by Bloomington.
    4. Raman: Duo login launch is on Feb 2nd for faculty and student employees.
    5. Salisbury: Undergraduate research journal is desperate for more submissions.
    6. Dave: Kevin Schasheck is organizing a benefit dinner for helping Syrian refugees on Tuesday March 28th at 5:30 pm in the Grille. Please save the date.