

INDIANA UNIVERSITY EAST
2005-2006 FACULTY SENATE
December 6, 2005
Whitewater Hall - 132
11:00 AM

Presiding: Cathy Ludlum Foons, Faculty Senate President

Present: Baldwin, L.; Barton, G.; Batraw, J.; Baumann, P.; Beck, V.; Bergen, M.; Bingaman, R.; Blakefield, M.; Bow, C.; Boys, S.; Branstrator, P.; Braxton-Brown, G.; Bullock, D.; Chang, W.; Clark, K.; Connerly, P.; Cooksey, A.; Cowling, J.; Curry, M.; Dempsey, K.; Desantis, K.; Dhawale, K.; Doerger, D.; Ette, E.; Fell, M.; Felton, K.; Fitzgerald, E.; Folkerth, M.; Foons, M.; Frantz, D.; Fulton, D.; Harper, J.; Helton, E.; Henderson, T.; Humphries, P.; Jayasuriya, K.; Jerzak, P.; Kirk, B.; Lafuze, J.; Ludlum Foons, C.; McFadden, S.; Meadow, L.; Morse, M.; Naaeke, A.; Nishihara, L.; Peacock, F.; Pomper, M.; Ramsey, R.; Rankin, S.; Rao, V.; Richards, L.; Rivard, T.; Roswell, R.; Sabine, N.; Scales, T.; Scott, W.; Seddighin, M.; Shapiro, S.; Slattery, E.; Stanforth, D.; Tolley, R.; Wagor, W.; Weber, G.; Williamson, M.; Winburn, E.

Absent: Armstead, S.; Baker, D.; Breymer, T.; Buckner, D.; Clapp-Itnyre, A.; Dulemba, S.; Englert, L.; Huffman, E.; Knuths, J.; Kreamelmeyer, K.; Kriese, P.; Lemming, E.; Mahaffey, J.; McFadden, B.; Osgood, T.; Passet, J.; Powell, M.; Roberts, M.; Roman-Royer, J.; Stolle, C.; Szopa, A.; Thomas, T.; Thomas-Evans, M.; Watkins, M.; Wilde, J.;

Purdue: Alenskis, B.

Guests: Ben Young, Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services

Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:05AM by Cathy Ludlum Foons, Faculty Senate President.

I. Approval of Minutes

A motion to accept the minutes for the November 1, 2005 meeting was presented. The minutes were approved as presented.

II. President's Report

This is the last meeting for the 2005 calendar year. We will hold the January 17, 2006 meeting as scheduled. In February we will vote on University Faculty Council Representative and Faculty Senate President. Nominees are needed!

Sheila Armstead broke her hip and is in Reid hospital.

Clarification regarding the special resolutions passed by the Bloomington faculty regarding the leadership of the university: the Trustees will be holding a special meeting to discuss these resolutions, but they have been very clear that the resolutions come only from the Bloomington faculty and not from the university faculty.

III. Executive Session

December Graduates – a tentative list of December Graduates was presented in Circular E14-06. A motion to approve the graduates as listed was made by TJ Rivard. The motion was seconded. The motion passed without opposition.

IV. Standing Committees

Curriculum Committee – Greg Weber

A motion to approve the new course proposal from NSM for BIOL-T101 Introduction to Biotechnology was presented moved and seconded by the Curriculum Committee.

Justification: 1) Elective for various degrees 2) Gateway to new proposed Biotechnology Degree 3) offer Fall 2006 to arouse interest in the Biotechnology Degree.

Discussion included clarification for why 2 credit hours were chosen rather than 3. In an effort to keep the Biotechnology Degree within the required number of credit hours various courses are set at lower credit hours.

The Motion to approve BIOL-T101 Introduction to Biotechnology passed without opposition.

Lecturers Policy – Ed Fitzgerald, FAC Chair

At the last Senate meeting the Faculty Affairs Committee was charged with bringing forward a Plan for revising the current Lecturers Policy. Circular E12-06 offers three options for review.

Discussion:

Ed – Discussion for comparison – what do you like what do you not like?

Q – What does Long-term contract mean? Rolling? Set amount of time? **A** – Renewable every 5 years.

Q – Under what circumstances would it not be renewed? **A** – Only not renewed if there is a restructuring of the department, down-sizing, or professional incompetence or series misconduct.

C – Preference of Option #1 because things are kept within the division

C – AAC Division Chairs are unanimous in supporting Option #1. Poses administrative issues.

Q – Option #3 Who would be on the Lecturer Review Committee? **A** – That decision has not been made. The thought is that it would be a campus-wide committee.

Q – Option #3 Does P&T Committee as ex-officio mean non-voting? **A** – Ex-officio means all rights but cannot vote.

Clarification – Ex-officio according to Roberts rules is that full-fledged member with all rights, based on a position being held.

A – The Committee hasn't worked out all the details. There was a misunderstanding among committee members as to the definition of Ex-officio.

C – Against all three Options in favor of current policy. P&T committee is accustomed to reviewing these materials. Each option creates new committees which seems counterproductive at a time when faculty complain about being overcommitted.

C – Option #1 seems to best serve the institution. The Tenure track process is a completely different process than the Lecturer Process. Option #1 creates the opportunity to implement a Senior Lecturer Policy and how one goes about changing their status and involves the Division in the entire process.

Q – Is the Committee here today for us to give input and have you go back and do more work on one or more options or are you here for us to say our general sense is that we would like to move a particular option in to being? **A** – Yes. This is the Senate's decision.

C – Does not see the point in creating two committees to review the same materials.

Q – Does this imply every division must have a P&T Committee? **A** – Yes

C – Option #1 makes it possible for there to be different criteria in each Division and creates less uniformity across the campus. Which may be fine ...

Q – What's the meaningful difference between long-term contract versus tenure? **A** – Long-term contract is for 5-years with no promises.

Q – Would they have to be re-reviewed then? **A** – They would not be reviewed by this procedure. They would be reviewed by the Division, the VCAA, and the Chancellor.

C – Criteria don't need to change from Tenure Track to Lecturer. The issue seems to be logistical in nature. The procedure for putting together the Review Document is very different than that of a Dossier. When there is significant difference between the required materials for the two documents there is a built in bias when shifting from the review of Tenure Dossiers to Lecturer Review materials. Therefore option #1 is supported. Also, Lecturers are very involved in divisions and not necessarily campus-wide. Therefore the Division is in a better position to make this judgment than the P&T Committee is.

Q – Larry Richards stated he thought the Division Chairs support Option #1 but that it presented Administrative obstacles. What obstacles? **A** – The Administrative problem has to do with Lecturers having certain criteria to meet which are very different from one Division to another. Service and teaching are inter-related and trying to find a way to be fair and consistent is much more difficult than with Tenure Track Faculty.

- C – Support Option 1; not only does it separate the expectations of Lecturers, it allows Divisions, who truly know what the expectations are, to decide if Lecturers are doing a good job.
- Q – Does the problem of consistency go away with the committee? A – The issue with the P&T committee is that it's designated for a very specific purpose. That purpose changes once we start adding other duties to it.
- C – From a Division that uses a large number of Lecturers I'm best suited to know whether they have met our needs with what we do. The policy says the criteria must be the same.

A motion to have Faculty Affairs Committee bring Option #1 to our next meeting for a vote was made by Greg Braxton-Brown. The motion was seconded.

Discussion included the benefits of keeping things within the Divisions; the process; the pluses of being evaluated by "peers"; the difficulty of the timing with the winter break prior to the next meeting; the "issues" not being solved by any of the proposed alternatives; the lack of consistency the option fosters; the need for FAC to better define specific criteria.

A motion to end the discussion and move to a vote was made by Ezekiel Ette. The motion was seconded. The motion passed with some opposition.

The motion to charge FAC with bringing Option #1 back at the next meeting for a formal vote passed with opposition.

Workload Committee – Jerome Mahaffey

Jerome Mahaffey, Co-chair for the Committee, led a discussion about whether the committee should be dissolved, kept the same, or empowered to do appropriate work. (Cir. E13-06)

Discussion included the history of the committee; the need for faculty being aware of reassigned time; the recommendation that the committee be recharged with policy making rather than just oversight of Faculty workload; the support of Divisional Workload Committees; reassigned time being one portion of Faculty Workload; the needs of the Administration for the committee; the Faculty having a say over their professional life; the ineffectiveness of the committee's history.

Due to time constraints the discussion was halted.

IV. Chancellor's Report – David Fulton

The Campaign for Community is doing well. Over \$1.7 million and expect to reach \$2 million before the end of Spring semester. Keep up the good work.

V. Academic Affairs Report – Larry Richards, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Advisors should not advise students about Financial Aid; they should refer students to the Fin. Aid office. It is important to know that how you advise a student may affect their Financial Aid.

It was requested that Advisors be supplied with a brief document highlighting Financial Aid areas so Advisors are better able to assist students. Larry Richards will mention it. He also recommended Divisions invite Dennis Hicks to their meetings to discuss it.

Distributed Education Committee – Larry Richards and Wendy Chang

Committee Members: Neil Sabine, Joan Lafuze, Jerome Mahaffey, TJ Rivard, Peggy Branstrator, Lora Baldwin, Dan Doerger, and Trudy Weyermann.

Thank you to the committee it has been wonderfully productive and amazing!

The Committee has developed three new Distributed Education programs: BA in English with Concentration in Professional Communication; BA in Communication; BS in Business Administration with a Concentration in Finance. All are Baccalaureate Completion programs offering enough to complete the third and fourth year of the programs. Two of the programs will be completely online and the other almost entirely online.

Q – What, if any, approval needs to be done for these programs? A – No approval needed because each of the programs already exists.

Q – There's a rumor "once online always online". Is this true? A – No, that is not true.

Meeting adjourned 12:15 p.m.