

Faculty Organization Meeting
November 15, 2019
1-3 pm
Hawthorn Hall 107
Minutes

1. Called to order at 1:00 pm.
2. Approval of Minutes: October 18, 2019 – approved without amendment.
3. New Business
 - a. Academic Affairs (Bill Allegrezza): This committee is understaffed at the moment and I would like to get some feedback from the faculty organization. We are proposing that every class be required to use the syllabus, gradebook, and announcements tools on Canvas. What does everyone think about this? Faculty Comment: Absolutely yes. Faculty Comment: Sometimes I do not really use the announcements. Faculty Comment: This is easy to do. Faculty Question: Would this be a requirement for adjuncts? Answer: The proposal is that this would count for everybody. Faculty Question: What would be the point of using the announcements tool in a face-to-face class? Faculty Comment: I assume emergency announcements would be important. The use of Canvas would put the responsibility on the instructor. Faculty Question: What is the enforcement mechanism? Is this just a best practice? Answer: I just came up with the policy, I assume enforcement would be up to the deans. Faculty Question: I post announcements on the page, and I send messages through the Canvas inbox. Would that be good enough or do I need to use the announcements tool? Answer: I would think that would be good. Faculty Comment: Using Canvas regularly is easy and provides a mechanism to stay in touch with students in the case of an emergency. Canvas actually works. Faculty Comment: In nursing we are required to have our syllabi on Canvas and in a Box folder, and faculty that do not do that have it noted on their annual review. Faculty Comment: I believe COAS has a requirement to use the syllabus and gradebook tools.
 - b. Teaching (Chris Young): There is a link in your email to a course that has best practices on keeping in contact with students. The Academy at IUN is also forming and we are accepting nominations of students who are intellectually curious but not very engaged. Faculty Question: What class-range are you targeting? Early or late? Answer: We have rising sophomores in mind, but we will keep it flexible for the first year and see what kind of nominations we get.
 - c. Plagiarism Prevention (Nico Casas): The plagiarism prevention workshop is being extended to an additional two dates, December 2nd and December 5th. The workshops so far have been a success with 22 students in attendance. I will send out a mass email to faculty about that.
 - d. Women's Faculty Lunch (Susan Zinner): The number of attendees at the Women's Faculty Lunch is dwindling. Surekha Rao and I are not sure how to proceed. We believe these are important, particularly for untenured female

faculty. Does anyone want to discuss this or raise the issue of whether this is worth continuing? Faculty Comment: It is worth continuing, so please do. Schedules can always be difficult. Faculty Comment: A lot of classes are between 10:00 and 4:00. Maybe it could be scheduled better by looking at days where there are fewer classes around lunch time. Faculty Question: Is this only for professors on a tenure track? Answer: No. Faculty Comment: Maybe people do not know what the luncheon is for or what expectations are, so if that could be communicated that would be helpful. Answer: Okay, I will do that for the next one.

4. President's Report – Susan Zinner

- a. Fidelity Retirement Change: I think this has been mostly resolved. The person on the Bloomington campus responsible for this spoke to the UFC on this issue. He was asked if this change could be done more slowly over the course of a year, but it cannot. He said that this change should not have any impact on the market. Assets will be moved on January 3rd out of TIAA and into the new Fidelity on January 6. We had a group presentation and one-on-one sessions with the Fidelity rep and those went well.
- b. UFC Meeting on November 12: Neither Susan nor Andrea were able to attend because of weather issues. There was a discussion on the draft policy on consensual relationships between faculty members and students. The policy says that student and faculty in a relationship must be from different departments and that the faculty member notify their department chair. There were a number of people opposed to this policy and in favor of an outright prohibition. Faculty Comment: I just completed the sexual harassment training on Canvas and it discusses an absolute prohibition. Answer: I don't know what to say to that, this is the policy under discussion. Faculty Question: How would this impact current relationships? What if my wife wanted to take a class that I taught? Answer: I don't know how to answer that. This is why there is a lot of discussion about the subject. Faculty Question: Is this separate from a prohibition on relationships with students in your own class? Answer: Yes. Other policies that were discussed included Fair Use of Copyrighted Works, Substance Free Workplace, Cheating and Plagiarism, and Search and Screen for Administrators (find links to all these policies [here](#)). As expected, the revised admissions policy permitting test-optional admissions policies at the individual campuses passed. The Admissions Committee on this campus is looking at our own admission policy. John Applegate said that the test-optional admissions policy could help us reach people who already have some college experience.
- c. Please self-nominate or nominate others for the Faculty Board of Review. The term starts in February. See Nicole Anslover's email.
- d. UFC suggestion that IU should become carbon neutral by 2040. Some UFC members are concerned that if the faculty make this recommendation, it will come at the cost of faculty positions or other necessary improvements at the university. IU East estimates carbon neutral initiatives will cost \$10 million, while Southeast estimates \$5 million. Faculty Comment: Perhaps we could consider smaller

initiatives that might be easier and less expensive to accomplish but would still have a positive environmental impact such as how we deal with rainwater or cell phone charging. Answer: Applegate's office will be talking about sustainability initiatives next, so perhaps that will be a chance to discuss other initiatives.

Faculty Comment: Treat these \$5 and \$10 million dollar estimates with caution. Also realize that these moneys may not have to be spent all at once to achieve these objectives. Also realize there is money available. We spent \$11 million this past year on infrastructure improvements on our campus. Susan: There will be a sustainability conference on a regional campus, probably in March 2020.

- e. The Deans' Review Committees have completed their work. The report for Dean Bankston is complete and the report for Dean Hoyert is getting near completion and will be presented to the EVCAA before the end of the year.
- f. Faculty Comment: I urge that all employees pay special attention to the retirement fund changes and consider carefully their options. It is complicated and you might want to talk to people. It's not for the faint hearted. Faculty Question: Were there any videos made of the retirement information session? Answer: No, but there are webinars available and the same information from the session is available in the webinar.

5. Chancellor's Report – William Lowe

- a. We have a registration initiative going on for Spring 2020. It is going very well. We have something like 1/3rd higher registration at this time this year than we did at this time last year. The offer of free parking does seem to be working. Thank you to everyone who has worked to get their students enrolled. Please keep it up, as we are coming into a time of year filled with many distractions for our students. Over the next month, please encourage your students who are not enrolled to do so. When we are able to work directly with our students, we are very successful. When we reach our students directly by phone or text, we enroll 8 out of 10 of them. This is really important. Thank you, but we have to keep up the initiative. Faculty Comment: Free parking ends today, so if you see a student, tell them.
- b. The data we compile each year about our faculty's scholarly and creative activities is very impressive. Particularly for a regional, comprehensive campus, we swing above our weight. The most recent report is that our faculty published over 100 articles (for a faculty group of 120 that have research expectations). There were 8 books and 50 creative engagements. \$900,000 in grants were received. There were also an impressive array of service engagements, numbering 400. This is a lot of very hard work. I am a great admirer and believer of the teacher-scholar model, and we are a good example of that. Thank you for the work you do in your professional lives and the enrichment of your students.
- c. Faculty Comment: One of my students said that it was nice to be on campus and that there were so many events, they mentioned the pizza that was offered for the registration, but also the Veterans Day luncheon and a SPEA luncheon. The food really brings people together. Answer: Thank you. If we just need to consider more food and if that keeps students on campus and keeps the experience rich for

them, then we definitely need to keep that in mind. We are looking for those sorts of ideas.

6. EVCAA's Report – Vicki Roman-Lagunas

- a. Congratulations to Susan Zinner on a great conference last week, “Artist of my own death.” This was a relevant subject for everyone and there were rich discussions there.
- b. Don't forget about the Fidelity choices. It takes some time and is a bit overwhelming.
- c. Academic Affairs invested about \$21,000 in marketing for our graduate programs and we have been getting a lot of “hits.” That means these potential students will be coming to you all. Anybody who hears from interested people, please respond to them in big ways. So far I am pleased, but we need to turn these expressions of interest into students. Our efforts need to be concentrated.

7. New Faculty Affairs policies – Bill Allegrezza (Attachment #1)

- a. There is not a quorum, so no vote can be held. Only 37 faculty members are in attendance. This item is being postponed to the next meeting.

8. Report on Pathways to Promotion and Tenure – Chris Young (Attachment #2)

- a. In 2017, President McRobbie asked campuses to mark out a clear pathway for colleagues who wanted to pursue promotion based on excellence in teaching. A committee chaired by Chris Young and Susan Zinner was created and it has produced this report. See Attachment #2.
- b. These are recommendations that everyone should examine within their units. They are conversation starters about what excellence in teaching should be. We did a comparative analysis of each unit's standards for excellence in teaching, and compared them to campus guidelines. We found this very interesting as there was not much alignment. President McRobbie's request included four categories of excellence in teaching, but of these four only the last two were present in the majority of campus guidelines on the issue. I encourage each unit to go through this report and talk about how you might update your unit's guidelines on promotion based on teaching. Faculty Question: What is the next step here? Answer: Guidelines are owned by each unit, so deans can encourage their schools to look at their own guidelines and think about revision. And from there it's really up to us on where we want to go with this. Perhaps it will go to Faculty Affairs. Faculty Question: For proving that students learn, what can we look for? Answer: What we found is that current guidelines are very vague. That makes sense in some regards, but it can also be very discouraging for new faculty members looking at the guidelines and not knowing what to work on. Pathways documents might have step by step guidelines on what to do next. This will look different for each discipline. Faculty Comment: FACET has an interesting model to demonstrate faculty success in student learning. The LEARN exercise gives data

on how faculty respond to and encourage student learning. The idea is not that you will be penalized, but that you will observe and make changes to improve. Answer: It is a nice and effective model and I can send out a link about it. Faculty Comment: It gives you a completely different perspective and it's like the lights have turned on.

9. Faculty Survey – John Novak

- a. This is an update on the Faculty Survey we are participating in through HERI at UCLA. So far we have 66 responses, which is about an 18% response rate. I encourage you to recommend that your colleagues complete it as well. We are keeping it open until the end of the year, so there is plenty of time to complete it. I will be sending out additional reminders next week and then at the beginning of December. As you complete it, you will no longer get reminders about it. Faculty Comment: Can you be more honest in your email about how long it will take? It is frustrating when the email says it will take 20 minutes, but then it takes over an hour. Answer: UCLA did not give us an estimate of how long the survey takes, so I apologize for that. I appreciate your time and dedication and I will make sure to make note that it takes awhile in the next email. Faculty Comment: I agree that it took a long time. What surprised me is that there is no open-ended question. Why isn't there one? Answer: That's a good question. We decided not to add open-ended questions this time, but we could have done that. EVCAA: It was important to me that we had a national norm survey, and adding in open-ended questions takes away from that. It would have made for an even longer survey, but perhaps the next time we do the survey Faculty Org might suggest open-ended questions that we could add to it.

10. Old Business

- a. None was presented.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 2:01 pm.

Attachment 1:

Faculty Affairs Policies

FACULTY AFFAIRS POLICIES:

1. Indiana University Northwest Policy on Combining Undergraduate and Graduate Level Sections

To maintain the integrity of the programs and degrees offered at Indiana University Northwest, the following policy has been established for combining undergraduate and graduate sections.

2. Combining 300 and 400 level courses with 500+ level graduate courses

Only undergraduate courses numbered at the 300 or 400 level may be cross-listed with graduate level courses. In addition, the graduate level course (500+) should include additional assignments/exams supporting graduate level credit.

3. Academic Renewal Policy (same language, new name)

<https://www.iun.edu/edu/registrar/policies/academic-forgiveness-policy.htm>

AUDITING A COURSE

Courses may be taken on an official audit basis, which means that students can attend the course without working for or expecting to receive formal credit. No credit will be given and the audited course will be indicated on the student's transcript with a grade of NC (no credit). The student must discuss course work expectations with the instructor and it is up to the instructor to approve the student's request. Courses taken for audit do not apply toward any academic degree and do not count as part of a student's full- or part-time course load for purposes of financial aid or loan deferments. The tuition for an audited course is the same as that for a credit course.

Students considering the audit option should discuss their plans carefully with their academic advisor. It is possible that another grading option (i.e., Pass/Fail) may be more appropriate. In some cases, schools do not allow students to register for a class for credit after taking it on an audit basis. Students must pick up the audit forms from their school or division, secure the appropriate signatures, and submit the completed form to the Office of the Registrar by the deadline specified in the academic calendar. Once invoked, the student may not change to credit status for the course.

Attachment 2:

Report on Pathways to Promotion and Tenure

October 2019

In response to President Michael McRobbie's State of the University address in 2017, each IU campus set out to review its language regarding demonstrating excellence in teaching at all levels for Promotion and Tenure (campus/school/department). The charge was to report back to the President's office confirming that each campus meets the requirements set forth in the address.

These requirements include assuring that our campus's promotion and tenure criteria for teaching excellence are reliable for applicants, rigorous, well-documented, externally peer-reviewed, and use best-practice standards for assessing teaching (for "effective" (i.e., satisfactory) and "excellent" levels). Moreover, campuses were asked to consider also whether there are any institutional obstacles to implementing best-practice standards.

To this end, Academic Affairs and the Faculty President assembled a committee that consisted of representatives from each school and college. Discussions centered on three items: the IU Northwest Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, Unit Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and the Pathways for Excellence in Teaching. The committee spent a bulk of its time considering whether these documents aligned with each other.

The committee's conversations were robust, interesting, and revealing. While most of the guidelines signaled a sincere desire to meet the standards set out by the President—reliable, rigorous, well-documented, externally peer-reviewed, use of best-practice standards for assessing teaching—we discovered that these criteria, were at best, met unevenly both within the campus's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and within individual units.

We came to this conclusion by surveying the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for both campus and individual units. One report examined whether consistency existed across individual units and the campus guidelines by noting key requirements. Developed in an Excel file, the reader can easily determine which requirements are asked of some candidates in some units for promotion and which are not. The other report approached the same guidelines, but asked whether they met the principles outlined in the document, *Identifying Pathways for Excellence in Teaching: Focus on direct evidence of student learning, Rely on multiple sources of evidence and reflect on interconnections, Focus on indicators of good teaching supported by research on teaching and learning, and Recognizing that excellent in teaching goes beyond the classroom*. This analysis revealed that some principles were achieved generally, but others (e.g. direct evidence of student learning) were not.

Across the different academic units on campus, there was a general appreciation for what the committee was attempting to do. Through their representatives, the units offered insights into what were the particular concerns and issues from the standpoint of their discipline, program, school, or college. In the course of our discussions and analyses of the various Promotion & Tenure guidelines, important considerations began to emerge. We submit these in the form of recommendations to our campus colleagues for future discussion, consideration, and action.

Recommendations:

A. Campus-level Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

1. Review inconsistencies in grant expectations between Teaching and Research substantive factors:
 - Teaching wording: “**Funded** external proposals for pedagogical innovation...”
 - Research wording: “**Efforts to attract** external funding to support [...] research...”

B. Unit-level Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

2. If lacking, establish clear guidelines on “satisfactory” and “excellence” in teaching.
3. Review and clarify how campus P&T guidelines are reflected in academic unit guidelines, with attention to campus P&T guidelines items that are generally underrepresented in unit guidelines, such as:
 - Presentations on teaching innovation in professional meetings.
 - Evidence of student learning or teacher effectiveness.
 - Contributions on teaching committees.
 - Mentoring faculty **in ways designed to support and increase the likelihood of tenure.**
4. Make explicit that course evaluations alone would not serve as direct evidence of teaching excellence (or even satisfactory teaching performance). However, a sustained pattern of excellent end-of-course evaluations can add to a case for excellence.
5. Consider including language that expresses expectations regarding Student Success and Community Engagement.
6. Provide greater attention toward clarifying expectations for Lecturers and Clinical Faculty who seek promotion. This is especially important since a third rank exists for each category.

C. Campus-level and Unit-level Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

7. As part of the charge to identify clear expectations for documenting excellence in teaching, the campus and academic units should review and consider revisions, clarifications, and additions to how excellence in teaching is measured to ensure that guidelines reflect the following general principles:
 - I. Focus on direct evidence of student learning.
 - II. Rely on multiple sources of evidence and reflect on interconnections.
 - III. Focus on indicators of good teaching supported by research on teaching and learning.
 - IV. Recognize that excellence in teaching goes beyond the classroom.

The assembled Committee set out to fulfill its charge to review the language regarding excellence in teaching at all levels for Promotion and Tenure on our campus, to examine its criteria for teaching excellence, and to consider whether there are any institutional obstacles to implementing best-practice standards. The value of the charge and of the Committee’s work is already evident. Following reports made by representatives to their respective units, some schools and departments have already begun revising their criteria with an eye on maintaining continuity with campus guidelines. The Committee intends to build on this momentum by continuing our discussions with

the hope of further clarifying Promotion and Tenure guidelines as they relate to excellence in teaching.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Greenburg, Associate Professor, School of the Arts

Kristin Huysken, Associate Professor, College of Arts and Sciences

Micah Pollak, Associate Professor, School of Business and Economics

Sharon Pratt, Assistant Professor, School of Education

Mark Thomas, Associate Professor, College of Health and Human Services

Christopher Young, Professor, College of Arts and Sciences and Academic Affairs

Susan Zinner, Professor, School of Public and Environmental Affairs and President, Faculty Organization