

**Indiana University South Bend Academic Senate meeting
March 25, 2016, Wiekamp 1011, 1:30 pm.**

Attending:

Adaikkalavan, T. Allison, S. Anderson, Bennion Turba, Bloom, Borshuk, Brandon, Bushnell, Chaney, L. Chen, K. Clark, N. Colborn, Collins, Dunn, Froysland, Griffith, Hebert, Hinnefeld, Hottois, E. Joseph, J. Joseph, B. Kern, G. Kern, Lambert, Levine, Lidinsky, Massat, Mattox, McGuire, Merhi, Mettetal, Nilsen, Opasik, Pant, Roth, Sage, Saksena, Schult, K. Smith, Sofhauser, Stankrauff, Takanashi, Thomas, VanderVeen, Vollrath, Weiss, White, Zynda.

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:39 p.m. by President Scott Opasik.

2. Approval of minutes

The minutes of the February 26th, 2016 meeting were approved.

Motion to approve, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

3. President Opasik shared the results of the recent election. The constitutional ballot initiative passed. The election results are attached to these minutes and will be posted to the Academic Senate website.

4. President Opasik brought the IU Domestic Partner Benefits Resolution forward for consideration. The proposed resolution and supporting documentation were circulated prior to the meeting, were posted to the Academic Senate website, and are included in these minutes.

Jerry Hinnefeld spoke in favor of the resolution and noted that the arguments presented are strong and well-presented.

Micheline Nilsen asked if the concept of the common law spouse would have bearing on this issue. Several respondents said no – not in Indiana.

Sara Sage voiced her opinion in favor of the resolution and noted that it is important that the faculty have a voice in the matter.

Scott Opasik noted that he found out recently that someone from Human Resources had spoken to faculty representatives at both Bloomington and IUPUI but not to any of the regional campuses.

Elizabeth Bennion Turba noted that the latest version of the FAQ included arguments from a colleague from IU East. These included ideological concerns and possible risk because of public notices of marriages without statutory protection of LBGQT individuals.

April Lidinsky suggested that we be leaders and pass this resolution which is deeply ethical and push back against this move by the IU Trustees.

Motion to close debate, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

Motion to approve, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.

Jann Joseph offered her appreciation for the faculty members that worked so hard on this initiative and asked that we acknowledge them.

5. President's report

A. Committee Assignments for 2016-2017

President Opasik displayed the committee needs for 2016-17 and noted that he has posted the document to the Academic Senate website. Continuing members have been included in the document. Please review and consider where you might serve when the call for committee members comes out.

6. Administrative and Officer Reports

A. Chancellor Allison

Chancellor Allison noted that budget hearings were held on Monday and Tuesday; things went well. The recommendations have been given to the Budget Committee who will respond by April 7th. Salary guidelines will be set forth as a 1% raise pool for at least satisfactory performance and there will be another 1.5% considered for further raises. The Vice Chancellors are considering a variety of ways to disperse this additional salary pool.

Allison expressed appreciation for faculty efforts during the last three budget cycles. Allison noted that he had recently met with approximately twenty students at an Ask the Chancellor event. Students noted raises to students as a positive and also inquired about faculty and staff raises. He discussed the difficulty of budgeting in higher education. Because of long-term commitments to faculty and staff it is difficult to be more nimble. As has been stated previously, the more we can grow enrollment through recruitment and retention the better off we will be in the future. Marketing efforts are increasing, including direct marketing. We are expanding our territory into Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois and this seems to be a positive move; Admissions received 1,600 inquiries during the first week of the email marketing campaign.

Ken Baierl showed the television ad that is currently running featuring IU South Bend graduates and a rough version of the television ad that will be released in April featuring employers. He noted that there were very powerful unscripted messages from a variety of employers in South Bend and Elkhart.

Anurag Pant noted that there could be some editing on the audio levels. Baierl responded in the affirmative and noted that this is a rough cut version.

Sue Anderson asked if other types of students could be represented in the videos, for example, Nursing students. Allison noted that part of the message is to inform people that our students are successful in more unusual occupations; they know that we have a nursing program. Allison has also received comments from students he has met with asking why there aren't current students pictured in the videos. These advertisements are aimed at the general community, parents, and others and intended to raise the profile of IU South Bend.

Ilene Scheffer noted that there will be much exciting news coming into the public eye in the near future with all of the new programs that will soon be available in the College of Health Sciences.

Chancellor Allison noted that there was a spreadsheet handout that outlined the progress of various capital projects on campus. He spoke about several of these projects. The Administration building renovation is ongoing. The deconstruction is mostly being done in-house to save money. Progress is being made on the completion of other contracts. Riverside Hall negotiations are continuing. The

contract specifications are very technical in terms of requirements for College of Health Sciences classrooms/labs/exam rooms, etc. These must all be complete before bids are opened. Northside exterior projects are progressing; phase two bidding went well and it appears that we may save some money there.

Allison noted that at the budget hearings there were some questions about capital reserves. Our general reserve is now at less than \$9 million. We are hoping that we don't have to dip into that much in the future. Capital reserves are at \$11.4 million total in various accounts. This spreadsheet is a draft and the amounts change weekly. There is a chance that IU could also allocate some funds toward some of the capital projects. There was a space planning workshop some time ago; this spreadsheet reflects those prioritized projects. All projects are totaled on the spreadsheet and if we spent all of it there would be 450,000 left. We will not spend all of that. For example, the Administration building remodeling is using some gift monies and some from reserves in order to optimize construction options. Riverside Hall costs are estimated at over \$1 million but there might be some gift monies coming in for Health Sciences. Because there is still no official design it is difficult to present ideas to potential donors. As for the Fine Arts building – we are unsure of estimates for renovation at this point.

An Alumni event will be held for all of the schools and colleges. Alumna of the year have been selected. This will be held at the end of April.

Chancellor Allison reminded faculty members to share the stories of graduating seniors with Ken Baierl so that these stories can be shared during Commencement.

Dean Vicki Bloom asked if there are plans on campus to work on the smell coming from the sewer. The answer was affirmative.

Carolyn Schult noted that it is positive to raise student wages but that some staff are making barely more than student wages. Chancellor Allison noted that he has asked the Vice Chancellors to examine these issues.

Elizabeth Bennion Turba noted that some secretaries are actually noting a reduction in pay because of reaching a differential whereby their raise in salary puts them into a higher category for purchasing health care, parking, etc.

Allison noted that one of the discussion items during the budget hearings was that we have to start somewhere with raising salaries and hope to at least establish a bottom floor for hiring faculty. He noted that EVCAA Joseph would address this topic further in her report.

B. EVCAA Joseph

EVCAA Joseph presented a budget review from the Academic Affairs perspective. Her office has looked at data on campus and at peer institution data. Last year they began to look at Associate Faculty salaries and established baseline salaries starting last fall. This year the approach is to work with Lecturer and Assistant Professor salaries. Minimums will be \$40,000 for lecturer with an MA; \$42,000 with a terminal degree. Assistant Professor minimum salaries will be set at \$50,000. These moves can create compression. She is asking for patience that compression will be addressed in future years. Deans are committed to working on this with the EVCAA.

Promotion and Tenure reviews are moving forward. The profile of the faculty (time in rank) is relatively young. We have long-term commitments to many people so we need to carefully consider future hiring. Her office has been writing longer letters during all stages of the PT&R process to ensure consistency. In addition, Academic Affairs will be discussing PT&R processes with the Academic Senate PT&R committee, the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the Affirmative Action officer and all campus units in order to ensure consistency across departments. Existing documents and signature forms will be examined for consistency. It is important that PT&R information be straightforward and consistent from hiring on. The Promotion process will be examined in detail as well in order to bring equity and fairness to all aspects of the PR& process.

Joseph reported that 14 Sabbatical applications were submitted. Eleven sabbaticals were approved and sent forward to Vice President Applegate's office: six for one semester; five for a full year. Letters will be going out with approvals soon.

Joseph reported on hiring progress. The goal was to complete hiring by spring break. Eighteen of 20 positions have been filled; two positions have been put on hold.

EVCAA Joseph asked that the faculty continue to support campus retention initiatives. Marketing is working; we have more traditional freshman enrolling, which is different for our campus and results in changes in the classroom. Faculty should work with Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to make sure that we are serving students in the best way in the classroom, in housing, and in various student services. We have one goal: student success. Students come to us across a broad spectrum and we must be sure to encourage junior faculty and others on campus to work well with our students.

The Administration is looking at data on students that have stopped out. Rebecca Torstrick's office is reaching out to students to gather information and determine if there are patterns as to why these students left. They are examining 2014 data. They will be seeking additional information from the faculty to correlate with the information from students.

EVCAA Joseph noted that she has asked staff in her area to look at staff salaries and report on necessary adjustments.

Elaine Roth noted that she appreciates the efforts to raise salaries. She encouraged EVCAA Joseph to pay particular attention to Associate Faculty salaries. Joseph noted that Associate Faculty salaries were raised last summer. Setting minimum salaries is an effective way to do this. 1% has been added to the raise pool for Associate Faculty as well.

Cathy Borshuk asked if the PT&R guideline review would be completed within the units. Joseph noted that we need a comprehensive review to ensure constituency and to make sure that all are receiving requirements in a clear manner and that hires are receiving the information and can refer to it as they proceed throughout their career.

Joseph gave John McIntosh credit for his efforts in this area. His office has helped to craft the letters to the candidates throughout the process in order to send consistent messages in the letters. She hopes that this consistency will move to the departments.

7. Carnegie Engaged Campus Taskforce (Bennion/McGuire)

Elizabeth Bennion Turba presented information on the Carnegie Engaged Campus application. Her PowerPoint is attached to these minutes. Bennion Turba reported that there is impetus to move in this direction. She encouraged faculty to get involved. This is an elective classification; participation is voluntary. This would distinguish as a regional public university. We are doing a lot of this work but it could be more systematic and we must take action to document our work. In addition to defining our involvement in community engagement it will be important to develop and strengthen community partnerships. January of 2020 is the next round of applications.

This application can and should shape campus planning. We can use the application process to shape the mission, strategic plan, curriculum planning and assessment. Faculty rewards for community engagement should be clear and consistent across campus. It will be important to align our various initiatives and ensure that community engagement is considered across all of these initiatives (FYS, Gen Ed, etc.)

Gail McGuire and Elizabeth Bennion Turba and their small task force welcome others that are interested in community engagement to get involved. They will need to identify all potential participants and move forward on the team and potential application. They would love to have all units on campus represented.

Anurag Pant asked about the benefits of this classification.

Bennion Turba responded that the classification helps to identify who we are to the community, to parents, and to students. This would be a mark of distinction and could attract donors and build new partnerships in the community.

Joseph noted that there is a movement to include additional information on the student transcript, such as community engagement, service learning, etc. Employers would then recognize this in students. The Higher Learning Commission is moving toward making community engagement a plus factor in accreditation.

Dean Elizabeth Dunn added that a model campus that has leveraged this is Portland State. They grew tremendously as a result of this classification. It can really shape your identity as an institution.

Kyoko Takanashi reminded faculty to please come to the Reimagining the First Year meeting on Monday afternoon. She noted that she appreciates how many of these initiatives are in place and hopes that as we move through this phase with all of these initiatives that are pulling us in different directions that we can align these initiatives.

Chancellor Allison noted that the Strategic plan mentions these initiatives. We do still need to get the metrics in place. The budget process asked people to address how their requests related to the strategic plan.

Joseph noted that her office is working on a master calendar. They are trying to map events on campus and to map these initiatives. She also encouraged colleagues to get involved. It is important to engage more volunteers on campus.

Ken Smith noted that a number of these initiatives are very interesting. He hopes that we will use our values to guide our work and discuss with colleagues what direction/vision we want to pursue with the

campus administration. This is up to the faculty to embrace these initiatives and to see what direction we should go in.

Chancellor Allison noted that General Education is a good example. FYS is one place that community engagement/service learning is employed on many campuses. Sustainability is also a strong asset. He agrees that it is important to focus on these and have good conversations.

Gail McGuire agreed but noted that we need a better mechanism to organize our work so that is sustainable.

Joseph noted that she has suggested a coordinator for the Carnegie initiative and that there are additional coordinators (FYS, Gen Ed, etc.) that would work together to seek overlap and synergy. In the Academic Affairs budget there is a faculty associate position proposed for key projects. It is ultimately up to the faculty and student services staff to implement.

Chancellor Allison noted that some other places have held community town halls where people are gathered to explore a specific topic. We could bring someone in from Portland State for example to discuss some of the issues and how to coordinate.

Dean Dunn noted that appreciative inquiry events can be used to collect information and find a way to move forward. Community Engagement is naturally built into our mission as a regional public institution. We can move forward from that. If you want to institutionalize this, it should be built into the curriculum. We don't have to reinvent the wheel. There are models that are similar that we can examine. It is beneficial to collect the information and documentation.

Bennion Turba agreed that the documentation provides a framework for what we're doing, and what we're doing well.

8. Announcements

Laura Whitney noted that students have been sent a campus climate survey from the Office of Student Welfare at IU Bloomington based on sexual misconduct issues. If there are questions there is contact information on the survey. Please encourage students to complete the survey if you are asked.

April Lidinsky noted that March is Women's History month. Please refer to the purple fliers for two more events. One is a presentation on the Ball Band/Uniroyal discrimination case. The Trapped documentary on abortion access will also be shown.

Jake Mattox noted that Joe Chaney will present a Shakespeare lecture on April 14. There is a flier with additional English events.

Linda Chen reminded the faculty of the Reimagining the First Year workshop from 3-5 p.m. Monday in the Alumni Room.

Alison Stankrauff noted that Undergraduate Research Conference submissions are due today but that they might still consider late submissions. The Undergraduate Research Conference will be held on April 15th in Weikamp Hall. Please encourage students to attend.

David Vollrath noted that there is still time to contribute to the Campus campaign. If you need a form, please contact Dave or Dina Harris. IU Day is 4/12 – another opportunity for giving.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy W. Colborn

Academic Senate Secretary

2016-17 Academic Senate Election Results

The Constitutional change in the charge for the CDC Committee passed

Executive committee

Officers:

President: Ken Smith

Vice President: Gail McGuire

Secretary: Anurag Pant

At large members:

Elizabeth Bennion

Gary Kern

Rebecca Brittenham

Continuing:

Past President: Scott Opasik

UFC: Neovi Karakatsanis

Athletics Committee

Kathy Ritchie

Ann Grens

Murli Nair

Continuing:

Bill Feighery

Sharon Jones

Alison Stankrauff

Committee on Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment

2 full Professors (two year term)

Henry Scott

Larry Bennett

2 members at Associate or Full rank (two year term)

Jorge Muniz

Haiyan Yin

2 tenure-probationary, non-voting faculty members (one year term)

Sharon Jones

Shahir Rizk

Continuing:

Morteza Shaffi-Mousavi

Christina Gerken

Ann Grens

Faculty Misconduct Review Committee

Committee members:

Theo Randall
Cathy Borshuk

Continuing:

Peter Aghimien
Peter Bushnell
Susan Cress

Alternates:

Teri Dobrzykowski
Julio Hernando
Kwadwo Okrah
Andrea Rusnock
Lisa Zwicker

Faculty Board of Review

Susan Thomas
Micheline Nilsen
Yi Cheng
Tom Clark
Lee Kahan

IU Domestic Partner Benefits Resolution

March 25, 2016

Whereas the Trustees of Indiana University have voted to eliminate domestic partner benefits, resulting in unequal treatment of faculty on the basis of marital status;

Whereas the Nondiscrimination Policy of Indiana University states:

“Indiana University prohibits discrimination based on arbitrary considerations of such characteristics as age, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status.”

Whereas the Trustees of Indiana University have voted to eliminate these benefits, resulting in unequal treatment of faculty and diminishment of their effective compensation;

Whereas The Constitution of the Faculty of Indiana University states:

‘The Trustees and administration should consult the faculty concerning: ... B. Budgets. C. Faculty compensation and benefits ... Consultation of the faculty shall be through representatives authorized by faculty governance institutions. Consultation should occur sufficiently in advance of action to permit faculty deliberation.’ (Article II, Section 2.3.)

Whereas no such meaningful consultation occurred by the “Trustees or administration” regarding the changes to “Faculty compensation and Benefits”;

Be it resolved that the Faculty of Indiana University South Bend calls on the IU Administration (1) to make available to IU employees in 2017 and beyond the domestic partner benefits that have been available for 2016 and earlier, (2) to extend domestic partner benefits to couples regardless of marital status and/or gender, (3) and to alter benefits in the future only after meaningful consultation with the faculty ‘through representatives authorized by faculty governance institutions’ and that such ‘Consultation should occur sufficiently in advance of action to permit faculty deliberation.’

Supporting Documents

IU Domestic Partner Benefits Resolution from IU South Bend

1) **Retaining domestic partnership benefits shows the university's support for all families.**

Saranna Thornton, a professor of economics at Hampden-Sydney College and chair of the American Association of University Professors' Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession, said AAUP guidelines on family responsibilities and academic work say institutions should strive to create academic communities in which "all members are treated equitably, families are supported, and family-care concerns are regarded as legitimate and important."

She continued via email: "Applying that principle to the provision of domestic-partnership benefits, the AAUP recognizes that families take many forms, not all of which are covered by traditional benefits plans. The AAUP supports making employee benefits available to faculty and staff in both traditional and non-traditional family structures."

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/07/18/partner-benefits-higher-ed-evolve-more-states-recognize-gay-marriage>

2) **AAUP's domestic partnership form offers a simple and widely approved model.**

<http://hrc-assets.s3-website-us-east-1.amazonaws.com/files/assets/resources/Sample-Statement-of-Domestic-Partnership-American-Association-of-University-Professors.pdf>

3) **Many public universities in our region have chosen to retain domestic partner benefits for all workers in the wake of marriage equality. A top reason cited is attracting and retaining quality employees.**

Ohio University: <https://www.ohio.edu/policy/40-013.html>

University of Wisconsin: <http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/benefits/domestic-partnership.aspx>

University of Iowa: <http://hr.uiowa.edu/benefits/domestic-partners>

University of Michigan: <https://hr.umich.edu/benefits-wellness/health/changing-your-benefits/life-events/domestic-partnerships>

Wright State University: <https://www.wright.edu/human-resources/benefits/open-enrollment/domestic-partnership-benefits>

4) **Without a change in policy, domestic partnerships will be discontinued at Indiana University.**

Domestic Partners at Indiana University – Issue Summary:

On October 9, 2015, the Indiana University Board of Trustees voted to discontinue domestic partner benefits effective December 31, 2016. This policy change was announced on November 19, 2015.

This decision by the Board was made as a result of the US Supreme Court ruling on June 26, 2015, that legalized same-sex marriage. Before this change, same-sex domestic partners were eligible for benefits after registering with the university. As noted in the announcement of the change, “Prior to this ruling the University’s Affidavit of Domestic Partnership stated, ‘We would enter into a legal marriage if the opportunity were available’” (November 19, 2015, memo from University Human Resources, “Discontinuation of Domestic Partner Benefits Program”).

It should be noted that the Board passed its resolution approving benefits to same-sex domestic partners on September 14, 2001. The policy went into effect on April 1, 2002. Other-sex (i.e., heterosexual) domestic partners were *not* eligible for benefits under this policy; other-sex couples needed to be married to receive benefits. These benefits were approved for “same-sex domestic partners of Indiana University employees and students who demonstrate that they are in a ‘verifiable committed relationship’” (Indiana University, University Human Resources, “Domestic Partner Coverages,” <http://www.indiana.edu/~uhrs/benefits/dp/dp.html>, accessed 26 Jan 16). To be eligible for benefits, individuals had to complete and submit the “Affidavit of Domestic Partnership.” This section of the affidavit indicates what evidence must be provided to qualify as domestic partners:

“In lieu of the marriage certificate that the University requires to cover a spouse, I am submitting the following supporting documentation to verify our interdependent financial relationship:

A civil union registration, or domestic partnership registration issued by a state or foreign nation that has legalized same-sex civil unions, or domestic partnerships; or

Joint ownership of a residence (home, condo, mobile home); or

One of the following: a lease for a residence identifying both partners as tenants; joint ownership of a motor vehicle; joint credit account; joint checking account; or other evidence of joint ownership of a major asset or joint liability of debt. “Additionally, individuals applying for benefits must affirm the following:

“*I declare that my partner and I:*

- 1) are at least 18 years of age and competent to enter into a contract.
- 2) are not married to another individual and are not the domestic partner of another individual.
- 3) are not related by blood closer than would bar marriage in the state of Indiana.
- 4) live together as a couple in a shared residence and intend to live together indefinitely.
- 5) have a relationship of exclusive mutual commitment that is the functional equivalent of a marriage; that is,
 - we are jointly responsible for each other for the necessities of life including each other’s financial obligations; and
 - we intend to remain in the relationship indefinitely; and
 - we understand IU-benefits will end December 31, 2016, unless we enter into a legal marriage recognized in the United States;
 - we have agreed that in the event of dissolution of our domestic partnership, there will be a negotiation of the division of property similar to that required of a married couple in the event of a divorce.”

We encourage IU to reconsider this policy change and expand domestic partner coverage rather than end it.

5) Upon hearing about the proposed resolution, faculty had questions. FAQs:

What is the issue here?

IU has announced plans to cancel domestic partnership benefits (effective December 31, 2016). This policy change reflects a narrow definition of family, as it recognizes legal marriage as the only way for individuals to form a family. Families today come in a variety of different forms, not all of them based in marriage.

Why not just get married?

The only thing that has changed here is the Supreme Court decision legalizing same-sex marriage. These individuals' family situation is no different than it was prior to the decision. The right to marry should not become a requirement to marry. Although it is true that registered domestic partners signed a statement indicating that they would marry if legally allowed to do so, the new ability to marry in Indiana was not accompanied by civil rights protections for couples who choose to marry. Gay people can still be fired or denied housing or public accommodations on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

What about fraud? Couldn't anyone who wanted benefits apply to be a "domestic partner"?

The previous policy required documentation and affirmation. That documentation, or additional documentation (as recommended by the American Association of University Professors), could still be used to verify a domestic partnership. And keep in mind that providing a marriage certificate is no guarantee that the relationship is not fraudulent. Domestic partners would be providing far more documentation than is required from people who get married. They are not required to provide any evidence aside from the marriage certificate, let alone the affirmation/certification required of domestic partners. (See above.)

Why should IU reconsider this policy change?

An August 2015 survey by the International Foundation of Employee Benefit Plans found that 70% of mid-sized to large-sized companies that provided benefits to same-sex domestic partners at the time of the ruling said that they are likely to continue to do so. Among those who provided such benefits for both heterosexual and homosexual domestic partners, 80% indicated that they would continue to do so. Reasons cited included: retaining and attracting quality employees, recognizing all types of families, believing it is the right thing to do, and the fact that many of their employees were choosing to stay in domestic partnership rather than to marry. Other Midwestern public universities have already decided to continue (and expand) benefits. Another concern is that same-sex couples may not be comfortable making an outward expression of their relationship by getting married, especially in states (like Indiana) that don't have anti-discrimination laws covering LGBT individuals." By recognizing domestic partners – same-sex or other-sex – the university would be acknowledging the reality of family diversity in the twenty-first century. IU would be a leader in supporting its employees and students and their families.

Is this an issue that actually affects current faculty members at Indiana University?

Yes, here is what one faculty member had to say:

"My commitment to my domestic partner and our children is not based in a law. It is a commitment I made and will continue to honor because it is my choice to do so. Being legally married only became a factor when the law changed—a law that is framed as creating equality but that also reflects a human prejudice. The idea that my commitment can only be represented and realized through marriage is based on a narrow view of family. Frankly, it is discriminatory.

"My commitment to my partner and children has not changed. It is a commitment I made outside the law. Why is it assumed that a change in the law has anything at all to do with my commitment to them?"

“Yet, by choosing to honor only those commitments made legal by marriage, IU is telling me that a commitment I made and have done nothing but honor matters not a bit. IU is telling me that my commitment only counts now if it is made through a legal marriage.


“I have devoted myself to my family for the last 6 years. I have made it clear through word and deed that they can count on me. I have supported and helped raise two children to whom I have no biological or legal relationship, despite having no rights as a parent. I have supported my partner in every way possible, yet, legally, we are considered to be strangers.

“IU’s domestic partner policy recognized our family. Ending that policy is the equivalent of revoking that recognition. Yet the only thing that changed was a law. We are still a family. No law can change that.” (Betsy Lucal, Professor of Sociology, IUSB)

Additional rationale for the continuance (and expansion) of Domestic Partner benefits at IU:

Denise Bullock, Associate Professor of Sociology, IU East

- Many LGBTQ identified individuals have an ideological objection to the historically patriarchal (and religious affiliated) institution of marriage. I have had many conversations on this issue. It is unfair to these individuals to force them to go against their ideological beliefs in order to protect their families.
- Marriage becomes part of the public records and some LGBTQ couples would be placed in a risky social/personal position by the public announcement. There are couples here in Richmond, for example, who have not married because the announcement automatically is placed in the paper. This visibility is seen to place them at risk.
- Having Domestic Partner benefits symbolically sends a message to all prospective faculty, staff, and students that IU is a welcoming and accepting institution. When I was on the job market, I only applied to institutions that had Partner benefits.
- The Indiana State Legislature continues to bring bills forward to challenge same-sex marriage in the state.
- So long as this issue is being contested, IU should be standing strong in support of the LGBTQ community.
- It is true that because some couples will choose to marry the number of people requesting Partner benefits will be reduced, the need will still be there for others.



Carnegie Engaged Campus Classification

2020



What is the Community Engagement Classification?

- The Carnegie Foundation's Classification for Community Engagement is an **elective classification**, meaning that it is based on voluntary participation by institutions. The elective classification involves data collection and documentation of important aspects of institutional mission, identity and commitments, and requires substantial effort invested by participating institutions. It is an institutional classification; it is not for systems of multiple campuses or for part of an individual campus.



How is Community Engagement Defined?

- ▶ Community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.
- ▶ The **purpose of community engagement** is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.

2020 Classification Timeline

January 2018	Announcement of the 2020 process
May 1- July 1, 2018	Request for applications (payment of fee and release of application)
April 15, 2019	Applications due/Reviewing begins
December 2019	Review process completed/campuses notified
January 2020	2020 classification results announced



Why Start Now?

- ▶ The application can (and should!) shape campus plans and actions.
- ▶ The application serves as a framework for strengthening our engagement efforts.
- ▶ **ASSESSMENT & DOCUMENTATION TAKES TIME!**
- ▶ *The assessment practices required by the Community Engagement Classification must meet a broad range of purposes:* assessing community perceptions of institutional engagement; tracking and recording of institution-wide engagement data; assessment of the impact of community engagement on students, faculty, community, and institution; identification and assessment of student learning outcomes in curricular engagement; and ongoing feedback mechanisms for partnerships.



Carnegie Advice (Partnerships)

- **Partnerships require a high level of understanding of and intentional practices specifically directed to reciprocity and mutuality.**
- Campuses have begun to attend to processes of initiating and nurturing collaborative, two-way partnerships, and are developing strategies for systematic communication. Maintaining authentically collaborative, mutually beneficial partnerships takes ongoing commitment, and we urge institutions to continue their attention to this critical aspect of community engagement.



Carnegie Advice: Faculty Rewards

- With regard to faculty rewards for roles in community engagement, it is difficult to create a campus culture of community engagement when there are not clearly articulated incentives for faculty to prioritize this work.
- We would like to see more examples of campuses that provide evidence of clear policies for recognizing community engagement in teaching and learning, and in research and creative activity, along with criteria that validate appropriate methodologies and scholarly artifacts. We urge Community Engagement institutions to initiate study, dialogue, and reflection to promote and reward the scholarship of engagement more fully.



Carnegie Advice: Alignment

- **Community engagement offers often-untapped possibilities for alignment with other campus priorities and initiatives to achieve greater impact**—for example, first-year programs that include community engagement; learning communities in which community engagement is integrated into the design; or diversity initiatives that explicitly link active and collaborative community-based teaching and learning with the academic success of underrepresented students.
- There remain significant opportunities for campuses to develop collaborative internal practices that integrate disparate initiatives into more coherent community engagement efforts.



We Need You!

- ▶ Because this is an institutional classification, evidence for community engagement often comes from many parts of the campus as well as from community partners.
- ▶ Campuses that have been successful in achieving the classification report that it has been highly beneficial to form a cross-institutional team with community representation to work on the application.
- ▶ **CONTACT** Elizabeth Bennion or Gail McGuire to get involved!