

Faculty Organization Meeting  
April 17, 2020  
1-3 pm  
Online via Zoom  
Minutes

1. Called to order at 1:01 pm.
2. Approval of Minutes: March 27, 2020 – approved without amendment.
3. New Business
  - a. Induction Ceremony (Jonathyne Briggs): Pending normal activities resuming in the fall, the Redhawk Induction Ceremony is planned for August 25 at 12:15pm. We think this will be a significant event in getting people back on campus. This will be Chancellor Iwama’s first ceremony with the students. Keep an eye out for an email from Debi Qualls about reserving regalia. Thank you to all the faculty for their past participation and hopefully future participation.
  - b. General Education and Assessment Committee (Doug Swartz): A couple of years ago we sent out a survey about general education, but no consensus for change emerged from that. So this year we thought we would come up with keywords to tag current classes for the requirements. These keywords would provide more description of how a class fits a requirement than is present in the bulletin descriptions. We will be sending around a document to ask faculty to supply a list of keywords that they might use to tag their classes. Cynthia O’Dell: We would like to get this input, like Doug said, and then select a set of keywords, because it does not make sense to have an unlimited set of keywords. These keywords would allow students to take general education courses that fit a theme if they wanted to do so.
  - c. Introduction of Instructional Designer (Chris Young): Chenfeng Zhang has joined CISTL as Instructional Designer. Welcome!
  - d. Thanks to Susan (Bill Allegrezza): Thank you Susan for being Faculty Org President for the last couple of years. It is a thankless job but we all really appreciate you.
4. President’s Report – Susan Zinner
  - a. New Faculty Organization officers: The election is over and we have new officers for next year. President Mark Baer, Vice President Bill Allegrezza, Secretary David Parnell, UFC Rep Harold Olivey, Northwest Council Rep Vesna Balac, All Campus P&T Committee Members Crystal Shannon and Monica Solinas-Saunders.

- b. Thanks to the following people finishing a term on the Executive Committee this year: Kris Huysken, Andrea Griffin, Scooter Pegram, Scott Hudnall, Marshelia Harris, Crystal Shannon, and Sharon Pratt.
- c. A proposed Amendment to the IU Faculty Constitution would give regional campuses an additional person to represent them at the UFC who is not tenure track. The UFC will vote on this on April 23<sup>rd</sup>. Email me with comments. I expect that this will pass. One of the things we will have to do is to amend our constitution if this takes place. Faculty Question: Can non-tenure track individuals be officers in the UFC? Answer: I believe that is a campus decision, not a UFC decision.

#### 5. Chancellor's Report – William Lowe

- a. Thank you to the president and all the officers of the Faculty Organization, and welcome to the new faculty officers who will lead us into a new year.
- b. Thanks to you all for the terrific effort you have put in over the past five weeks. There have been comments from all, faculty, staff and students alike, that life on Zoom is exhausting. I can confirm that. Thank you for the work you are putting in to keep IU Northwest open and accessible to our students.
- c. It is very important that we recognize everything our students are experiencing. Remind them that the campus has services open and available for them.
- d. We had very good attendance at our town hall meetings this week: 140 on Tuesday and 80 on Wednesday. We will continue to work to minimize disadvantages and fallout from the pandemic. IU is mandating a 5% decrease in the budget for the next year under the assumption of declining enrollments.
- e. This is my last Faculty Organization meeting as chancellor. I have been very proud of my time at IU Northwest and my faculty colleagues here. Thank you as always for your good work and all the best for your future.
- f. Faculty Question: I am wondering what's happening with sabbaticals this coming year. I have been approved for sabbatical. Is that going to go through despite the budget change? Vicki: I have the answer to that and I will report on that as soon as I have the opportunity.
- g. Faculty Question: Is the 5% budget cut supposed to be permanent? Chancellor: Yes, that is part of the requirement. The budget must be 5% smaller than it is now. Faculty Question: What is the rationale for making it permanent? Chancellor: It is permanent in the sense that the dollars must absolutely be out of the budget, but it does not prevent a budget growth in the future. The assumption behind it is that we are in for some tough times and that this has to be a reduction that we would not expect to get back. We should not plan in the next fiscal year that these resources would come back.

## 6. EVCAA's Report – Vicki Roman-Lagunas

- a. Thank you to all for your hard work. I am astounded by my colleagues on campus and so grateful for what you are doing. These are not easy times, and dealing with that on top of a budget cut is particularly hard. But we will get through it.
- b. Sabbaticals are not being cancelled. If you have plans to travel for your sabbatical, for example to Paris in August, then you should not count on being able to do so and you may want to defer. But sabbaticals in general are not being cancelled or stopped.
- c. The tenure clock extension must be filed by May 1 for those individuals who were scheduled to go up for promotion/tenure this coming year. They need to inform Academic Affairs and fill out a form to get an extension for another year. The form goes through Academic Affairs and then John Applegate and will not be denied. Other probationary faculty have until December 31 to request their extension.
- d. Spring Student Evaluations: I have talked with the Executive Committee about this. We are planning to proceed with distributing the student evaluations as normal. There is a UFC task group looking at the general issue of whether student evaluations should be used in evaluating faculty teaching. But in this particular situation, while I feel very strongly that students need to be allowed to fill out evaluations, it is an unprecedented time and we will not mandate the inclusion of this semester's evaluations in the evaluation of any faculty member for promotion or tenure.
- e. Zoom Recordings: Online teaching does not necessarily mean synchronous teaching. However, some faculty who have not trained in online teaching have chosen to do synchronous teaching through zoom. The issue with synchronous sessions for a class is that students have lives that have changed enormously, and they cannot necessarily keep a consistent schedule. If you are using a synchronous zoom meeting for your classes, please record the lectures/meetings for students to view later. However, for FERPA reasons, the only people who can have access to the recorded meetings are the people enrolled in that class right now. You can't use it again next semester. If you need help with this, you can contact our folks in CISTL.
- f. S/P Grades: We will be allowing students to request an S or P grade in lieu of a letter grade this semester. We are asking all faculty to apply letter grades as usual. The students will be given the opportunity to request an S or P after they have seen their letter grade. Letter grades are always the better option, but there might be times where an S grade makes more sense to a student instead of the letter grade. We are calling this a request, not an appeal, since the word appeal has a negative connotation. We have come up with a pathway for this request – the student will request it and initiate the process.
- g. Cynthia O'Dell: We have a simple statement for transfers. IU will accept transfer coursework from other institutions with a grade of S or P as long as it is for an

academic term in 2020 impacted by COVID-19, and the student supplies information describing the context of the grade. For us, IU will be indicating on the transcript what S grades in Spring 2020 means. I think this does not do any violence to the overall policies of our transfer system. Faculty Question: How do we know what the overall grade is behind the S or P? What if it is a D? Answer: The note on the transcript from the transferring institution should indicate to us that the S or P stands for a C or better, which is what we currently require for transfer credits anyway. Peter Zachocki: IU is planning to apply a message to its own transcripts indicating that the COVID-19 pandemic may have impacted grading. Faculty Question: If a student asks for an S grade but they have received a D or D-, are we allowed to say we are willing to give them a P grade? Answer: Yes, that is absolutely the case. We can do a P for a D- or better. This is a nice option, but it's not the best option for our students except in a very limited number of cases.

- h. Enrollment: I wanted to end my report on a positive note. Our enrollment is looking fabulous. We are doing so well with our summer and fall enrollments compared to the other regional campuses. This is because everybody is doing an outstanding job of advising the students and getting them in classes. The sooner they register, the more likely that they will stay with us during this time.
- i. Faculty Question: How should we consider the grade 'S' when examining students applying to professional programs? Cynthia: It's a sticky situation. You do not want to disadvantage the students, because the whole point of this option is to help the student. I think you will have to come up with a process for how to handle this within your academic unit. Faculty Comment: We won't accept any with a P, it would have to be at least an S, because a P indicates a grade below a C.
- j. Faculty Question: What happens if we have enrolled students for Fall semester for in-person classes, but we then have to move them online? Some students may think that is not what they signed up for. Answer: That is a good question and in some ways we are going through that now. If it's decided that we have to stay online during the fall, we need to be prepared for that as faculty. We need to have this as a possibility in our mind. We have to do the best we can. We have to be comfortable with ambiguity.
- k. Faculty Question: If our clinical agencies let us come back, we are planning to go back to allowing our students to go to clinicals. Is that okay? Answer: We are looking to nursing and medical to have input on that and to decide as a system. IUN is not going to make decisions differently. Faculty Comment: That is kind of difficult because campuses were split before clinics closed. Some were doing it, some were not. Chancellor: If there is an opportunity for our students to go back into clinicals, please let Vicki know.
- l. Faculty Question: Should faculty begin work on preparing fall classes to go online right now? Answer: That is a good question. I know how much work it is to

prepare classes to go online, so I would hate for all that work to be done if it is not necessary. We are trying to be optimistic right now.

- m. Beth Tyler: For those who were present at the town hall meetings, we talked about this a little. I have been doing my best to stay in touch with students and send out messages to them. In my latest message, I asked how the students were doing, how we were doing, and how the students wanted to hear from us. I have received more than 100 responses. The most common response was thank you. Our students miss their face-to-face classes, miss being on campus, and miss you. Our students generally feel that there is MORE work in their classes now than when they were face-to-face. They know there are lots of distractions. They are experiencing burnout from staring at the screen so much. Students say they have too many emails. Some of them are interested in a town hall meeting. I think it's a minority, but I am going to talk to Marketing about how to do it. Some did contact me about financial stress, and I am following up with them on it. IUN is receiving \$1.5 million of CARES Act money, and that money is for giving directly to our students for helping them in their situations, not for paying their school bills. Faculty Question: How did you send your personalized messages to students? Can we do that? Answer: Yes, I just did a mail merge, and you can do that too. Faculty Question: Can we get a link to the emergency plan page so we can send it to our students? Answer: Yes, once I get the website up I will send it to faculty. Probably on Monday.

## 7. Guidelines for Online Education at IUN – Chris Young

- a. This document (See Attachment #1) came out of a committee called the Online Education Council, which was charged by the Vice Chancellor to set our guidelines for online education at IU Northwest. The context at the time, in 2018 when this was started, is that some institutions were being investigated for whether their classes met federal standards for distance education. Susan: One thing that the Executive Committee mentioned when examining this document is that it should be considered a set of guidelines rather than a policy, which is a small distinction but we thought it was important. Chris: Yes, and our committee was fine with that and agreed to use the word guidelines. These guidelines are really to protect us and it is in our best interest to have high standards for our online courses. Faculty Question: Is there any distinction in the document between recommendations for a full-time faculty and an adjunct faculty? Answer: All faculty are expected to have training in online education before they teach online. Faculty Question: Where does the \$250 for adjunct faculty taking the online teaching class come from? Answer: From CISTL. Faculty Question: Is there a difference between the online courses taught here and those taught through IUOCC? Answer: Well, both types of classes are taught by IUN faculty members, so the same requirements would apply. These guidelines suggest going through this training every three years. Faculty Question: Yes, I see that the online class

and QM training should be refreshed every three years. How was that time frame decided and are things really changing that frequently? Answer: In the last three years a lot has changed in terms of what we know about QM standards and the issue of accessibility. Whether the same amount of change occurs in the next three years is unclear. But these are our guidelines as faculty and we can adjust them. Faculty Question: Does an adjunct get paid \$250 every time they take the online class, so every three years? Answer: Yes, because it does take their time every time they retake it.

- b. Faculty Question: Do we really need to tie our standards to an outside training company like QM? Answer: That's the system that IU is using right now. Downstate is using QM, so if we want to stay ahead of the curve and police ourselves, this is what we should use. Faculty Comment: It would be easier if we would stop changing LMS. Answer: As far as I know there is no plan to change from Canvas. Faculty Question: Is this active now? I have two adjuncts that are in the OTC and they have not been given money. Answer: This is not yet in place; nobody is getting paid yet. Faculty Question: Does this give the deans more power? Answer: Not particularly. Faculty Question: What does it mean that this is a guideline? It seems like a policy to me. Faculty Comment: Executive Committee saw it as guidelines meaning that, for example, you would not have classes taken away if three years passed without training, but might just be reminded to go take your training. Faculty Comment: I am in favor of this, but I find it strange that online classes are more heavily regulated than face-to-face classes, many of which are probably worse than is described here. Vicki: Oh, I completely agree. There is a fear that because classes are online, students are not getting the same level of education as they would in face-to-face. We can agree or disagree with that, but it is a fear from the Department of Education that needs to be addressed.
- c. The vote was conducted via the "Participants" feature of Zoom and the majority of faculty present voted yes to endorse these guidelines as a resolution of faculty organization.

## 8. Peer Mentoring – Chris Young

- a. In CISTL we have been putting together a peer mentoring program for online teaching. We pair mentors and mentees, and they get together to have a meeting and form guidelines for their partnership and what they want to accomplish. People have handled this in different ways. Some mentees are early in their careers and some want to have their courses QM certified. There are different ways to use the program, and we encourage you to take advantage of it. We have 13 peer mentors. Contact Tamekha in CISTL if you are interested. Faculty Question: Is mentoring available in the summer? Answer: Yes. Faculty Question: Is being a QM Peer Mentor a sign of excellence in teaching for promotion/tenure? Answer: That's a good question. I think it could serve as evidence for that.

Faculty Comment: I was told yes, and that's why I'm serving as a QM Mentor currently. Faculty Question: Can we get a list of the peer mentors? Answer: You can email Tamekha and ask for a list.

9. Criteria for Promotion to Rank of Teaching Professor – Mike LaPointe and Chris Young

- a. Chris: The Faculty Affairs Committee took up the task of establishing criteria for the promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor, a recently approved third rank for lecturers (see Attachment #2). We tried to lay out why we did what we did in the narrative in the beginning. The committee is present today. We are hoping that we can look at it and review it. We had the Executive Committee look at it and addressed their questions and concerns. The goal is for this to be in place for our colleagues who wish to go up for promotion to Teaching Professor in the next academic year. Mike: We wanted to get these out now, and then do a holistic review of all the criteria for promotion for other ranks in the future. Susan: I want to point out that the response to Executive Committee comments is also included in our attachments (Attachment #3).
- b. Faculty Question: Were any lecturers consulted? Answer: We had a clinical professor on the committee, but we did not have any lecturers.
- c. Susan: Does anyone want to comment? I think we might be especially interested in comments by lecturers.
- d. Faculty Question: Did you say that the guidelines for promotion to teaching professor were similar to the guidelines for promotion from associate to full professor? Answer: Yes, that's what I said. I want to make clear that these are not required criteria, just potential criteria. Faculty Question: Why are they not parallel to guidelines for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer? Answer: Because there really are not any requirements in our promotion and tenure handbook for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer. So we felt we wanted to make something more concrete for this.
- e. We would encourage each individual unit to establish their own criteria, and we hope this document gives some ideas of where to start with that.
- f. Faculty Question: Are internal grants for teaching considered as a sign of excellence? Answer: This is just a set of options, it is not required that individuals do all of these, but they can pick or choose, and this list is not exhaustive. It just gives options for people trying to decide how to construct their dossier.
- g. Susan: Kris, do we need to vote on this? Kris: This comes from Chris and Mike's committee, so it's already motioned and seconded for a vote. Moderator: Please clear your previous votes and then we can vote on this using "Participants."
- h. These criteria passed by a majority of the vote of the Faculty Organization.

#### 10. Administrative Review Committee Charge – Glenn Lauzon

- a. Two meetings ago, we discussed the idea to have an Administrative Review Committee. Harold, Mark and I met last week to draft a document describing the committee (see Attachment #4). Our mission was to develop a sense of what this committee would do. We started with what is described in the bylaws and then we drafted three areas in which this committee could collaborate with the administration to fulfill our mission: strategic planning, annual survey, and periodic review of academic unit heads. The committee would not do the review but would assist with it.
- b. Faculty Comment: Including information about review of deans seems unnecessary since a process of dean review has already been approved. Glenn: We were not suggesting that the process be reassessed or rewritten. We just felt that as a standing committee, this committee should have a set of duties assigned to it, and this was one of them. That does not mean there is a plan to redo the process, but to oversee it when it is needed.
- c. Faculty Comment: I think it would be good to add “review of need for new administrative positions” to the list of responsibilities for the committee.
- d. Faculty Question: What is included in the term “administration;” how far down are you planning to go? I also have questions about the survey, but we can come back to that.
- e. Faculty Comment: Given the incoming budget cuts, I think we need a way to review the need of new administrative positions.
- f. Susan: We have to take a moment now to consider what to do. Should we ask faculty to send in feedback and revisit this in August? Is that fine with you, Mark? Mark: Yes, I think that would be fine, because this is the first time people have had a chance to see this outside of us three. Susan: Okay, please send comments and this will be readdressed in the fall.
- g. A motion to extend the Faculty Organization meeting by 15 minutes was seconded and passed.

#### 11. Constitution Committee Annual Review – Danny Tsataros

- a. This committee met and decided there were no changes to be made to the Faculty Organization Constitution at this time.
- b. Susan: Thank you. Remember that there was a new constitution passed last year so there was not an expectation that there would be any changes required this year. There may need to be changes next year based on the new lecturer representative to UFC, but that will happen under Mark’s presidency.

#### 12. Senior Survey Report – Cynthia O’Dell

- a. This item was postponed to the fall because it is not time sensitive.



13. Tech Tips – Will Radell

- a. Presentation on how to schedule and record meetings in Zoom and embed them in Canvas pages. Remember not to record meetings that may have FERPA protected data in them. More in depth information will be available through a CISTL training next week.

14. Old Business

- a. None presented.

15. Thank you to the Chancellor and welcome to incoming Faculty Org President Mark Baer

- a. Susan: Thank you to the Chancellor for his hard work and for being willing to reach out to faculty every time there was an issue. I know that it is not easy navigating between Bloomington, our campus, and our faculty, but the Chancellor always managed this with grace. We wish him well as he takes a short time off before returning to join us as a faculty colleague. A video of applause was played.
- b. Susan: Finally, I would like to say thank you to the faculty for allowing me to serve as Faculty Organization President for the last four years. I especially thank Kris Huysken, who was an excellent Vice President and who did everything I asked her to do. I now pass the gavel to Mark Baer, who will make a great Faculty Organization President. Mark: Thank you Susan. I would like to present you with this plaque that thanks you for your excellent service to the Faculty Organization. We appreciate your leadership. Susan: Thank you. This is our last Faculty Organization meeting of the year, so we will see you all in the fall under Mark's leadership.

16. The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 pm.

## Guidelines for Online Education at IU Northwest

### Online Education Guidelines Rationale

Creating a clear standard for expectations in online education allows IU Northwest to maintain our high standards in academic quality, inspire excellence in teaching, and achieve student-learning outcomes on par with our traditional face-to-face courses. Furthermore, the institution seeks to continue with the integration of best practices by improving on technologies and online course development as appropriate. This document describes the recommended policies and operating procedures for the development, delivery, and evaluation of 100% online courses at IU Northwest. These guidelines apply to faculty of all ranks including tenured/tenure-track, lecturer, clinical, and adjunct. In the event an online course is offered through Indiana [University Online Class Connect \(IUOCC\)](#), or is a part of an [online collaborative program](#), those policies override this document.

### Definition of Online Education

[IU Online](#) defines online education as a subset of distance education that uses Internet technologies to deliver instruction to students who are physically separated from the instructor and to support [regular and substantive interaction](#). In online education, instructional content is intentionally designed and delivered asynchronously on the Internet to replace classroom instruction time (contact hours) between the student and instructor.

### Faculty Qualifications for Online Education

As with traditional courses, instructors of online education courses will meet the expectations regarding the qualifications of faculty outlined in the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) [guidelines](#). Faculty requesting to teach online courses must show competence in online instruction through prior training in teaching online or by completing the [Online Teaching Course offered by the Center for Innovation and Scholarship in Teaching and Learning \(CISTL\)](#). The general standards regarding faculty conduct, office hours, and faculty responsibilities also apply in the online education setting. Deans and/or Chairs should consider evidence of prior online teaching and/or online training prior to scheduling teaching assignments. Deans and/or Chairs, in consultation with each faculty member, will determine the precise terms and conditions of every academic appointment and teaching load. It is highly recommended that faculty complete [IU's Teaching Online Series](#) before teaching online. It is recommended that new and adjunct faculty share with their deans (or chairs or program directors when appropriate) any previous online training and experience. If prior training exists, new faculty are encouraged to complete [IU's Teaching Online Series](#) before assigned courses begin and the Online Teaching Course within the first semester at IU Northwest.

Before teaching online, faculty must/should:

- Be trained in IU Northwest's adopted Learning Management System (i.e. Canvas)
- Complete the Online Teaching Course (OTC) offered by IU Northwest's Center for Innovation and Scholarship in Teaching and Learning or equivalent (within the first semester of teaching online)
- Complete Quality Matters (QM)--Applying the Standards at IU course within three years of first teaching online. This course requires a full day to complete.
- Renew their OTC and QM training every three years.

- Have their course reviewed by an IU Northwest Peer Mentor (arranged through CISTL in partnership with both the faculty member and the peer mentor). Peer Mentors are certified by Quality Matters after completing a rigorous three-week course.
- Discuss with their Dean and/or Chair other relevant online training while at Indiana University (e.g. working closely with designers at eDS as part of a collaborative degree program).

In addition, it is highly recommended that the faculty:

- Complete [CISTL's Online Course Development Grant program](#)
- Remain current with emerging methods and new technological avenues that may promote greater student success in online education
- Meet with the campus's Instructional Consultant

It is expected that all new faculty will take the Online Teaching Course offered by CISTL before or soon after the start of their first semester as they were informed in their appointment letter from their Dean.

Adjunct faculty are also required to take the Online Teaching Course offered by CISTL and will be paid a stipend of \$250.00 upon completion.

## Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Online Courses

It is recommended that faculty members not yet promoted or tenured plan to have [a formative review done of their teaching](#). Observations of online courses and face-to-face courses should be included in the promotion and tenure dossier. It is recommended that academic units incorporate these recommendations in their definition of excellence for teaching in the [annual report](#) for all faculty ranks.

Deans and Chairs retain the right to "visit" or enter an instructor's online course, but the faculty member must be first notified of such a visit. Extraordinary cases in which an egregious lack of regular and substantive interaction is demonstrated may provide an exception to this rule.

## Faculty Peer Mentoring

In consultation with CISTL, faculty members will play an important role in determining who will serve as their Peer Mentor for online teaching. Peer Mentors come from a variety of academic ranks and units. To become a Peer Mentor, faculty must be recommended to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by the deans of each academic unit and then become certified reviewers by completing an intensive three-week training course offered by Quality Matters.

## Quality Assurance of Course Design

IU Northwest is committed to adhering to the highest possible standards in online education. Online education courses should be subject to regular ongoing assessment by the academic unit. If a course is offered at the campus level both online and face-to-face, learning outcomes must be identical. Online courses must adhere to the rules of conduct as outlined in the [Code of Academic Ethics](#), which includes clear course goals and liberal contact hours. Online courses should parallel instructional time commitments required for face-to-face courses.

In accordance with the [Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education Programs](#) developed by the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (C-RAC), IU Northwest faculty engaged in online teaching should ensure curricula for online learning are “coherent, cohesive, and comparable in academic rigor to programs offered in traditional instructional formats.” More specifically:

- The curricular goals and course objectives show that the faculty member has knowledge of the best uses of online learning in different disciplines and settings.
- The curriculum is coherent in its content and sequencing of courses.

The IU Northwest center for teaching and learning, CISTL, provides training regarding course design and implementation. Training is provided online, in onsite workshops, and through individual consultations in a format that prepares faculty to develop courses that are in accordance with [Quality Matters Rubric](#), IU’s chosen quality assurance process for online and blended courses.

## Regular and Substantive Interaction

Faculty members engaged in online education courses must adhere to the Federal Interaction Standards for regular and substantive faculty-to-student interaction. Indiana University has developed an [Interaction Standard](#) for regular and substantive interaction based on the [Federal Interaction Guidelines](#) (see also, this [source](#)).

IU’s [Interactive Standard](#) requires regular (repeated) and substantive instructor-initiated interactions that are related to the academic subject matter. This interaction must be more than giving a numerical grade or providing feedback on student work. In addition, grading of student submissions cannot be the sole form of instructor interaction in the course.

The following examples are provided as a suggestion of ways a course and instructor could meet the interaction standard. The course should include evidence of multiple methods and multiple instances.

### *Course Examples*

- Planned, weekly announcements or other communication that directly address student contributions to the course, including challenges and successes. Students should have a channel to respond to announcements.
- Create a syllabus that meets or exceeds accessibility standards.
- A general open discussion thread is available for students to post questions on muddy points. The instructor encourages learners to participate and answer their peers’ queries.
- If grading rubrics are used, the rubrics should include clear, thorough descriptions for each criterion reference point.
- Respond to all students in the course’s welcoming introductions.
- In a discussion thread, the instructor responds with formative coaching to at least 25% of student posts.
- The instructor allows for iterative submissions (ie. rough drafts) and provides feedback on the submissions.

- The instructor provides opportunities for students to engage in reflection on aspects of their learning and provides responses to such reflections.
- The instructor provides a mechanism for students to provide feedback on the course experience regularly and articulates a plan to respond to this student communication.
- Instructor requires students to meet during office hours (virtual or otherwise, at least once during the semester).
- A structure is in place to facilitate ongoing conversations around assignment feedback, and learners are encouraged to reflect on and respond to this feedback.
- The course includes synchronous group critique sessions via video conference or other meeting technology. Should an instructor pursue this option, it is recommended that the synchronous meeting be recorded so others may watch at another time.

To meet this standard a course may include:

- course policies or syllabus statements around interaction plans;
- assignments that include planned interaction in their design.

## Attachment 2:

### Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Teaching Professor

#### Teaching excellence beyond Senior Lecturer

Since senior lecturers are required to stay current in their discipline and pedagogy, but not required to seek promotion to Teaching Professor, the evidence supporting promotion should go beyond the excellent teaching typically expected of a senior lecturer. To qualify as a Teaching Professor, the candidate must have a record of accomplishment that advances the teaching mission of Indiana University.

The criteria for granting long-term contracts after a probationary period shall be analogous to the criteria for granting tenure, except that lecturers shall earn the right to a long-term contract on the basis of their excellence only in those responsibilities that may be assigned to them. Each school will establish procedures and specific criteria for review of individuals concerning the renewal of long-term contracts or their equivalent.<sup>1</sup> Promotion to Senior Lecturer or higher is based on continued improvement in and demonstration of excellence in teaching or service, with at least satisfactory performance in the remaining area.<sup>2</sup> The dossier should convincingly substantiate a case in accordance both with the criteria in the Indiana University Academic Handbook and with any approved unit promotion and tenure guidelines. Promotion to Teaching Professor is analogous to being promoted from Associate to Full Professor. While no specific distinctions are made between being promoted to Associate Professor, to Professor, to Senior Lecturer or to Teaching Professor, higher levels of promotion will expect greater demonstrated achievement—in merit and in impact. However, what indicates excellence—for example, in research for a person seeking promotion to associate professor—is quantitatively and qualitatively different from what is expected of a person seeking promotion to professor.<sup>3</sup> Lecturers are academic appointees whose primary responsibility is teaching. Lecturers' assigned responsibilities may include research and service only in support of teaching.<sup>4</sup>

Indiana University Northwest is a learning-focused institution that emphasizes engaged students, inspired faculty, and continuous improvement of faculty. To engage students, Indiana University Northwest creates a learning environment to foster teacher-student, student-student, and student-content interactions and relationships. This environment includes inspired teachers—a faculty unified in a culture of teaching and learning excellence.

The faculty pursue continuous improvement in a community of scholars studying and contributing to the knowledge about teaching and learning. Therefore, all candidates for

---

<sup>1</sup> Indiana University Academic Handbook.

<sup>2</sup> Indiana University Northwest Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

<sup>3</sup> Indiana University Northwest Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

<sup>4</sup> Indiana University Academic Handbook.

promotion to Teaching Professor must demonstrate a compelling record of teaching activities at IU to pursue these foci: engaged students, inspired faculty, and continuous improvement.

There is more than one way to demonstrate teaching excellence beyond promotion to Senior Lecturer. While there are many ways to categorize excellence, the candidate's dossier will be reviewed in two main categories: **Excellence in Teaching** or **Excellence in Service in Support of Teaching and Learning**. A candidate may be promoted based on evidence of excellence in one category and satisfactory in the other category. Candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor must show evidence of student learning. Direct evidence of impact on student learning will be weighted much more heavily than indirect evidence (e.g. student evaluation data). Teaching awards or any other teaching-related recognition should be considered as general evidence of excellence that amplifies other evidence. Naturally, the more prestigious the award the more it will amplify other evidence. Research or creative activity will be considered when it strengthens one or both of these categories.

### **Excellence in Teaching**

All faculty in the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Teaching Professor are expected to stay current in pedagogy and their academic discipline. Therefore, while the attainment of a terminal degree in their academic discipline is not sufficient *alone* for promotion to Teaching Professor, it should be weighted heavily in consideration of excellence in teaching. Other factors may individually or jointly establish excellence in teaching and qualification for promotion to Teaching Professor. The non-exhaustive list of factors includes:

**Substantive** accomplishments (those most likely to strengthen a case for excellence):

- Awards (local, University-wide, regional, or national)
- Consistently favorable student responses on evaluations, on both the prose comments and numerical results
- Pedagogically-oriented publications in peer-reviewed journals and other scholarly publications
- Efforts to attract external funding for pedagogical innovation or scholarship of teaching and learning
- Attainment of a terminal degree in their academic discipline
- Presentations on research on teaching and learning, innovations, and best practices at professional conferences or workshops
- Authored peer-reviewed articles, textbooks, textbook chapters, and e-texts
- Edited text books or other pedagogical publications
- Peer reviews (external and internal) attesting to impact and value of the candidate's work
- Participation in curriculum development and/or program development
- Development of and dissemination of quality teaching materials
- Applied research on teaching in the candidate's academic discipline, sharing pedagogical innovation, and disseminating best teaching practices.

**Significant** accomplishments (those that might further support the candidate's case):

- Student letters (solicited or unsolicited) commenting on or analyzing the value and effectiveness of the teaching. If the letter is solicited, include a copy of the letter sent to students and indicate how the students were chosen.
- Peer teaching evaluations
- Electronic formats developed for courses and used in teaching
- Course and program design or supervision
- Evidence of student learning or teacher effectiveness (results can be summarized in the Teaching Narrative)
- A list of courses taught reflecting impact on program
- Evidence of teaching creativity or innovation
- Mentored students or faculty, with feedback if available from affected individuals
- Effective student advising
- Innovative course materials developed and implemented, pedagogical presentations on campus
- Contributions on committees that deal with teaching, learning, or student success
- Authored non-peer-reviewed relevant publications (e.g. newsletters contributions)

### **Excellence in Service in Support of Teaching and Learning**

As faculty progress in their careers, their contributions will frequently change in nature spreading beyond the classroom. A non-exhaustive list of activities that indicate service in support of teaching includes:

- Peer review of others' teaching
- Mentoring of faculty
- Programmatic assessment of learning
- Writing student recommendations particularly for scholarships, graduate programs, and employment
- Supervising/leading student service, experiential, or practice-based learning
- Nominations of teachers and students to renowned awards, scholarships, and leadership positions
- Teaching-related committee work
- Student-facing campus service (e.g. sponsoring or advising clubs)
- Outward-facing service toward learning in the community
- Guest lectures
- Serving on teaching award committees
- Chairing and participating in Faculty Learning Communities
- Mentoring student-athletes
- Leadership in teaching-related societies or organizations
- Service awards related to teaching or learning
- Leadership activities at the department, school, campus, or university level
- Participation as a reviewer for teaching-related scholarly journals
- Service on a teaching-related journal's review board, or service as an editor for a teaching-related journal.
- Service on external pedagogical grant review boards



Attachment 3:

Response to Executive Committee Comments on Teaching Professor Criteria

1. The criteria to move from Associate Professor to full Professor are very similar to those of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. It is very much a matter of expanding the reach and impact of ones' work. Did you think about doing the same thing for this rank? Most members of the Executive Committee felt that, where possible, the move from Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor should be analogous to the move from Associate Professor to full Professor. Why not simply expand the current criteria in Senior Lecturer? **We feel that it is analogous to a promotion from associate to full professor. Since the rank of Lecturer does not have criteria listed in the P & T Guidelines, we borrowed from the Excellence in Teaching Criteria from the P & T Guidelines and from the FACET-suggested criteria for the rank of Teaching Professor. We hope the added paragraph in the narrative section will help clarify.**

2. Why are only funded grants considered for Teaching Professors? For TT faculty, "efforts to attract external funding" is viewed as significant. Shouldn't we extend the same criteria to NTT faculty? **Corrected. Good catch. (We hoped to suggest further revisions in the future. For instance, for Excellence in Research for Tenure Track it states, "efforts to attract" and for Excellence in Teaching for Tenure Track it says, "Funded."**

3. The comments re. "attainment of a terminal degree" might be more appropriately included as an item in the Excellence list (and not in the narrative section). **We listed it as an item in the Excellence list as suggested, but also kept it in the narrative section for the purpose of clarity.**

4. Since IUN has really been focusing on the importance of community engagement, could we include "evidence of student and community engagement" and "research and community efforts" in one of these lists? **We wanted to keep this as close as possible to what is already extant in the handbook. We hope to add these items when we do a more holistic revision.**

Attachment 4:

Administrative Review Committee Proposal

**Administrative Review Committee**

Bylaws Charge: “shall review and evaluate the objectives and accomplishments of the IUN Administration, reporting to the Faculty each academic year.”

Acting as a sub-committee of the Campus Affairs “super committee,” to carry out this charge, the committee will perform work in three areas:

1. Strategic Planning, Vision, and Values Statement
2. Annual Survey
3. Periodic Review of Academic Unit Heads

**Strategic Planning, Vision, and Values Statement**

The committee shall collaborate with the campus administration to review and evaluate the official statements of “Strategic Priorities and Objectives,” “Vision,” and “Values” of IU Northwest.

The committee shall collaborate with the campus administration to evaluate progress in accomplishing the priorities and objectives of the Strategic Plan.

The committee shall report to the Faculty annually, during the Fall semester.

**Annual Survey:**

The committee shall collaborate with the campus administration to conduct an annual survey of students, faculty, and staff.

The committee shall report to the Faculty annually, during the Spring semester.

**Periodic Review of Academic Unit Heads**

The committee shall collaborate with the campus administration to develop a timeline, process and data-gathering mechanisms for conducting regular performance reviews of academic unit heads.

The committee shall confer with the campus administration annually, reporting to the Faculty Executive Committee in August of the need (if any) to constitute a performance review committee during the academic year.

<b>Academic Unit</b>	<b>Current Head</b>	<b>Last Review</b>	<b>Anticipated Review</b>
College of Arts and Sciences	Mark Hoyert		
College of Health and Human Services	Pat Bankston		
School of the Arts	David Klamen		
School of Business and Economics	Cynthia S. Roberts		
School of Education	Mark B. Sperling (Interim)		
Library and Information Science	Latrice Booker (Interim)		