**Indiana University South Bend Academic Senate meeting**
**September 18, 2015, Wiekamp 1011, 10:00 am.**

**Attending:**
Adaikkalavan, Allison, Amellio, Ananth, Barrau, Bennett, Bennion Turba, Bloom, Borshuk, Botkin, Bryant, Bushnell, Chaney, Clift, N. Colborn, L. Collins, Cress, J. Davis, Dunn, Economakis, Ervick, W. Feighery, Finlay, Fisher, Fong-Morgan, Froysland, He, C. Hebert, Hernando, Hinnefeld, Hottois, Jones, J. Joseph, Kahan, Karakatsanis, Kazmierczak, Keen, Kwong, LaLime, Lambert, Y. Lee, Levine, Lidinsky, Limbert, Lucal, Luppes, Makielski, Mattox, McGuire, McIntosh, Mettetal, Moore, Je. Muniz, Nilsen, Quimby, Randall, Resler, Rizk, Roth, Scheessele, Schrank, Schult, Scott, K. Smith, J. Smith, Sofhauser, Song, Stankrauff, Suttman, Takanashi, Tetzlaff, Thomas, Vaidyanathan, VanderVeen, Vollrath, Watson, Zynda.

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:03 a.m. by President Scott Opasik.

2. The minutes of the meeting of April 24, 2015 were approved.
    *Motion to approve, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.*

3. Opasik asked for a special election to fill the PTR Committee. The Executive Committee nominates Julio Hernando to fill the voting position and Julia Gressick to fill the non-voting position. Opasik asked for nominations from the floor; there were none.
    *Motion to close nominations, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.*
Nominations were closed.
    *Motion to accept by acclimation, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.*

4. Committee Reports
A. Common Questions for Student Evaluations Task Force – Yuri Obata and Sharon Jones

Opasik prefaced the student evaluation questions discussion with brief views on screen of the student view of the evaluation and the faculty view of the evaluation results. He noted that the Student Evaluations Task Force is asking the Academic Senate to vote on each question separately. We will also vote on whether or not each question will include a comment box, on whether or not to use a 4 or 5 point scale and the order of that scale, on whether or not each question should include a NA option, and on whether or not to include an overall comment box for any other comments.

Yuri Obata and Sharon Jones presented the Task Force's recommendation with an explanation of the revisions, which were based on the previous recommendations, discussions at the April meeting of the Academic Senate, summer session pilot questions, BL questions and other sources. The Committee completed the questions quickly and have taken input in the form of forums and surveys and really appreciate the input.

These are the general all-campus common questions. Other questions can be added by departments, schools and individuals. Thus, these common questions should be very general and applicable across all disciplines and types of courses.

4- or 5- point scale question:
We will vote on having either a 4 point scale or 5 point scale. The 4 point scale is without an average or neutral; the 5 point scale includes a middle range. The Task Force noted that the 4 point scale forces students to make a decision. This is convenient; we have used 4 points in the past. The Task Force noted

that some felt that the 5 point scale could be advantageous for those who get more negative evaluations. It was noted that the students requested a NA in the summer pilot.

Adding an optional comment box for each question:
This option is now possible in the new system and could be very useful. There may be additional information for the students to add.

Order of numbers on the scale:
The Task Force recommends that the larger number be first; a higher number is better and this is consistent with past practice.

Question 3:
Wording suggestion: the word "effective" could mean many things. That word could be replaced by "positive."

Question 4:
Wording suggestion: the assignments "for" the class could be added.

Question 9:
If we decide to adopt a comment box for every question, that will be rephrased as "Any other Comments."

The Task Force then took questions from the body.

Jerry Hinnefeld noted that the process described is a good one. He also suggests a separate vote for the Senate to endorse whether or not we want this set of questions to be required on all course evaluations. He believes that this is a good thing but notes that this is a new precedent and it should be endorsed. He noted that IUB has a subset of questions that is used for PT&R purposes specifically and that presumably a candidate could add other questions. Another question is will these questions be used for PTR purposes?

John McIntosh noted that this evaluation system doesn't have room for an unlimited number of questions. The goal is to have the common set PLUS additional questions.

Scott Opasik noted that it was the understanding of the Task Force that these questions would be used for PT&R purposes.

Jerry Hinnefeld noted that this needs to be clear in the vote.

*Motion that the votes that we take on individual questions are preliminary to a global vote on whether to require that the questions be required on all course evaluations, seconded.*

Discussion:

Lee Kahan clarified that if the questions aren't approved, the pilot questions will be used for the fall semester for PT&R purposes. We are thus moving toward campus-wide questions whether these are approved or not.

Jerry Hinnefeld noted that at the moment there is no mandate for a set of campus wide questions so if we do not approve these questions each unit will need to consider whether or not they want to use the system or find some other way to administer evaluations.

Dean Dunn asked Hinnefeld for clarification – are we voting on whether these questions will be required or just required for PT&R?

Hinnefeld responded that these are two separate points. The global vote would be whether or not to include all questions in course evaluations. He sees the PT&R question as a separate vote.

Julio Hernando inquired as to whether or not survey results had been considered by the Task Force? Task Force members responded with yes – the wording on the screen is what was agreed on by the Task Force. The Task Force mentioned the two suggestions in wording changes at the beginning of the presentation and will note additional comments received during discussion of each question.

Carolyn Schult noted that endorsing these questions and their use is important so that it's not the software dictating policy.

*Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

Vote on the motion:
*Motion that the votes that we take on individual questions are preliminary to a global vote on whether to require that the questions be required on all course evaluations, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.*

Gail McGuire noted that she would like to vote on the NA portion first before we consider each question because that will affect opinion of individual questions.

Carolyn Schult noted that this is also related to the 5 point scale which is a standard Likert scale. It is also standard that a larger number is better on the scale. NA gives you more information than a Neutral designation.

Opasik noted that we need a motion to change the order of voting; the Task Force agreed to this friendly amendment.

*Motion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

Bill Feighery noted that after looking at the example of how the evaluation would appear to the students he would like the order to be Strongly Agree first.

John McIntosh noted that labels can be changed in terms of what they say.

Bill Feighery stated that if the student just picks the first box then SA should be on the left.

Dean Dunn asked to hear from the survey experts because there is a lot of science on this.

Gail McGuire replied that we need to do the best we can but these are all fallible instruments.

Cathy Borshuk noted that there is no one best way. It varies.

Carolyn Schult will concede the order as long as she gets 5 points.

Jerry Hinnefeld reminded the body that we are in discussion on the NA question.

>  *Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

>  *Motion to vote on ordering, NA, and 4 or 5 point scale, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

Vote on NA:

>  *Motion and second included above; NA carried by voice vote.*

Vote on scale of 4 or 5:

Opasik asked for a show of hands for a 4 point scale: 16
Opasik asked for a show of hands for a 5 point scale: majority

>  *Motion and second included above; 5 point scale carried by a show of hands.*

The Task Force representatives clarified that the middle choice in a 5 point scale would be "Neither agree nor disagree."

Vote on the order:

>  *Motion to open discussion on wording, seconded; approved by voice vote.*

Discussion.

Bill Feighery suggested that we remove "Somewhat" from the wording. Friendly amendment accepted by the Task Force.

The scale voted on: SA, A, Neither agree nor disagree, D, SD (but not order)

>  *Motion to accept wording as noted, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

Opasik asked for a voice vote on the order of the scale: will scale be ordered from SA to SD or reversed?

From SA…left to right
Or
From SD…left to right

>  *From SA…left to right was approved by voice vote.*

Vote on Individual questions:

Question 1: The instructor was well–prepared

*The question was approved by voice vote.*

Question 2: The instruction explained the subject matter clearly

*The question was approved by voice vote.*

Question 3: The instructor created an effective learning environment

*The voice vote was split on this question.*

Discussion:

Sharon Jones from the Task Force noted that instead of the word "effective" they received suggestions to use the word "positive." Some people thought effective was too vague. The Task Force noted that IUB used this term in their evaluations and they thus don't feel like it is an invalid word.

Jerry Hinnefeld noted that this is a vague question in general.

Henry Scott commented on the difficulty of ensuring that students understand every word in the questions like we mean them.

Lee Kahan asked if it would it be more effective to say "an atmosphere conducive to learning?"

Susan Moore thinks that will also be confusing. She believes that the 4th question actually gets more to the heart of the matter anyway and is against q. 3.

Joe Chaney noted that students might respond to the overall learning environment in a course and suggested that we could say "I liked the learning environment."

EVCAA Jann Joseph requested that the body always keep the student viewpoint in mind in our discussions; we should have a respect for the student's ability to answer the question. Reminder that there is a student in the room and that we teach very capable, able students.

Ilan Levine stated that he doesn't like the question and believes that the box at the end could encompass that element of the evaluation.

Ken Smith likes the question and thinks it is a different question from all of the others.

Someone noted that students might not understand experimental teaching techniques and might comment negatively on those.

Dean Dunn noted that these are student satisfaction surveys and are not effective learning assessments.

Cyndi Sofhauser likes the phrase "conducive learning environment."

Hannah Vann noted that in her observation as a student she can tell when the learning environment is effective. She thinks it opens it up a chance for comment.

Chancellor Allison noted that this kind of question can generate useful comments.

Sharon Jones noted that survey comments reviewed by the Task Force suggested "the instructor created an environment in which I was able to learn."

Kyoko Takanashi asked if we can adopt the question and exclude it from the PT& R process?

Jerry Hinnefeld reminded the body that we are not committing to using any of these questions for PT&R at this point.

Cathy Borshuk noted that we are discussing two different things. The word "effective" and the word "environment." Is this reflecting the fact that we are reading this two different ways? She noted that in constructing survey items the goal is to try to empathize with the respondent, so we should think of all of the ways that students might read these.

> *Motion to change the wording to:* "The instructor created an environment in which I was able to learn."
> Motion changed to: "The instructor created an environment that was conducive to learning."
The Task Force accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Discussion.

Elizabeth Bennion Turba asked Hannah Vann if she thought this wording was more clear. Hannah responded yes.

There was a question about the Task Force's intent when constructing the question. Sharon Jones responded that they were referring to a positive, comfortable learning environment. They considered online courses here, too.

Dean Elizabeth Dunn asked for clarification of the motion on the floor.

We are voting on the new wording as noted in the motion: "The instructor created an environment that was conducive to learning."

> *Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

Final vote on question 3:

*The question was approved by voice vote.*

Question 4: The Assignments helped me to learn.

 Discussion.

What is the definition of "assignments." The Task Force members noted that they left this very general in order to accommodate all types of assignments.

Micheline Nilson asked whether it could be changed to "graded assignments?"

Jennifer Muniz suggested the terms "course activities" or "course work."

Dean Vicki Bloom doesn't think "course work" is descriptive enough.

Susan Moore commented that "assignments" seems specific and students could always use NA. Also in the CANVAS CMS all are listed in Assignments section.

Hannah Vann noted that as a student this was a question that was very clear to her.

> *Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried via voice vote.*

> *The question was approved by voice vote.*

Question #5: The instructor was available to provide help when needed.

Discussion.

Julio Hernando noted that "when needed" is ambiguous. Sharon Jones mentioned that this was also noted as a problem in survey results and that "help" was also mentioned as a vague word.

Julio Hernando suggested a friendly amendment to delete the "when needed." Sharon Jones suggested the addition of the word "readily" before available. Julio H. agrees with this change.

Discussion on whether or not to include the parenthetical phrase: (e.g., email, office hours, one-on-one consultation). There was a suggestion to add an "or" after the second comma. Neovi Karakatsanis suggested a friendly amendment to delete the parenthetical phrase.

Susan Moore noted that we've been talking about the specificity of the parenthetical comments and felt that they were helpful.

Neovi Karakatsanis removed her friendly amendment.

Tami Martinez noted that "readily available" means different things and that there is an advantage to keeping the parentheses – students could then comment in the box on specific things.

Dean Dunn noted that the "when needed" is unnecessary.

> *Motion to close discussion, seconded; passed by voice vote.*

Final question wording: The instructor was readily available (e.g., email, office hours, or one-on-one consultation).

> *The question was approved by voice vote.*

Question 6: The instructor provided helpful feedback on graded materials.

April Lidinsky suggested a friendly amendment to make wording consistent with the inclusion of a parenthetical phrase: ( e.g. …)

Kelcey Ervick noted that she also gives feedback on ungraded materials.

Betsy Lucal suggested the wording "submitted materials."

Other suggested "assigned materials" and "course materials."

Raman Adaikkalavan suggested that perhaps this could be a department-level question because he doesn't give feedback on software. It was suggested that students could use NA in that case.

It was suggested that to be consistent with question #5 we should change the wording to include examples:

The instructor provided helpful feedback (e.g., assignments, exams, presentations).

A friendly amendment to add the word "on" was rejected.

> *Jerry Hinnefeld offered a formal amendment to add "on" at the beginning of the parenthetical phrase, seconded; the motion carried by voice vote.*

> *Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

A final vote was held on the question: The instructor provided helpful feedback (e.g., on assignments, exams, presentations).

> *The question was approved by voice vote.*

Question 7: Overall how do you rate this instructor?

Discussion.

There was a friendly amendment to add a comma after Overall. Accepted by the Task Force.

Bill Feighery would like to make sure that the scale is the same. It was noted that it cannot be the same due to the working of the question.

Carolyn Schult noted that we don't necessarily need 5 responses. This is an actual question and not a statement that you agree or disagree with.

Elaine Roth asked if the surveys noted any questions that should be excluded? Sharon Jones explained the percentages of responses and that there were no clear results but that these last two questions were a little less acceptable to most survey respondents.

> *Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

A final vote was held on the question: Overall, how do you rate this instructor?

*The question was approved by voice vote.*

Question 8: Overall how do you rate this course? There was a friendly amendment to add a comma after Overall. Accepted by the Task Force.

Jay VanderVeen asked to confirm that the ordering or responses would still be from positive to negative. The Task Force affirmed.

Cyndi Sofhauser noted that this question could be interpreted differently since all other questions are about the instructor.

Gail McGuire referred to teaching a statistics course and how students might differentiate the questions. She felt that this was helpful information for a PT&R committee to see.

Dean Elizabeth Dunn noted that as a former faculty developer and as a Dean, these are the two most common questions and students understand their intent and meaning.

> *Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

A final vote was held on the question: Overall, how do you rate this course?

> *The question was approved by voice vote.*

John McIntosh asked if the scale would stay as written. The Task Force confirmed.

Vote on the question of including a comment box for each question.

Discussion.

> *Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

> *Including a comment box for each question was approved by voice vote.*

Bill Feighery noted that the scale for the first set of questions is 5, and for the second it is 4; this will look different and might be confusing.

Gwynn Mettetal noted that this will be confusing for dossiers.

Susan Moore and Jerry Hinnefeld noted agreement.

Dean Elizabeth Dunn recommends that we charge the Task Force to come up with a solution to the numbers scale so that it isn't difficult.

> *Motion, seconded.*

Discussion.

Jerry Hinnefeld noted that we could use a 0 to 4 so that it all matches.

Dean Dunn offered an amendment to her motion to adopt the 0 to 4 scale for the top questions so that the bottom questions will match.

*Motion, seconded.*

Discussion.

Chancellor Allison noted that a simpler solution might be to insert "Needs Improvement" between poor and satisfactory, thus achievement a 5 point scale on the second set of questions.

Larry Bennett agrees with this.

Dean Dunn withdraws her motion.

*Motion to insert "Needs Improvement" between poor and satisfactory, seconded.*

Discussion.

*Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

Vote to adopt both scales as currently represented.

Joe Chaney asked for a show of hands.

*The scales were adopted by voice vote.*

Dean Elizabeth Dunn reminded the body that we can collect data for a time and can revise these questions if necessary as time goes on.

Question 9: adding one final box labeled "Any additional comments?"

Jerry Hinnefeld thinks this is a good idea.

*Motion to close discussion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

*The question was approved by voice vote.*

Elizabeth Bennion Turban asked if we could consider cutting the words "that was" in question 3?
As a point of order we will not consider since we have already voted on this.

Jerry Hinnefeld noted that since 8 weeks courses are using pilot questions only the end of semester evaluations will have these questions. He suggested that these course evaluations questions be included on all course evaluations beginning with the spring 2016 semester.

*Motion, seconded.*

Discussion.

Hinnefeld clarified his motion – He hopes that all courses that can will use them but doesn't want to say that it is required because of previous agreements made between some schools and departments and Academic Affairs for the fall term.

John McIntosh noted that he has consulted with the departments that have 8 week courses.

Dean Dunn asks if Hinnefeld is saying that we can't require this of the 8 week courses?
Would units then be free to complete course evaluations however they want for fall 2015?

Mike Keen noted that we could require that all courses that aren't short courses use these questions. This would be a separate question.

> *Motion to close discussion on Hinnefeld motion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

> *The motion carried by voice vote.*

Mike Keen moved that the newly accepted course evaluation questions be required for all courses that are not short classes or others that are exempt and those units that have already been exempted.

Discussion.

General agreement that these questions will be used in the fall of 2015 unless an exception has already been granted.

The sense of the body is that this is fine.

*Mike Keen withdraws his motion.*

President Opasik asked for a motion to suspend rules in order to extend the meeting time to allow for presentation.

> *Motion, seconded; carried by voice vote.*

*The complete listing of the approved course evaluation questions are included with these minutes as Appendix A.*

5. Other Reports

A. Hannah Vann, SGA President addressed the Senate. She noted that she has been chosen to represent the IU system at the Indiana Statehouse and is Chairing the All-University SGA. This will be the first time that the ULSA meeting will be held in South Bend.

She sees an increase in student involvement in SGA issues. She thanked faculty, academic leaders, and administrators for encouraging students. She wants to unite with faculty and administrators to fund activities that support retention and supports reaching out to get the student opinion on retention.

She showed a video of students responding to questions about the influence of professor on students.

She asked the faculty body to continue to encourage students and to believe in students.

Ken Smith noted that it would be helpful if students set their own agenda with regard to retention. Gwynn suggested that this would be a good Vision 2020 proposal.

6. Administrative and Officer Reports

A. Chancellor Allison acknowledged the meeting's time shortage and stated that the Chancellor and EVCAA will visit each school in the near future; he will save some comments for those smaller meetings.

Budget –one key message that he heard from last year's budget committee is to start the budget process earlier. He will make that happen. Tuition raises for 2016-17 have been set at 1.2% which doesn't cover a 1% salary increase for everyone so enrollment/retention is key. He applauds the student retention idea and will discuss further with Hannah. There was a project to interview each student that didn't return that did not come to fruition but there will be an initiative to do qualitative research on this question in the future.

Enrollment – applications from the 18 year old segment of the population were up. There are more honors students, more 20th Century scholars, and 80 new scholar-athletes.

The Athletics committee will be coming forward with an additional recommendation in order to meet Title IX requirements at the next Senate meeting.

We have come to some agreements with Adams High School for the use of their facilities for our athletes.

Residential Housing filled for the first time this year. The Chancellor thanked Karen White and Ricky Ganaishlal for their work in this area.

Facilities –The Administration Building renovation plans will be presented at the next IU Board of Trustees meeting on October 9th. This will be a financial approval of approximately $3.5 million dollars, not an architectural approval. This is necessary so that construction can go ahead once architectural planning is complete.

The Chancellor noted that he was pleased with the great energy on campus this week, citing Constitution Day and other activities. He believes that with our shifting demographics that students will be looking for more activities and engagement.

B. Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Jann Joseph reported on several key issues.

General Education – As we prepare for the HLC visit in 2017 there are many good things to report but there is concern about the General Education program. She has received recommendations from the Gen Ed committee, the Assessment committee, and the HLC leadership to increase oversight of the Gen Ed program. There will be a review of Gen Ed, perhaps with an outside consultant. We will look at interdisciplinary courses and will look for a General Education Director.

Scheduling – We will continue to optimize how we offer classes for our students with the idea of getting as many of our regular faculty teaching students.

We must move our students toward increased engagement. We have NSSE results that show that students are not engaging in High Impact Practices in positive comparison to our peer institutions.

Retention – We will increase our goal of retention to 70% in the next few years and then hope to raise the goal to 75%. With 90 more freshman retained to sophomore year, and similar gains across the campus this would result in 300 more students enrolled which equates to an additional 2 million dollars. She asked the body to consider what positive actions might be taken with that money and noted that if we come together around retention it cascades across the campus to solve lots of problems and to create potential.

Dr. Joseph commended the Academic Senate for our robust discussion and important work on the evaluation questions this morning.

She will have further information to share at unit meetings.

C. Laura Whitney – Student Code Procedures.
Ms. Whitney was no longer at the meeting. This report is tabled.

D. Sara Benken – IU Human Subjects office reminded the body of the consolidation of Human Subjects operations into one office. Over the summer representatives visited each campus and discussed issues with committees and interested parties.

Beginning in July 2015, all proposals began to be submitted via the electronic system. All ongoing studies have been placed in the system. The HS office will be happy to work with you to get information and documents into the system. She and her office continue to work closely with Erika Zynda who is the IRB liaison on this campus.

Following this meeting there is an IRB workshop in UCET on the IRB process, requirements, etc. – please attend. She will travel here periodically and stressed her availability to help people through the system and through the process.

E. Ezella McPherson – Titan Success Center.
Dr. McPherson presented information on the Titan Success Center and their retention efforts with students.

The mission of the Titan Success Center is to work with campus units to ensure the success of conditionally admitted students, to help them to transition to college, and to choose majors. Other students are also welcome to come into the office and be served. The Titan Success Center staff strive to build relationships with students and connect with them. Staff have seen many students on multiple occasions for support.

When a student visits the staff ask them to get into Oncourse or Canvas to show the advisor their courses. Staff help with admissions, registration, and other questions. Meetings with students also include developing plans for success. This may include referral to campus resources including talking with faculty members.

As faculty members use FLAGS staff are contacting students through multiple means to try to get them into the office for intervention.

The Titan Success Center staff have worked within the School of Business to attend cohort meetings and present information on time management and study strategies.

An Open house event is coming up. Please watch for more information.

Jay VanderVeen asked if flagging results in calls to all levels. Dr. McPherson answered that calls are made to freshmen and sophomores.

Raman Adaikkalavan asked if students are required to come to the Center or if the staff will work with them online? McPherson noted that the students have thus far been required to come in to the office.

Chancellor Allison asked if there were any early successes to talk about? McPherson noted that just getting students in is often a success. Some students have real issues and they need directed to appropriate resources. So far they have talked to approximately 175 students in their office.

The Chancellor noted that the direct feedback that he has heard is from faculty that are relieved that when they use FLAGS they know that something will happen.

Dean Dunn noted that 80% of classes are using Flags now that we know something is being done to intervene with the students.

Louise Collins asked what faculty can do to help the Titan Success Center? McPherson responded to send students to the Center.

Raman Adaikkalavan asked if there was a webpage for referral. The URL is:

https://www.iusb.edu/titan-success/index.php

7. Announcements

Alison Stankrauff is the Chair of the Vendor Review Board. The Board will be looking at purchasing practices of the campus to see if these align with campus goals and values of diversity, sustainability, etc. Please complete the brief survey on the handouts available and get those to her. She will also post on the Daily Titan.

Dean Vicki Bloom noted that Naz Pantaloni will be on campus on October 23rd as part of a Scholarly Communications conference. He will present information on Copyright in the Classroom in the SAC at 2 p.m. The Veterans Book Club will have their first meeting soon; please encourage student Veterans to attend.

Lezlie Ontiveros from Making the Academic Connection announced that this year's Multicultural Showcase Day will be held on Friday, Oct. 30th. 300 students will be on campus. If any faculty members are willing to volunteer to do a 30 minute, engaging mini-lecture, please contact her at lezontiv@iusb.edu or 574-520-4342 or Cynthia Murphy at 574-520-4361 or via email at cmurphyw@iusb.edu.

Raman Adaikkalavan noted that the DE Task Force send out a student survey about distance education starting in the summer months and have received 600 responses so far. Faculty members should also have received an email to complete a survey about distance education this week. Please complete this survey. Administrators will receive a survey soon as well.
A copy of the report of the Campus Directions Committee is attached to these minutes.


8. The meeting was adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Nancy Wootton Colborn
Academic Senate Secretary

Attachment: Course Evaluation Questions

Student Evaluation Task Force Revised Recommendation – approved by the Senate on Sept. 18, 2015

All the questions from 1 to 8 will have a box for additional comments.

1. The instructor was well-prepared.
2. The instructor explained the subject matter clearly.
3. The instructor created an environment that was conducive to learning.
4. The assignments helped me to learn.
5. The instructor was readily available (e.g., email, office hours, or one-on-one consultation).
6. The instructor provided helpful feedback (e.g., on assignments, exams, presentations).

Above 5 questions are answered by the following scale:

Strongly agree – 5
Agree – 4
Neither agree nor disagree - 3
Disagree – 2
Strongly disagree – 1
Not applicable - is added here

7. Overall, how do you rate this instructor?
8. Overall, how do you rate this course?

Above 2 questions are answered by the following scale:

Excellent – 5
Good – 4
Satisfactory – 3
Needs improvement - 2
Poor – 1

9. Any Additional comments?
(Box provided)

Attachment: Campus Directions Committee Fall 2015 report

**Fall 2015 Report of the Campus Directions Committee**

During the 2013-2014 academic year, the campus developed a strategic plan which was approved by the Academic Senate. In November 2014, Chancellor Allison charged the Campus Directions Committee to align the campus plan with IU's strategic plan, and to monitor and report progress toward achieving campus goals. We addressed some small changes in the campus plan made in light of progress already achieved and feedback from the IU administration.

Co-chairs Lyle Zynda and Rob Ducoffe worked with Doug McMillen and Bini Tesfamariam to develop a dashboard framework for tracking progress toward the goals of the strategic plan. The Committee, Chancellor Allison, the Chancellor's Cabinet and the Academic Cabinet reviewed the framework, which includes the objectives of the strategic plan, corresponding goals, required data or documentation (and sources thereof), as well as information on progress to date toward the goals.

To keep assessment of progress up to date, campus units will be asked to report the current status of initiatives related to the plan's goals.