**Minutes**

**Faculty Assembly, School of Liberal Arts**

**2:00–4:00 p.m. Friday, March 6, 2020 Room LE 103**

Faculty Attendees: Marta Anton, Jason Aukerman, Emily Beckman, Julie Belz, Didier Bertrand, Dennis Bingham, Herbert Brant, Andy Buchenot, Jennifer Bute, David Craig, Mary Ann Cohen, Ulla Connor, Kevin Cramer, Tom Davis, Andre De Tienne, Cornelis De Waal, Fred DiCamilla, Aaron Dusso, Owen Dwyer, Estela Ene, Carrie Foote, Steve Fox, Beth Goering, Nancy Goldfarb, Ray Haberski, Kelly Hayes, Katharine Head, David Hoegberg, Sue Hyatt, Sumana Jogi, Samuel Kahn, Kristine Karnick, Jack Kaufman-McKivigan, Daniella Kostroun, Elizabeth Kreider-Reid, Kathryn Lauten, Tim Lyons, Enric Mallorqui-Ruscalleda, Tom Marvin, Kate Miller, Leslie Miller, Kenzie Mintus, Anita Morgan, Wendy Morrison, Elizabeth Nelson, Nichole Neuman, Steve Overbey, John Parrish-Sprowl, Mike Polites, Josh Prada, Rob Rebein, Charles Reyes, Audrey Ricke, Nancy Robertson, Emilio Robles, Steve Russell, Ron Sandwina, Carly Schall, Lois Silverman, Michael Snodgrass, Brian Steensland, Elizabeth Thill, Jennifer Thorington Springer, Joseph Tucker Edmonds, Thom Upton, Wendy Vogt, Scott Weeden, Robert White, Kim White-Mills, Jeff Wilson, Mel Wininger, Haixia Zhao

Guest Attendees: Tanner Hammock, Tiea Julian, Shannon Kelley, Julie Patterson

1. David Craig called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.
2. Minutes from January 24, 2020, Faculty Assembly meeting were approved as distributed.
3. President's remarks
   1. David Craig announced that we have a packed agenda, so Ray Haberski will be timing discussions to help us stay on schedule.
   2. David asked everyone to get a ballot for IFC representatives. We will be voting shortly.
   3. Robert’s Rule of the Day – who owns the motion?
      1. We are called Faculty Assembly for a reason; it is the assembly that owns motions and amendments after they are made.
      2. If you do not like the direction of the discussion related to a motion or amendment you made, you can request that your motion be withdrawn, but the assembly has to agree. If someone objects and the objection is seconded, a vote is required. You cannot speak against your own motion. Seconds cannot be withdrawn.
4. Dean's remarks – Interim Dean Rob Rebein
   1. Updates on IUPUI’s response to Coronavirus. Check emails for the most up-to-date information.
      1. Next week will be “Plan B” week. Faculty should prepare to move teaching online if the campus is closed. Preparing could include making sure you have a computer that you can use to work from home or ensuring you have access to all files you need to work from home. It also includes preparing your students for the possibility that campus will close and classes will move online without creating panic.
      2. The <https://keepteaching.iu.edu/> website has much useful information.
      3. If possible, have a trial run one day next week so that you’ll have time to make adjustments if the campus closes.
      4. During the planning week, the technical staff will have a Zoom room that faculty can contact for assistance. Details about that will be sent in an email.
   2. IU Box is being discontinued because of increasing costs to the university. We will have a year to prepare.
   3. Q&A
      1. Tom Davis asked if we can assume that we will have remote access to materials on our on-campus computers. Mike Scott said he could help faculty set that up.
      2. Nancy Robertson asked about the percentage of our students who have WiFi at home and raised concerns about equity if we move classes online. Dean Rebein suggested that faculty find out from students what they use to access the internet at home and work with them to find solutions.
      3. A question was raised about whether we should move Box files to the G drive. Mike Scott said tools are being developed and more information will be forthcoming.
5. New business
   1. Nominating Committee
      1. Steve Fox presented the slate for elected SLA committees. We still need nominees for Vice President and Executive Committee. Steve encouraged faculty to nominate colleagues or let him or any member of the Nominating Committee know if they are interested in serving SLA in this way. David emphasized the urgency of filling these positions and strongly encouraged people to step up.
      2. Elections for SLA’s representatives to IFC were held. After the meeting, David Craig and Beth Goering counted the ballots. The IFC representatives will be: David Hoegberg, Jason Kelly, and Kim White-Mills.
   2. Undergraduate Curriculum and Standards Committee Action Items
      1. David announced that the Diversity & Inclusion Pathway Minor has been approved at the campus level
      2. Ray Haberski asked Kristine Karnick to introduce the Proposal for the B.A. in Theatre, Film, and Television. Kristine explained that the new degree makes 3 programs (film, media, and theatre) that have been “buried” in other majors more visible. The program involves collaboration with several other programs in SLA and is supported by Informatics, Engineering, and Herron. The floor was open for discussion. Herb Brant asked, “Why didn’t we have this before?” David Craig called for the vote. The motion passed unanimously.
      3. Ray Haberski asked Kenzie Mintus to introduce the Pathway Minor in Multicultural Perspectives on Health. Kenzie explained that we already have an interdisciplinary health minor, so the goal was to create a pathway minor with a distinct focus. The floor was opened for discussion. There was none, so David called the vote. The motion passed unanimously.
   3. Diversity & Inclusion Committee
      1. Estela Ene presented the SLA Diversity & Inclusion Vision Statement for a first read.
      2. David announced that some changes had been made from the version distributed on Friday, Feb. 28. The changes were highlighted in a projected version of the document.
      3. Estela explained that the statement aligns with IUPUI’s vision statement on diversity, equity and inclusion but adds an SLA flavor to it by highlighting our commitment to creating excellent education, research, and service by using an inclusive lens and by creating and using models of inclusion. In creating the statement, they examined model statements from peer institutions and solicited feedback from OEO. The changes made since the first draft was distributed stem from that feedback.
      4. David explained that this is a first read and a chance to provide feedback to the committee. The floor was open for discussion.
         1. David Craig asked if the statement of goals was a statement of goals for the school as a whole or just the committee. Estela noted that the committee sees them as one and the same. The committee decided to limit the statement to 3-5 achievable goals. As these goals are met, new goals will be added. Jennifer Thorington-Springer explained that the goals came from information the committee received from OEO and from patterns noticed in the climate survey.
         2. Carly Schall asked how progress toward the goals will be measured. Estela explained that activities are already being undertaken by the committee to reach the goals. Jennifer Thorington-Springer acknowledged the importance of this accountability question. She explained that all schools are being asked to create a strategic plan related to diversity & inclusion. In SLA, the plan has the Dean’s support, and now we need everyone on the faculty to contribute to meeting these goals.
         3. Nancy Robertson noted that one way everyone can contribute is to be proactive about integrating D&I activities into recruitment, P&T, etc.,
         4. Steve Russell raised a question about the decision to change the phrase “physical and neurological (dis)ability status” to “ability status,” noting that the revised wording seemed less clear. Estela explained that it was changed for the sake of parallel construction in the sentence.
         5. Julie Belz asked if the committee had thought about including a category related to food issues and allergies in the “Vision” portion of the statement.
         6. David Craig noted that concerns like these are what the committee is looking for and invited faculty to send their questions, concerns and recommendations about the statement to Estela Ena.
         7. Andy Buchenot asked about the differences between the 1st and 2nd draft and confirmed that the updated version will be made available in box.
         8. Daniella Kostroun asked for clarification on differences between this vision and OEO. Carrie Foote explained that this document allows us to emphasize what we value at the school level.
   4. Promotion & Tenure Committee Action Item - SLA Criteria for Promotion in the Lecturer-Line Ranks
      1. David Craig explained that IFC is currently voting on campus criteria for promotion of lecturers. That vote closes at 5:00 today. Our criteria are contingent on the outcome of that election. We will discuss and vote on the distributed document. If IFC passes the campus proposal and we pass ours, our guideline will be in effect. If IFC does not pass the campus proposal and we pass ours, our guidelines will be tabled.
      2. André De Tienne explained that the P&T Committee had revised the proposal based on the feedback received from SLA faculty after the first read in January. They also made some revisions to make it compatible with the campus document. André highlighted the key changes that had been made.
      3. The floor was opened for discussion.
         1. John Parrish-Sprowl asked for clarification on the requirement that work be peer reviewed. André explained that the expectation is that scholarship of teaching will have some type of peer review.
         2. Steve Fox proposed a friendly amendment to change the wording of the sentence, “There are many teaching-related activities and achievements that are not all required by the school for a successful promotion case, but one or more such activities, properly documented, are expected when making the case for excellence in teaching, in conjunction with the specific criteria outlined below for each promotion rank” to “One or more teaching related activities or achievements, properly documented, is expected when making the case for excellence in teaching, in conjunction with the specific criteria outlined below for each promotion rank.” The recommendation was accepted as a friendly amendment, and there were no objections from the floor.
         3. Mel Wininger asked whether the bullet point, “a record of positive contributions over several years to the teaching mission of the unit, campus, or university that is broad in scope, including the advising and/or mentoring of students,” means that candidates must have done advising or mentoring. Thom Upton explained that the campus criteria require candidates to show excellence in one category beyond excellence in the classroom, and demonstrating excellence in advising is one way to meet that criterion. David Craig proposed changing the word “including” to “such as.” The Committee accepted the recommendation as a friendly amendment, and there were no objections from the floor.
      4. David Craig called for the vote on proposed criteria with the two friendly amendments. The motion passed unanimously.
   5. Ad Hoc Online Education Committee
      1. Wendy Morrison presented the Ad Hoc Online Education Committee report on online education within SLA.
         1. Online education is a substantial part of SLA already. Students who take both online and traditional classes take a larger number of credit hours. At IUPUI 47% of students are taking at least one online class. On average, online students are 9 years older than traditional students are, more likely to be female, more likely to be first generation, and less likely to be underrepresented minorities.
         2. Online courses we offer in SLA are not necessarily part of IU Online. IU Online was designed to prevent overlap in online programs offered within the IU system. One task of the committee moving forward will be to track IU Online collaborations that involve SLA and look for lessons learned by faculty/departments that have already participated in this challenging process.
         3. The committee recommends developing peer review processes for online teaching, teaching evaluations that are more suited to online assessment, and syllabus guidelines for online courses. These will require collaboration with other SLA committees.
         4. The committee emphasized the need to agree on a shared vocabulary for online education (i.e., hybrid).
         5. Online education is regulated by federal rules. If it is possible for students to complete their program of study with more than 50% online courses, the program must be approved as a hybrid program. Given this rule, all IUPUI programs may need to be approved as hybrid programs. If more than 80% of the classes can be completed online, the program needs to be approved as a fully online program. This is something the committee will need to work on going forward.
         6. Class size is another thing the committee should consider.
         7. Classes need to have interaction or they are considered correspondence classes. Students can’t receive federal funds for correspondence classes.
      2. Wendy presented a Proposal to Create a Standing Committee of Online Education for a first read.
         1. David Craig asked about what was meant by the statement, “The Committee will also review existing courses that are changed to an online format.” Wendy explained that the committee would have to work with SLA Curriculum committees on that. David asked how this process would be handled. Wendy explained that processes would need to be devised because of legal issues. Marta Anton reinforced the need to create processes because of federal online audits.
         2. Marta Anton asked about how the committee visualized collaboration between the online committee and the curriculum committees. Would one committee member serve on both committees? Wendy explained that they were thinking that courses would first get approval from the appropriate Curriculum Committee, and approved requests for online courses would be passed along to the Online Committee.
         3. John Parrish-Sprowl raised a concern about the use of the phrase “best practices,” noting that the phrase implies that we know what is “best” and discourages innovation, since we already know what’s “best.”
         4. Herbert Brant asked whether the committee had considered the amount of duplication of effort this proposal might be creating. He explained that a previous proposal by the Ad Hoc Bylaw Revision Committee to create separate curriculum committees for online and traditional classes had been rejected because the faculty felt they unnecessarily duplicated effort.
         5. David Craig invited faculty to email additional comments, questions, and concerns about this proposal to Wendy.
   6. Teaching and Advising Committee
      1. Sue Hyatt presented a Statement on Lecturer Teaching Loads for endorsement. This statement is being brought for endorsement only, because Faculty Assembly does not have the authority to make policy on this issue. As an example, Sue shared a case of a lecturer whose course canceled was in the fall and was therefore expected to teach five spring courses. The committee felt that a five-course load was too much.
      2. The floor was opened for discussion.
         1. Carrie Foote noted that some lecturers may choose to teach 5 courses in a semester, so restricting teaching load to 4 classes/semester should not be made a policy.
         2. Daniella Kostroun asked whether the total number of students taught was a consideration when the case was decided, noting that the work work associated with teaching can vary a lot depending on class size. David Craig reminded the faculty this is a question of general policy and we should guard against focusing on specific cases. Daniella suggested that the question is whether this should be policy or decided case by case. Rob Rebein emphasized that there is need for consistency.
         3. Brian Steensland noted that this policy would be a way to prevent chairs from underscheduling to guard against lecturers having courses canceled. He also suggested adding language about exploring other alternatives, such as 2nd 8-week courses, first.
         4. Kim White-Mills asked whether we are creating policy on a single case.
         5. Dennis Bingham noted that the 2nd 8-week course option may be a “false myth,” sharing an experience of a lecturer in his department whose 2nd 8-week course didn’t make either.
         6. Liz Thill noted that this is a problem Classics has been wrestling with for years. She agreed that the number of students a lecturer is teaching has huge repercussions and suggested that this is a bigger issue that needs to be addressed.
         7. Tom Davis noted that if the 2nd 8-week course option is used, the classes should always be gen ed courses. He also observed that part of problem with replacing a class with a “project” is gauging equity in workload. Most estimates claim that teaching a course involves 120-170 hours of time. How would we ensure that the replacement projects are comparable to that?
      3. David Craig called for the vote. The motion for endorsement of the statement did not pass.
   7. Faculty Affairs Committee
      1. Steve Fox presented 4 policies related to associate faculty compensation for faculty consideration and endorsement. He explained that the committee had consulted with associate faculty in preparing these proposals. For the first time, they have an associate faculty member on the committee. He noted that these proposals are small steps that won’t cause excessive financial burden to the school but that demonstrate the value we place on the work associate faculty do.
      2. Policy for Course Cancellation Compensation for Associate Faculty.
         1. Steve explained that this policy was endorsed in 2018, but it has been tweaked since then, so it’s being brought again for endorsement. One change is that 30 days was changed to 15 days, and the other is that the School and the Department will split the cost.
         2. John Parrish-Sprowl noted that the policy could have an unintended consequence if it encourages chairs to cancel classes sooner to avoid paying $500 when waiting longer would allow time for the class to fill. Steve explained that reducing the time to 15 days was an effort to address this.
         3. Jeff Wilson raised a question about whether it is even possible to pay associate faculty in a semester when they don’t teach. David Craig explained that Faculty Affairs researched this, and it is.
         4. Tom Davis asked whether the compensation should be adjusted based on the credit hours of the cancelled class.
         5. The vote was called. The motion to endorse the proposal passed nearly unanimously with few no votes.
      3. Policy for Including Associate Faculty in All Annual Pay Increases
         1. Steve explained that if we had been doing this for the past 30 years, associate faculty pay would be better than what it is now.
         2. Herb Brant noted that faculty pay is based on merit. Steve explained that this is a common assumption, but pay increases are often across the board for cost of living adjustment.
         3. Kathryn Lauten asked whether the pay increase would be across the board for all associate faculty in the school. Steve said that associate pay is figured that way.
         4. Brian Steensland asked for a cost estimate, noting that it will impact the pool for all raises so having figures on what that would look like would be useful. He noted that he understands the principle behind the proposal but thinks having the full financial picture would be useful. Steve noted that when raises are approved by the state, that doesn’t come with extra money to pay for those raises, so it’s the school making the commitment.
         5. Daniella Kostroun raised a concern about unintended consequences and asked if the committee had considered lump sum increases instead of percentage based increases.
         6. The vote was called. The motion to endorse the proposal passed with more yes votes than no votes. A notable number of faculty abstained, but fewer than the yes votes.
      4. Policy for Associate Faculty Tuition Waiver
         1. Steve explained that many associate faculty wouldn’t take advantage of this, but some would use it for professional development or adding a degree.
         2. Nancy Robertson noted that associate faculty would need to be told that they will be taxed on that waiver. Steve agreed that was good advice.
         3. Tom Davis noted that this would come from the school’s budget, which is unlike the full-time faculty waiver that comes from university budget.
         4. Mel Wininger observed that he took advantage of this benefit in the past and never had to pay taxes. Steve observed that this is a reminder that we offered this benefit in the past.
         5. The vote was called. The motion to endorse the proposal passed with more yes votes than no votes. A notable number of faculty abstained, but fewer than the yes votes.
      5. Policy for Associate Faculty Stipend for SLA Faculty Assembly Committee Service
         1. Steve explained that this is the first year an associate faculty member has served on an SLA committee. He noted that we don’t pay associate faculty for service, so this is a small honorarium in a sense.
         2. Michael Snodgrass asked whether the pay would come from the department or the school. Steve said the school.
         3. Scott Weeden asked when the funds would be distributed. Steve explained that the committee member would be given $500 at the end of each semester served.
         4. Herb Brant said that if it’s $1000 for the year, he would vote against it because participation is voluntary.
         5. Emily Beckman noted that Julie Patterson’s participation on the Faculty Affairs Committee was invaluable. Julie Patterson explained that unlike full-time faculty who volunteer work time for committee work, she is giving up billable hours to be here.
         6. Daniella Kostroun suggested that language about how associate faculty committee members would be selected should be added to the proposal. David explained that the process for selection is already in place in the Bylaws.
         7. Daniella Kostroun asked whether serving on committees would factor into advancement for associate faculty. Steve said it would not affect that because associate faculty aren't expected to do service.
         8. The vote was called. The motion to endorse the proposal passed nearly unanimously with few no votes.
   8. Bylaws Review Committee
      1. Herb Brant presented the Proposal on Committee Membership. He explained that the proposal was more of a policy statement than a regulation, asking the entities that determine committee membership to consider all options to find the greatest diversity possible in making up committees.
      2. The vote was called and passed unanimously.
   9. Technology Committee
      1. Kathryn Lauten alerted faculty to new data sharing and technology compliance verification procedures that will be coming soon. All faculty will be required to provide the verification.
6. Announcements
   1. Jeff Wilson reminded faculty of the summer grants for research and creative activity. The deadline for submission is midnight on March 23.
   2. The ballot for elected SLA committees will be distributed in late March. David reminded people to nominate colleagues or self-nominate for the VP and Executive Committee slots on the ballot. In April, the Preference Survey for Appointed Faculty Assembly committees will be distributed.
   3. Nominations for Faculty Medal of Academic Distinction are due on March 23 and nominations for Outstanding Faculty awards are due on March 30.
7. The meeting adjourned at 3:56.