

**Indiana University East
Faculty Senate 2009/2010
May 4, 2010
Whitewater Hall Room 132
11:00 AM**

Presiding: Laverne Nishihara, Faculty Senate President

Present: Baldwin, L; Barbre, J; Batraw, J; Baumann, P; Bingaman, R; Blakefield, M; Braxton-Brown, G; Buckner, B; Bullock, D; Cheung, O; Clapp-Itnyre, A; Clark, K; Curry, M; Dulemba, L; Desantis, K; Fell, M; Folkerth, M; Frantz, D; Gabston, M; Greer, K; Harper, J; Heffron Williamson, M; Henderson, T; Huffman, E; Humphries, P; Jance, M; Jayasuriya, K; Kathuria, H; Kriese, P; Kunshek, R; Lafuze, J; Ludlum Foos, C; Lundy, D; Ma, H; Mahaffey, J; McFadden, B; McFadden, S; Mckinley, E; Mohamed, W; Morgan, A; Morse, M; Olson, D; Paydar, N; Peacock, F; Pomper, M; Ramsey, R; Rankin, S; Richards, L; Rivard, T; Rybas, N; Sabine, N; Samborsky, E; Scales, T; Scane, M; Scott, W; Seddighin, M; Shapiro, S; Stager, J; Stolle, C; Thomas Evans, M; Thornburg, E; Tolley, R; Watkins, M; Weber, G; Whitt, P; Wilde, J; Yates, F

Absent: Armstead, S; Baker, D; Bow, C; Branstrator, P; Breymer, T; Cooksey, A; Dempsey, K; Doerger, D; Felton, K; Fitzgerald, E; Helton, E (on leave); Knuths, J; Maurer, J; Passet, J; Roswell, R; Simon, J; Slattery, E; Stanforth, D; Wilson, E

Guests: Applegate, L, *Visiting Faculty*; Hicks, D, *Registrar*; Kim, A, *Visiting Faculty*; Libert, J, *Visiting Faculty*
Faculty Senate Secretary: Kristie Marcum-Filler

Call to Order

Quorum was reached and the meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. by Laverne Nishihara, Faculty Senate President.

I. Executive Session –

Voting Item: Approval of May 2010 graduates (confidential Cir. E71-10)
Faculty approved the May 2010 graduation list.

- II. Approval Of Minutes –** Walter Scott was present at the April 27th Faculty Senate meeting.
The minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting on April 27, 2010 were approved as corrected.

III. Chancellor's Report – Chancellor Paydar

As we are coming to the close of the academic year, the Chancellor wants to thank everyone for a job well done. It has been a very busy year for everyone. It has been a magnificent year for Indiana University East. As we all know, universities our size or smaller than Bloomington truly depend on enrollment for their growth. As for the state budget, we all know where it is so recruitment, retention, and graduation are the factors that indicate the success of a university. We had a wonderful recruitment class last year and this year the numbers look good. The continuing student registration is up around 20% for fall and new applications are up by 47%. The numbers seem to be good and the new degree programs that everyone is working on should add more degrees to our portfolios. It is because of our growth that we have been able to cut our budget significantly without any academic program cuts; in fact we have increased our budget in academic areas. So we hope that the budget conditions will allow us to reward all of our faculty and staff for their hard work. I want to take this opportunity to officially and personally thank you. I thought of

many items to bring up but nothing comes close to the hard work especially considering the large number of students you now have.

IV. Standing Committees

A. Nominating Committee – LaDonna Hatley Dulemba

Voting Item: By-Election of alternate members of the Faculty Board of Review

Discussion: Laverne Nishihara explained that a situation has occurred involving the Faculty Board of Review, making a by-election necessary. The Faculty Board of Review is the Board that hears grievances from faculty. There are elected members to the Faculty Board of Review: Joan Lafuze, Markus Pomper, Susan Shapiro, Denise Bullock, and Paul Kriese. Each of these members will remain members of the Faculty Board of Review. However, situations occur that require members to step off the Board. For example, they may be disqualified from hearing a case or there may be a conflict of interest. Currently, there may be a situation where all the HSS members of the Faculty Board of Review must be replaced by alternate members. Therefore, we must have three non-HSS tenured Faculty to serve. In addition, we will need one extra member as an alternate in case one of these members cannot serve. The alternates will serve temporarily as needed.

We must pass some motions to suspend the rule for a by-election procedure. Two of the Senate members available to serve on the Board were members of the Faculty Board of Review less than two years ago. This technically means they are not eligible. The first person is Ed Fitzgerald who served last in 2008. He was elected for that calendar year and since 2010 has not passed yet, it has been less than 2 years. The second person is Greg Weber, who served in 2009 and less than two years has passed since he was a member. In order to fill the alternate slots on the Faculty Board of Review and move forward with the election we must have a motion which is labeled Motion #1 on what has been presented in a handout. This can be a voice motion leading to a vote. If the vote goes against the suspension of the rules, we will not be able to proceed with the election. In this case, we will not have a Faculty Board of Review in place and we must then consult the Office of Legal Counsel. The By-Laws in Section V.A.1.c dealing with the Faculty Board of Review includes the statement that at least two years must lapse between service. The explanation has been presented to Senate.

We have a large faculty body and some wonder why there are only four Senate members eligible to serve as alternates and they wonder why faculty from other Schools cannot fill the slots on the Board. For this by-election, members must be non-HSS tenured members. When HSS was disqualified from serving as alternates and when others were disqualified because they may be Deans or upper-level administrators, there were only four members left available to serve. The reality is that there are just four and all four have agreed to serve in this capacity.

There is no opposition but has it been fully explored that if we do go along with this plan then there won't be any challenge. This is a concern of the Senate. The President has explored what we are able to do as a faculty governance body as much as possible. We are doing what is possible within faculty governance. If this does not pass we will only have recourse to the Office of Legal Counsel.

The motion to suspend the rule that at least two years must pass to serve on the Faculty Board of Review carried.

Motion for a by-election procedure: The Bylaws section IV.A.2.c state that the Nominating Committee must prepare a slate which contains twice the number of candidates needed and in no instance must this number be less than four. We do not have eight candidates to fill the slate. Because

this is not a general election but a by-election, the laws say very little about the requirement. There needs to be a vote to approve the way this election is being proposed. So the question is whether in this case, Senate can vote in three alternates and an additional alternate with a slate containing a total of four candidates. As far as we understand, if we can't do this we will need to call in the Office of Legal Counsel. This is the limit of what we can do in faculty governance.

The motion that Senate can elect three alternates to the Faculty Board of Review plus the fourth alternate as needed with a slate totaling 4 candidates carried.

Outcomes of this ballot election for alternate members of the Faculty Board of Review will be presented via the Senate listserv.

B. Curriculum Committee – Bob Ramsey

Voting Item:

New Program Requests:

BS in Biochemistry (Cir. E72-10)

This is a new program that is intended to bridge the gap between biology and chemistry. This will prepare students for graduate school or professional occupations. It is a 120-hour program and the break-down of requirements has been listed on page 10 of the Senate packet. One of the interesting things about this program is the operation with Reid Hospital. Lecturers will be connected with staff at Reid hospital offering a job-shadowing program for students.

Discussion: There is support for such a program but this degree program is lacking physical chemistry and some of the prerequisites of physical chemistry which may be essential. The faculty member has taken the liberty of contacting other campuses who have agreed that this program may not be transferable to other campuses.

It looks as if this degree has used all nine of the general education requirements to fulfill degree requirements and is this consistent with biochemistry degrees in other institutions?

The requirements vary depending on which area the student is focusing on. The courses we are requiring for this degree are the most suitable. That is why our School has approved this degree. When we started by adding course requirements we had one general elective and our school decided we needed more electives and this is why we have decided to go with this.

Shouldn't general electives be used outside of the degree to give the students a broad variety of knowledge? There are 15 electives but they are not general education electives. This is based on exactly the same template as all of our other degrees.

Is there a culminating senior capstone, could you explain this capstone, and can you speak about how the objectives (ethics for example) will be met in this degree program? We will study conditions that we see all the time that makes schools more sensitive to understand the problems people have. We definitely have subjects in this degree which do emphasize ethics. The capstone course is program specific and students have a wide variety of methods that they can use to demonstrate the contexts and how they display this information, which could involve writing and media.

On the general education question, the BSS degrees were developed before the general education framework we developed. Actually, BSS and NSM are in violation and it is unsure how you can develop the nine hours of the NSM general education requirements and not count some of this. We don't know how you can say that you have to take 9 credit hours outside science. We think there is a problem with the general education framework.

Is there faculty to teach these courses without taking instructors from lower level courses? Most of these classes are already being offered and they have decided who will teach what. It does suggest that there are more teachers needed than what there are currently. Some faculty will teach additional courses and lab courses will be taught by adjunct faculty.

Other IU BS degrees in Biochemistry are certified and the difference between BA and BS are the chemistry courses. Also, are the course numbers consistent with other campuses? The numbers we are using are the numbers issued by Bloomington and there are emails to prove this case. Some missing courses include L107 and L154, and then there are courses which are new courses. We are changing 107 to 101 and 102 and there are two new courses added which will be replaced with 4-credit courses. We are replacing the 5-credit course with two 4-credit-hour courses including a lab. Are the 300- and 400-level courses offered at certain times so that students will only be able to enroll in this program at certain times? If you only offer these courses every four years then you have a limited number of years that people can start this program. The biggest flexibility of this program is that there are independent studies which can be used in this case.

There is a question on the student outcomes which are very vague and in the degree you should be stating specific types of knowledge. This is true and the program will have to develop a plan to address this.

The motion to pass the BS in Biochemistry carried.

BS in Human Biology (Cir. E73-10)

The motion to pass the BS in Human Biology carried.

BS in Psychology (Cir. E74-10)

There was a friendly amendment on Page 29 focusing on learning outcomes: part of the original BS degree remains. The following sentence should be added: "Consistent with the previous Behavioral and Social Sciences degree with a concentration in Psychology, the new degree will allow students to meet campus learning objectives. In addition, students who complete the degree program will be able to:" (followed by the list of student outcomes).

The motion to add the proposed sentence to the proposed BS in Psychology carried.

Is this in keeping with psychology degrees system wide? This is a standard psychology and general degree as a whole.

The motion to pass the BS in Psychology carried.

Information Items (*disseminated via Senate Listserv; no discussion requested*):

MCI Course Activations:

INFO-I201 Mathematical Foundations of Informatics (Cir. E75-10)

INFO-I202 Social Informatics (Cir. E76-10)

INFO-I213 Website Design and Development (Cir. E77-10)

INFO-I300 Human Computer Interaction (Cir. E78-10)

INFO-I303 Organizational Informatics (Cir. E79-10)

INFO-I308 Information Representation (Cir. E80-10)

INFO-I310 Multimedia and Technology (Cir. E81-10)

INFO-I400 Topics in Informatics (Cir. E82-10)

INFO-I420 Internship in Informatics: Professional Practice (Cir. E83-10)

INFO-I450 Design and Implementation of an Information System I (Cir. E84-10)

INFO-I451 Design and Implementation of an Information System II (Cir. E85-10)

INFO-I460 Thesis/Senior Project I (Cir. E86-10)
INFO-I461 Thesis/Senior Project II (Cir. E87-10)
INFO-I499 Readings and Research in Informatics (Cir. E88-10)

(Informatics cognates disseminated via Senate listserv; no discussion requested)

New Cognate in Informatics: Criminal Justice (Cir. E89-10)
New Cognate in Informatics: Music Technology (Cir. E90-10)

C. AAA Committee—Michele Curry

Revisions to Grade Appeals Policy (Cir. E91-10)

After receiving input from each School we have incorporated your feedback into this policy. It is the same process as it has always been and what we recommend as changes is time. Throughout the policy, the time frames have been changed but the process has not been changed.

Discussion: Faculty members are unclear on the time frame in the grade appeals policy process. After thirty calendar days a student may appeal and after this, it will only be considered under extreme circumstances.

There was a motion to revise a sentence under “Limitations of Time” to state: “Grade appeal must be initiated in writing to the instructor of record within 30 calendar days . . .” The motion carried.

There should be some underlining added to the headings: Scope and Effective date; Limitations of Time; Extended Appeals Process; Process for Grade Appeals.

There are all types of structural issues in this document and headings should be reorganized and classified. Faculty should support the changes in time and date and then we should pass this document and then send it back for restructuring.

There was a motion to pass the revisions to the Grade Appeals Policy as amended. The motion carried.

D. Faculty Affairs Committee—Markus Pomper

EVCAA Review Policy (Cir. E46-10)

Discussion: What was wrong with the old review? Technically, faculty only has executive review and therefore we have no business to review them. We have tailored this to the Vice Chancellor. We will collect data and provide the Chancellor with the information whose duty it is to evaluate the Vice Chancellor. Why was the model switched? We want to be consistent with other IU campuses and the previous policy was vague.

The motion to approve the EVCAA Review Policy carried.

V. Academic Affairs Report—Executive Vice Chancellor Richards (5 minutes)

The EVCAA often finds a few items in new degree proposals that get sent back to the Schools for possible revisions before they go to the Academic Leadership Council. The B.S. in Psychology program as presented will not have to leave this campus for approvals. The Indiana Commission for Higher Education recognizes this program as a degree program (B.S. in BSS-Psychology) and it is presented as a name change only. After

Commencement everyone can gather at Smiley's; there will be a reminder sent out. Thanks are given to all for their hard work this past year. However, our work is not done and more proposals will be coming forward in the fall semester. The expansion of our degree programs, which are typical of campuses like ours, will make us more comprehensive in our degree offerings and more attractive to a broader population of students. We are doing this without additional funds from the state. As we grow, hopefully we can increase our number of full time faculty but for now we must depend on part time instructors.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

<C:\Documents and Settings\Inishiha\Desktop\Senate packet100826 extra\Cir. E01-11 Senate membership roster2010-11.docx>