

Curriculum Committee
Year-end report: 1998-'99
Submitted by Cathy Ludlum Foos, Chair

The 1998-'99 Curriculum Committee was composed of the following members: Kris Dhawale, Larry Englert, Cathy Ludlum Foos (Chair), Lynn Hufford, Sue McFadden, Joanne Rains, and Rob Tolley. The committee met weekly throughout the year.

The following **new programs or revisions to existing programs** were brought to the Senate and approved on the dates indicated:

- Revision in Education degrees to allow graduation without licensure—EFS 10/6/98
- New post-baccalaureate certificate in general business—EFS 12/1/98
- New minor in business and technical writing—EFS 12/1/98
- Revisions to IIM degree—EFS 3/2/99
- New degree in humanities and fine arts—EFS 4/6/99
- New certificate in international business—EFS 5/4/99
- New certificate in small business entrepreneurship—EFS 5/4/99
- New certificate in fundamental business—EFS 5/4/99
- New minor in gerontology—EFS 5/4/99

A proposal from BEST for a post-baccalaureate certificate in health care management was discussed late in the year, but voting was postponed pending further discussions between members of the BEST division and faculty in Nursing and SPEA.

The following **new courses** were brought to the Senate and approved on the dates indicated:

- IIM I310 Information Support Systems (3 cr.)—EFS 10/6/98
- IIM I430 Data Analysis & Decision Support Systems (3 cr.)—EFS 11/3/98
- IIM I450 Legal & Social Aspects of Information Technology (3 cr.)—EFS 11/3/98

A **change in course title** for HIST H108 & H109 was brought to the Senate and approved—EFS 10/6/98

A number of **revisions to existing programs or courses** were deemed *non-substantive* and were announced to the Senate as information items (descriptions of the changes appear with the agendas for the meetings indicated):

- Minor changes in course requirements for B.S. in Business Administration (10/6/98)
- Revision of B.A. in Biology to include a second track option (12/1/98)
- Course replacement in minor and A.A. programs in Women's Studies (3/2/99)
- Course replacement in Sociology concentration of B.S. in Behavioral & Social Sciences (5/4/99)

- Change in grading policy for MATH M007 & M014 (described in minutes from 4/6/99)

The following **courses were activated from the Master Course List:**

- CSCI A115 Using the World-Wide Web (1.5 cr.)
- BUS F480 Professional Practice in Finance (3-6 cr.)
- WOST W200 Women in Society: Introduction to Women's Studies (3 cr.)
- WOST W201 Women in Culture: Introduction to Women's Studies (3 cr.)
- WOST W480 Practicum in Women's Studies (3 cr.)
- WOST W495 Readings and Research in Women's Studies (3 cr.)
- WOST W498 Critical Issues in Women's Studies (3 cr.)
- MATH M006 Basic Mathematics (3 cr.)
- ENG W331 Business and Administrative Writing (3 cr.)
- ENG L332 Romantic Literature (3 cr.)
- ENG L335 Victorian Literature (3 cr.)
- ENG L394 Film as Literature (3 cr.)

In addition to straightforward programmatic changes, the committee dealt with a number of broader curricular issues. First, the committee was charged by the Faculty President to discuss the Curriculum Committee role in the following areas:

- Long-range planning of curriculum
- Long-range course scheduling
- Coordination of course offerings among divisions
- Activation of courses from the Master Course List

With regard to **long-range planning of curriculum**, the committee felt that this should not be the responsibility of the Curriculum Committee, but that it should be the committee's responsibility to be thoroughly familiar with the campus long-range curricular plan so that new course and program proposals can be evaluated in terms of the plan.

Long-range course scheduling and coordination of course offerings among divisions were felt to be more appropriately the role of the collected division chairs.

The issue of **activating courses from the Master Course List** was much more difficult. The committee discussed the issue at a number of meetings as well as promoting discussion among the faculty through the faculty listserv. Opinions overall were quite strong, and evenly split between thinking we need a campus approval process for these courses and thinking our current practice is adequate. The committee's determination for the time being was that we should keep our current policy, but the committee also expressed a desire that divisions establish an approval process at that level if they don't already have such a policy.

Issues above and beyond those raised by the Faculty President were:

- The role of the Curriculum Committee in evaluating assessment plans for new program proposals
- The policy on inter-campus transfer under discussion by the UFC Educational Policies Committee and the Academic Officers Council
- The definition of *substantive* used to determine whether proposed changes to an existing program require Senate approval
- Campus communication patterns

The committee developed a proposal articulating its view of the appropriate role for the Curriculum Committee in evaluating **assessment plans** (Circular E14-99). This was brought to the Senate and approved—EFS 4/6/99.

Developing a policy on **inter-campus transfer** was on the agenda of both the UFC Educational Policies Committee and the Academic Officers Council during the year. The Curriculum Committee discussed the proposals developed by each of the above groups and determined that we supported the AOC version rather than the EPC version. The point of contention was whether campuses should have to accept courses of the same title and number from other IU campuses when those courses are to be applied to the major (EPC said No, AOC said Yes). This issue was presented to the Senate as an information item. A motion was made and seconded from the floor of the Senate that the IU East representative to the EPC convey to that committee our faculty's endorsement of the AOC proposal. Motion passed—EFS 4/6/99 (not reflected in minutes).

The Senate charged the committee to develop a **definition of the term *substantive***, used to determine whether proposed changes in a existing academic program require Senate approval. After much discussion, and no concrete feedback from the rest of the faculty, the committee agreed that the current practice of determining on a case-by-case basis whether proposed changes are substantive is the best way to proceed.

Patterns of communication at the campus level have an impact on how well curricular changes are understood and on how favorably they are received. Accordingly, the committee devoted an entire meeting to discussing this issue. We determined that communication on campus is not very effective, and the committee charged the chair to propose to the Agenda Committee that the campus hire an outside consultant to assess our patterns of communication. This resulted in two meetings of the Senate Agenda Committee with the executive officers of the Staff and Professional Councils and a follow-up meeting of representatives of those three groups with the campus Executive Council.

**Annual Report:
Nominating Committee
Spring 1999**

I. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:

Ed Brown (Chair), term to expire in year 2000

Mary Ann Morse, term to expire in year 2000

Anne Szopa, Term to expire in year 1999

II. THE ROLE OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE:

Article VI., Section 5, sub-section a, dictates that the Nominating Committee shall consist of three members elected by the Senate. Additionally the Constitution advises that this committee shall present to the Senate a list of nominees for the standing committees. It also tells us that members of ad hoc committees created by the Senate shall also be nominated by this committee unless the Senate makes other provisions. There is little other descriptive data available from which the role of the Nominating Committee can be deduced. Therefore the Committee has looked to custom and usage for guidance and have defined our role as follows:

It is a Nominating Committee function to assemble a list of nominees for the various standing committee elections for presentation to the Senate for vote or approval as the situation may require. The criteria for nominee selection shall be three fold. Consideration is given to: 1. individual faculty responses to a survey conducted for the purpose of soliciting interest in committee service, 2. divisional diversity in the makeup of each committee where required as well as where reasonably possible even when such diversity is not required, 3. the committee service load of the nominees.

The role of this Committee has extended to the study of and referral to the Senate of changes in policy, bye laws, or Constitution which have impact on the mission and procedures of the Nominating Committee.

III. UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

The Nominating Committee conducted an election at the May 4, 1999 Senate meeting for the selection of one member. T. J. Rivard was elected to fill a second term. He will serve with Mike Foos.

IV. PROCEDURAL CHANGES

During the current academic year the Nominating Committee brought the following bye law change moved and seconded to the floor of the Senate. It was unanimously passed.

Section IV: Meetings

A. Voting

1. (no change)

2. Voting to fill vacant seats on the Promotion and Tenure Committee; the Faculty Board of Review; and the Nominating Committee shall be accomplished as follows:

i. **Nominations:** Every faculty member eligible to sit on the Nominating Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Faculty Board of Review are nominees for these elections, unless and until that person removes his or her name from the list of nominees.

ii. **Slate Selection Date:** The process of selecting the slate of candidates for an election to fill vacant seats of any of these committees shall occur at the regular Faculty Senate Meeting immediately preceding the regular meeting in which the general election to fill the vacant seats occurs.

iii. **Slate Selection:** On the "Slate Selection Date" there will be a round of primary balloting for the purpose of identifying candidates from among the nominees. The number of candidates shall be set at twice the number of seats that need to be filled on the committee, but in no instance may be less than four. Each voting member of the Senate shall cast a primary ballot containing all of the names of the individuals they would like to see on the ballot as candidates. These names need not be ranked in order of preference. These primary ballots will be tabulated by the nominating committee and the number of candidates needed who receive the highest vote count will assume positions as candidates on the general election ballot. In the event that the last person to be selected as a candidate has the same number of votes as one or more other persons, all of those individuals shall be listed on the general election ballot.

iv. **General Election Voting:** On election day preprinted ballots containing all of the names of the candidates will be passed out to the voting members of the Senate. Voting members are to rank each candidate in the order of their preference on this ballot.

v. **Tabulation of the General Election Ballots:** The nominating committee will tabulate the vote. Any ballot which fails to rank all candidates will not be counted. Any ballot containing duplicate or "O" rankings will not be counted. Each candidate must be given a different ranking or the ballot will not be counted. If there is any reasonable way to tabulate a ballot, it will be counted so long as the manner in which the ballot was marked does not have a

disruptive impact on the intent and purposes of the election. Candidates receiving first choice votes will receive one vote during the vote count, those receiving a second choice vote will receive two votes and so on until all the ballots are counted. The number of candidates needed for each election receiving the lowest vote totals will be seated as the newest members on the respective committees.

Other policy changes of a non radical nature occurred which were not treated as voting items but rather Committee prerogative. In an effort to gain wider participation in Senate voting the Committee has made use of the list serve to remind Senate members of up coming elections and of the identities of nominees. The list serve was used on one occasion to solicit response from those who wished to have their names withdrawn from consideration in elections (FBR and P & T). Additionally, rather than announcing the names and vote totals of candidates who were unsuccessful in their bid for election to Committee assignments, all vote tallies have been archived by the Senate Secretary and are available for review by any Senate member who wishes to see them.

V. EVENTS OF ACADEMIC YEAR 1998 - 1999

In the Fall replacement members were elected to positions on the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Faculty Board of Review.

At the conclusion of the election for the Promotion and Tenure Committee the following persons, with term expiration dates as indicated, constituted the membership of that committee: Dhawale (00), Judy McCarty (00), Sue McFadden (00), Nishihara (99), Rains (99), Sabine (99) - Chair.

At the conclusion of the election for the Faculty Board of Review the following persons, with term expiration dates as indicated, constituted the membership of that committee: George Blakey (99), Mary Ann Morse (00), T. J. Rivard (00), Jane Vincent (99), and Marilyn Watkins (00).

However, due to the difficulty in obtaining a "majority vote" with such a large member of candidates the Nominating Committee began to study alternative means of conducting elections for members of the Nominating Committee, The Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Faculty Board of Review. The result of that effort is to be found in section IV, under Procedural Changes in this Report.

George Blakey, unable to finish his term on the Faculty Board of Review due to a sabbatical needed to be replaced. As a result the following e-mail was sent to the faculty at I. U. East:

X-Sender: edbrown@juliet.ucs.indiana.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Mon, 19 Apr 1999 14:49:14 -0600
Reply-To: IU East Faculty Senate <IUE_SENATE-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU>
Sender: IU East Faculty Senate <IUE_SENATE-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU>
From: Ed Brown <edbrown@indiana.edu>
Subject: Replacement for FBR Member

To: IUE_SENATE-L@LISTSERV.INDIANA.EDU

Greetings from the Nominating Committee:

We have a "situation". (Not a problem, just a "situation"). A member of the Faculty Board of Review, as it is currently constituted, will be unable to finish serving a term on that Committee. This current Committee member's term is scheduled to terminate in 1999, and would therefore be replaced next Fall. We need a replacement for the remainder of this member's current term of office. The situation arises due to the fact that we only have one more Senate meeting and our new bye law requires a two meeting process for the election of FBR members. It is apparent we will not have time to use the new procedure.

Consequently, I am asking all tenured faculty members who have a desire to finish out the partial term of this member to send me e-mail notice of that desire. We will put together a slate from the e-mail responses I get and hold an election (majority vote) during our May Senate meeting. Please respond by April 30, 1999.

Ed Brown edbrown@indiana.edu

On May 4, 1999, a slate constructed from e-mail responses was put before the Senate to elect a person to finish George Blakey's term on the Faculty Board of Review.

On May 4, 1990, slates were put before the Senate for confirmation for the Curriculum Committee, Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee, Workload Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Budgetary Affairs Committee. The form of those slates appear in section VIII of this report.

VI. NOMINATING COMMITTEE CALENDAR

Early August:

Send letter (e-mail draft) to Kim Ladd to be enclosed with adjunct contracts (sent out from Kim's office in mid-Aug.) soliciting their interest in being an adjunct representative in the Faculty Senate for the up coming school year.

Faculty Retreat:

"Slate Selection" process for Promotion and Tenure Committee elections of members of the and the Faculty Board or Review

Sept. Senate Meeting:

Conduct the elections for the seating of new members on the Promotion and Tenure and the Faculty Board of Review

February Senate Meeting:

Elections for President of the Faculty Senate

March:

Send out Faculty Committee Service Preference forms.
(staff does not receive) Solicitation among the staff employees for service on the admin. Committees was accomplished through the Chancellor's office. Begin preparation of the slates for the Senate Standing Committees.

April Senate Meeting:

Slate selection for Nominating Committee

May Senate Meeting:

Present slates re Senate Standing Committees for approval.
Conduct election for member of University Faculty Counsel

Agenda Committee
1998-99 Final Report

The Agenda Committee is a Faculty Senate Committee comprised of the chairs of the AAA (Kumara Jayasuriya), Budgetary Affairs (Lora Baldwin), Curriculum (Cathy Ludlum Foss), Faculty Affairs (Jerry Wyett [Fall], Robert Hertzog [Spring], and Workload (Joe Blake) committees, the President of the Faculty Senate (Michael Foss), and the Chancellor (David Fulton), *ex officio*. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Diane Roberts) was invited to each meeting of the entire committee.

During 1998-99 the Agenda Committee met twice each month. The Committee meetings took two forms. Once each month the committee met to determine which items would be on the agenda of the Faculty Senate meeting. The committee determined the order of the items and examined issues from committees that were being considered for possible addition to the agenda.

Once each month the committee chairs and the Senate President met without the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor. These meetings focused on the direction of faculty governance on this campus. This group examined the long-range issues to be on the Senate agenda. Over the course of the year this committee examined its charge and role in the Faculty Senate.

Over the years the Agenda Committee has been active in a number of roles that are not specifically delineated in the committee description. These include: academic long range planning, faculty retreat planning, enhancing senate communication and providing advice to the Senate President. The Agenda Committee felt that these were appropriate functions and will continue to function in these ways next year while continuing to reevaluate its role.

Agenda Committee played an active role in the planning and implementation of web access to Faculty Senate information, use of the file server to make Faculty Senate minutes readily available and coordination of Faculty Senate archives.

The 1998-99 minutes of the Agenda Committee can be found on the file server.

Budgetary Affairs

Annual Report for 1998-99

Committee Members: Mary Blakefield (NSM), Ed Brown (BSS), Ron Carter (HFA), Kelly Dempsey (NURS), Larry Englert (BEST), Cheryl Stolle (EDUC) and Lora Baldwin, Chair (Library).

The main activity of the Budgetary Affairs Committee fall semester was to create a set of bylaws to follow. The committee started with the Budgetary Affairs bylaws from Bloomington and then revised and adopted them to fit our campus. R.A.L.P.H. (Revenue and Liabilities Procedural Handout) was sent to the Agenda Committee but was held up from being sent to the Senate awaiting reports from other Senate Committees. R.A.L.P.H. discusses composition, management, meetings, relationships with campus administration and the East Faculty Senate, authority, and confidentiality.

BAC also discussed the changes to the 18-20 plan and made copies available to interested faculty. The committee looked at how the East campus would be affected and determined that there would not be serious implications. However, the changes to the retirement plan for new faculty will make it even harder to attract the faculty we want since we aren't competitive salary wise either.

The committee examined the implications of the Monterrey proposal and discussed their concerns with the Chancellor.

During the Spring Semester the committee continuously talked about salary floors. Raising the floors higher without raising existing salaries would lead to even greater compression of salaries. Could we successfully raise the floors by twice the cost of living for the next five years? What impact would that have on existing salaries? Could we create a "step" level among faculty ranks similar to the one the Federal Government uses? Unfortunately, no conclusions were reached about this issue.

The committee became active in the budget process at an earlier stage this year with a presentation to the Executive Council in February. Of concern to the committee was the need to support degree programs that were not adequately staffed; the need to maintain unfilled positions; the growth of non instructional administrator to student ratio; the new technology mandates; and funding for new technology. There was also strong support in raising salary floors, existing salaries and adjunct salaries.

The committee solicited input on the suggested budget from faculty through email and held an open meeting.

The committee also met with Vice Chancellor Diane Roberts to discuss the need to reevaluate the math positions and the salaries being offered.

In regards to our report, here are the numbers. The committee is continuing the discussion on the other issues you outlined at the beginning of last year. I can give the remaining at the October meeting.

Promotion and Tenure Committee Report to the Senate

The committee acted on five cases for promotion and tenure. There were no problems in interpreting or following the policies outlined in IU and IUE handbooks.

There were twenty-two applicants for the TERA awards and twelve (the maximum number) were awarded. The procedure for determining these awards was the same as the previous year.

Thanks for your help.

Neil