

Indiana University South Bend
DRAFT - Minutes of the Academic Senate
18 April 2003

Members Present: S. Agarwal, P. Aghimien, G. Anderson, S. Anderson, T. Anderson, A. W. Bartholomew, E. Bennion, J. Blodgett, P. Bushnell, J. Chaney, L. Chen, X. Cheng, J.R. Colborn, N. Colborn, L. Collins, R. Cordell, J. Detlef, K. Egerton, W. Feighery, B. Fong-Morgan, L. Fritschner, P. Furlong, S. Gerencser, J. Good, A. Guillaume, G. Hadley, H. Hakimzadeh, C. Harrington, M. Heck, P. Henry, J. P. Herr, J. Hinnefeld, G. Huitink, J. Hurst, N. Karakatsanis, B. Kern, W. Knight, B. Knowles, L. Lambert, V. Larsen, I. Levine, J. Lewis, E. Maher, M. Makielski, D. McMillen, J. Meyer, P. Nietch, S. Norton, D. Olson, S. Opasik, P. Pierce, R. Pope, U. M. Reck, E. Roth, M. Russo, M. Scanlan, R. Schreiber, C. Schult, R. Schwartz, S. Sernau, D. Shlapentokh, S. Shore, K. Smant, R. L. Smith, C. Sofhauser, R. Torstrick, D. Vollrath, L. Walker, L. Williams.

Thanks to the generosity of Chancellor Reck, light refreshments were available just outside the meeting room during the half hour preceding the meeting.

President Roy Schreiber began the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of March 21, 2003, were approved by voice vote without dissent.

II. Memorial Resolution for Joseph Ross

A memorial resolution for Emeritus Professor Joseph Ross of the Chemistry Department was read by G. Huitink. [The text of the resolution is appended at the end of these minutes, as provided in the resolution.] Schreiber asked for a voice vote on approval of the resolution. It was approved without dissent. Schreiber remarked that when Dr. Ross was president of the Senate, Schreiber served as secretary, and that Ross had tremendous patience with a younger colleague who required a great deal of patience.

III. Special Election for Senate PTR Committee

Schreiber reviewed the need to elect a member to serve during the fall semester, 2003, on the Senate Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee. As provided in the Senate constitution, the election was conducted on the floor of the Senate meeting. Schreiber asked for nominations. John Lewis (Political Science) was nominated. There was a motion to close nominations. The motion was approved by voice vote with only Lewis dissenting (in good humor). A voice vote on electing Lewis to the committee was taken and approved with only Lewis dissenting.

IV. Administrative Reports (Reck, Guillaume)

Chancellor Reck

The chancellor read an email from student Brett Elms expressing his gratitude to the faculty for making his experience at IUSB a rewarding one and for giving him good principles to live by.

The chancellor thanked the faculty panel who spoke at the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees on our campus in early April. The panel consisted of R. Schreiber, D. McMillen, E. Maher, A. W. Bartholomew, and E. Bender. Their statements were well received by the Board. McMillen talked about the need for residence halls; Maher talked about our need for full-time tenure positions; Bartholomew talked about the importance of sharing electronic resources with all campuses; and Bender talked about campus directions.

The chancellor expressed her thanks for the cooperation of the faculty during the recent YWCA luncheon on our campus in late March. Reck continues even now to receive positive input from community members about their experience here. It was carried off with superb professionalism.

The chancellor reviewed the recent hiring searches. We were successful in hiring a Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs and University Advancement, Ilene Sheffer, who will begin here formally on July 1. The search for a Vice Chancellor for Information Technology was not successful, so the search will begin again early next fall, with ads to appear in a timely way. Vice Chancellor Guillaume will again head the search committee, and he will be contacting members of the current committee to ask whether they are willing to serve again. R. Torstrick is chairing the search for an Affirmative Action officer. Candidates will be on campus soon for interviews. D. McMillen is chairing the search for Director of the Student Activities Center and Athletic Director. Candidates will be on campus soon.

The chancellor reviewed the requirement in the Indiana University Academic Handbook that the chancellor establish a committee of faculty and administrators to review decisions concerning paid family leaves. The chancellor has asked the Senate president to recommend faculty names, and Reck will choose administrative members. This committee will be up and running by the fall semester.

The chancellor showed a transparency that reviewed the budget process that has been followed this year. Reck has received input from the Senate Budget Committee as well as from the Chancellor's Cabinet. The last item listed on the process [report of the chancellor to the Senate on the budget adopted] cannot be followed because the budget is still "undecided". The recommendations include new positions to be created in Art History, Mathematics, Education, and the Library. Also the position of Director of Student Life Services is to be created. A number of other areas will receive new funds. At some point in the future, these recommendations will be available for review on the chancellor's Web page.

The chancellor also reported on efforts in the legislature to assure that our campus receives the resources it needs.

Vice Chancellor Guillaume

Guillaume expressed his opinion that this has been a great year, and he looks forward to his address to the faculty next fall, at which time he will review the past and look to the future.

He expressed his frustration that budget constraints are so severe that we can do little beyond repair and maintain what we have. He feels, however, that we are moving slowly beyond that situation.

Guillaume noted that he had met recently with B. Withers and B. Torstrick about a thematic year for us next year, on the topic of Identities in Conflict. The events they are planning will create a wonderful intellectual community for us. It will involve not only IUSB but other universities and cultural institutions in this region. It is linked to our General Education program, and is a high point for the vice chancellor to have that passed. He looks forward to working with the faculty to get that program implemented starting in the fall of 2005.

The vice chancellor presented the Distinguished Researcher of the Year award for 2003 to two faculty members, P. Bushnell (Biology) and D. Olson (Sociology). Olson thanked the IUSB community for its support of his research and the environment in which he is able to do his work.

V. A Report from the Senate Library Affairs Committee concerning the Patriot Act

S. Gerencser (Political Science) explained that the Patriot Act passed by the U.S. Congress requires that librarians take certain actions to comply with the act. The members of the Library Affairs Committee have been reviewing with the librarians the requirements of the act and the effect of these requirements on members of the campus community. They feel that serious issues are raised by the Patriot Act, and so the committee proposes to stage a forum in the fall semester where these issues can be discussed by the IUSB community. Examples are

(1) the requirements concerning maintaining records of use of library materials, and reduction of availability of documents (IUSB is a federal document repository), as well as the narrowing of the Freedom of Information Act;

(2) computer records;

(3) release of records of faculty and students to federal investigators without the knowledge of individuals being investigated; this is of special concern in the case of international students who are subject to deportation without public hearings.

Anyone who has questions about this matter should contact R. Cordell in the library. Anyone who wishes to participate in organizing the forum should contact L. Walker, chair of the committee, or S. Gerencser.

VII. Approval of Committee Assignments

Schreiber brought to the floor of the Senate the recommendations made by the Executive Committee for membership on the various appointed Senate committees for 2003-4. [The list of recommendations is appended to these minutes.] Some committees are not yet at appropriate strength, so he encouraged members to contact him if they wished to have their names added to under-populated committees. The constitution requires approval of membership of the new committees at the last meeting of the academic year, so a motion was made to approve. The motion was passed without dissent by a voice vote.

VIII. Amendment to the Senate Constitution to Create an Assessment Committee

The Senate voted nearly two years ago to have the campus Assessment Committee become an Academic Senate committee. Some negotiation has taken place among members of the Office of Academic Affairs, the present Assessment Committee, and the Senate Executive Committee. The result is a proposed amendment to the Senate Constitution describing the committee and its responsibilities. Schreiber called for a discussion of wording of the proposed amendment, which was available on paper at the meeting, and which read as follows:

To Article VII. Standing Committees Section 7, add Subsection P:

P. Assessment Committee

Committee Charge:

The Committee is responsible for promoting and supporting the continuing development of assessment efforts at IUSB. The Committee is also responsible for advising the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who maintains primary administrative responsibility for IUSB assessment efforts. The Committee oversees and coordinates assessment activities by collecting annual assessment data from individual units, conducting periodic assessment reviews of units, and awarding assessment grants.

Committee Membership:

Nine faculty members with voting privileges serve staggered three year appointments. Five members will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate; four members will be appointed by the Office of Academic Affairs. A chairperson of the Committee will be appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs from among the nine faculty members.

Question: In the current charge to the existing, administratively appointed Assessment Committee, the committee has responsibility for assessing General Education. That responsibility is not stated in the proposed amendment. Is that an oversight, or is it intended that another committee would have responsibility for assessing General Education.

Response: The input we received from the existing Assessment Committee did not mention that, but that can be accepted as a friendly amendment.

Question: Why is the chair of this proposed Senate committee to be chosen by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs instead of by the Senate?

Response: I would say it is a recognition of the mandated responsibility that the Office of Academic Affairs has for making sure that assessment is carried out. It seemed appropriate to have that office select the chair, while at the same time requiring that the chair be a faculty member.

The proposal was amended by adding the words “and General Education” after the words “conducting periodic assessment reviews of units”.

There was a motion to close debate on the amendment. A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved without dissent. Schreiber said that he would send out a paper ballot for the vote on the amendment.

IX. Electronic Voting on Senate Business

Schreiber asked L. Williams and J. Hinnefeld to make a presentation on the possibility of electronic voting to replace paper ballots. Williams noted that a handout was available at the meeting to describe how electronic balloting can work. [The handout described the balloting system currently used by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.]

The advantages are as follows:

- (1) it would save trees since it would not be necessary to print ballots for everyone, but only for those who wish to use paper ballots;
- (2) it would greatly reduce the time required of the Senate secretary in tallying votes; when the secretary closes the electronic ballot, an immediate print-out is made listing the number of votes for each item on the ballot;
- (3) it is a secure method; you login using your network ID and password, and you can vote once and only once;
- (4) it is flexible in the sense that more than one selection from a list can be accepted where that is wanted (e.g., “vote for two of the following”); if you vote for too few choices, you are warned that that is what you are doing; if you vote for too many, you are made to start over again;

The disadvantages are as follows:

- (1) this system requires that you use a PC that can login to the campus Novell network; by the end of the year, all PCs on campus will be connected to that network;
- (2) some people will prefer to cast paper ballots; the secretary will need to remove such individuals from the electronic balloting roster;
- (3) once you begin voting, your name is recorded in a database as having voted; if your system crashes before you finish voting, you can't re-enter the system and start over; since the print-out of the results lists how many people voted for each item, the victim of such a crash could notify the

secretary of the Senate concerning how many items they succeeded in voting on, and then the secretary could supply that person with a paper ballot on which to finish voting.

Question: Why do we need to bother with paper ballots? Do we really have faculty members who can't understand how to do this?

Response: You know the answer to that. (Laughter)

Question: We do balloting this way in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. How many people ask for paper ballots?

Response: Only a couple.

Question: Wouldn't it be possible to make the last item on the ballot read "I have completed this ballot", and then if that item was not checked, the person's ballot would simply not be counted?

Response: The way the system works is that as soon as a person votes on a particular item, that vote is recorded, so failure to complete cannot erase votes on earlier items.

Question: Is there any way of maintaining anonymity in this system? It looks like we might be losing the one thing we get with paper ballots.

Response: The system records who logged in to vote, and it records the votes, but it does not record who voted how. So there should be no way of determining who voted for what. Our present system does not have complete anonymity, since your name must be on the envelope that carries your paper ballot, so it would be possible for the secretary to record who voted how.

Question: Will it be possible to see the entire set of questions before you begin voting?

Response: Yes. The initial screen gives you the option to display the ballot in its entirety before selecting the option to begin voting.

Question: How often, in your experience with LAS electronic balloting, has it occurred that someone's machine crashed while they were voting?

Response: It has never happened.

Schreiber asked for discussion of the question of whether to allow the Senate Executive Committee to experiment with this electronic voting process.

Question: Would it be possible to run an experiment in which the members of the Senate are allowed to try out the system and see whether they are comfortable with it?

Response: We could set up a test of the kind that is shown on the handout about electronic balloting.

Remark: Recently the students held their annual election for officers using electronic voting.

Everything seemed to go well for that election. The number of votes was substantially higher than in prior elections.

Remark: It would really be helpful if it were possible to access the balloting system from something other than a PC. Perhaps it ought to be available from any Web browser.

It was pointed out that the student election was conducted over the Web and everything went smoothly. Williams promised to look into the possibility, which would allow faculty to vote from any machine that had Web access.

A motion was made to have the Senate Executive Committee explore the possibility of electronic balloting to begin in fall 2003.

Remark: I think we may want to draw a distinction between voting on constitutional amendments, which may require a mail ballot, and other Senate business. Can that be accepted as a friendly amendment? [It was accepted.]

A voice vote was taken on the motion “that the Executive Committee explore the possibility of electronic balloting for Academic Senate mail ballots beginning fall semester 2003.” The motion passed without dissent.

X. Reports from Senate Committees

Budget Committee

J. P. Herr reviewed the recommendations that the Budget Committee had made to Chancellor Reck and Vice Chancellor Guillaume. He also reported on a letter that the committee sent to Reck that

- (1) asserted the principle that expansion of the faculty should not occur without additional support services and materials for such faculty, and that the campus should fund existing faculty support needs before funding new faculty positions;
- (2) recommended giving secretarial positions to General Studies and the School of the Arts; also giving additional funding to the library;
- (3) supported a number of requests from Vice Chancellor Zemke over which the Budget Committee has no jurisdiction;
- (4) raised some concerns about auxiliary budgets for entities that should be self-supporting, but in some cases are not; examples are the Child Care Center, Dining Services, Continuing Education, performing arts, student housing, parking, the Student Activities Center, the bookstore; questioned why the Child Care Center is more expensive than most others in our community; the campus provides space, utilities, and custodial care at no charge to these entities, but the cost of that should be recovered; student housing, parking, and the bookstore do at least pay for themselves.

Herr also showed a transparency indicating prospects for the campus under various scenarios in the state legislature. If the governor’s budget proposal is adopted, IUSB will end up about \$700,000 short; if the Indiana Senate proposal is adopted, we will end up about \$400,000 short; if the Indiana House proposal is adopted, we will end up about \$300,000 ahead. A tuition increase will be needed to cover some costs.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee

K. Smant raised three concerns.

First, the committee asks that the Senior Lecturer application process be handled expeditiously by the academic units so that the application process can begin next year.

Second, the committee wants to work with the Senate and administration on matters related to Merit Status for associate faculty. Specifically, the committee has discovered that the 10% increase in salary that accompanies elevation to Merit Status has in some cases been dropped in the semester immediately following the one in which it was given. The committee wants to see it made mandatory that the increase be permanent.

Third, the committee wants the campus to make a commitment to give a new award for outstanding teaching by associate faculty. This should entail a nomination and selection process, a cash award, and a ceremony of recognition. The award would not have to be given every year, but associate faculty whose teaching is outstanding should have the possibility of being recognized and rewarded.

The Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee

W. Feighery reported that the committee considered 21 Category 2 cases, 21 Category 3 cases, 44 Category 4 cases, 13 Category 5 (tenure) cases, five promotions in rank, and two deans. Recommendations were made in all these cases. In addition, 6 mid-career dossiers were reviewed.

The Research and Development Committee

S. Shore noted that the Senate had already seen the result of some of the committee's work in the two research awards that were given earlier today. The committee has a 60% acceptance rate for research grants and a 30% acceptance rate for curriculum development grants. To succeed, it is important to read the instructions concerning rules for applying for the grants. If human subjects are to be used in any way, it is especially important to follow the rules.

The proposals received by the committee are generally superb. The quality of research being done at IUSB is remarkable. The committee is proud to have the role of awarding funding for the proposals, but wishes it had much more money available.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
William Knight
Secretary of the Academic Senate

[Two appendices follow.]

Appendix A

Appointed Academic Senate Committees 2003/2004

Academic Affairs

Isaac Walters - Arts
Teresa Dobrzykowski - NHP
Mary Truex - LAS
Michael Lasater - Arts
Brenda Knowles - B & E

Curriculum

Lynette Lashley - Arts
Feng Shan - Library
Linda Chen - LAS
Susan Cress - Education

Facilities Management

Randy Isaacson - Education
Judith Gottwald - Library
Paul Beem - LAS
Peter Aghimien - B&E
Peter Bushnell - LAS
Geraldine Huitink - LAS

Faculty Welfare

Elizabeth Bennion - LAS
Paul Kochanowski - B&E
Patti Nietch- NHP
Gail McGuire - LAS
Karen Gindele - LAS
Dmitry Shlapentokh - LAS

Academic Personnel

Bill Knight - LAS
Michael Kinyon - LAS
Christina Rios - Education

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Rae Sovereign - Labor Studies
Kate Edgerton - LAS
Kevin Smant - LAS

Student Affairs

Meryl Domina - Education
Douglas McMillen - LAS
Melchor de Guzman - SPEA
Jim Howard - NHP
Joanne Detlef - LAS
Steve Norton - B&E
Thomas Clark - LAS

Library Affairs

Steven Gerencser - LAS
Raman Muralidharan - B&E
Patrick Furlong - LAS
Wayne Bartholomew - B&E
Lesley Walker - LAS
David Surma - LAS

Teaching

Cheri Brown - LAS
Sara Sage - Education
Denise Smith - Education

Budget

Jamshid Mehran - B&E
Paul Herr - SPEA/LAS
John Lewis - LAS

[Second Year]
Lois Carder - Arts
Mike Darnel - LAS
Linda Fisher - Library
Bridget Fong-Morgan - LAS

[Third Year]
Dan Holm - Education
Raj Kohli - B&E

Research and Development

Larry Lambert - Arts
Deb Marr - LAS
Anne Brown - LAS
Monika Lynker - LAS
Mark Fox - B&E

[Second Year]
Douglas Agbetsiafa - B&E
Benjamin Withers - Arts
Jon Proctor - SPEA
Marcia Heck - Education

Advising & Admissions

Linda Blodgett - B&E
Ann Grens - LAS
John Finnegan - Purdue Tech.
Suzanne Meyer - LAS
Paul Joray - B&E
Gwen Mettetal - Education

General Studies

Betsy Lucal - LAS
Ellen Maher - Library
David Vollrath - B&E
Louise Collins - LAS

Information Technology

Ken Smith - LAS
Gary Kern - B&E
Dean Alvis - LAS
Kirby Cheng - Library

[Second Year]
Karen Ackoff - Arts
Fred Herschede - B&E
Robert Pope - LAS

Matt Marmorino - LAS

Campus Directions

Eileen Bender - LAS

Nancy Colborn - Library

Sushma Agarwal - LAS

Paul Herr - SPEA/LAS

Bruce Wrenn - B&E

Katherine Jackson - B&E

David Vollrath - B&E

Mike Keen - LAS

Assessment

Patricia Henry - NHP

Barbara Peat - SPEA

Linda Fisher - Library

Appendix B

Joseph H. Ross

May 24, 1925 – October 12, 2002

Memorial Resolution

Joseph Hansbro Ross was born May 24, 1925 in Houston, Texas. He graduated from Rice University in 1946 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Chemical Engineering and received a Master's degree in Chemistry from the University of Texas in 1948. He served at the Army Chemical Center in Edgewood, Maryland and received his doctorate from the University of Maryland in 1957. Following postdoctoral studies with Robert C. Elderfield at the University of Michigan, he was hired as a research chemist at the American Cyanamid Company in Stamford, Connecticut. In 1963 he moved to South Bend, Indiana where he taught organic chemistry until his retirement in 1994.

Joe was the first chair of the IUSB chemistry department, his title being Assistant Chairman of the Chemistry Department of the Indiana University South Bend-Mishawaka Campus. (In those days regional campuses had assistant chairs; department chairs resided on the Bloomington campus.) Joe's administration of the chemistry department in the 1960's and early 1970's set the department on the course it continues to follow today. He understood the important role that instruments were to play in chemical education and introduced instrumental techniques into organic chemistry laboratories. To this end he obtained instruments from Bloomington and local industries, and he wrote grant proposals. Joe was the first person on campus to be awarded a National Science Foundation grant, and the instrument he obtained with that grant is, with some modification, still being used today.

Joe was an active participant in the affairs of IUSB. He was chair of the Academic Senate (1970 - 71), and he chaired many Senate and Liberal Arts and Sciences committees. He was also actively involved with the American Chemical Society and held a number of offices with this organization. He served as chair of the local section of the American Chemical Society (1974) and as Councilor (1983) and Alternate Councilor (1978 - 83). He was a member of the American Association for the

Advancement of Science, the Royal Society of Chemistry, Sigma Xi, the Indiana Academy of Sciences, and the American Association of University Professors.

Joe is survived by his wife Alberta; four children, Mary Angela Ross of Durham, North Carolina; Joseph H. Ross Jr. of College Station, Texas; Robert Barkley Ross of Raleigh, North Carolina; and Kathleen Ross Jarrell of Charlotte, North Carolina; and seven grandchildren. Joe was a longtime member of Little Flower Catholic Church and took an active role in parish affairs. He had a great love of music. He played the piano and was a frequent concert-goer.

Joe Ross had a major impact on the mission of the chemistry department. We remember his vast knowledge of chemistry, his gentle humor, the twinkle in his eyes. We remember a good man. We remember a kind man. We are saddened by his passing but are enriched by our time with him.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED: that the faculty of Indiana University South Bend acknowledge our collective loss, and extend our deepest sympathy and sincerest condolences to Alberta and his children; that this resolution be recorded in the minutes of the Academic Senate; that a copy of this resolution be sent to his wife Alberta; and that a copy be entered in the archives of the Franklin D. Schurz Library.

April 18, 2003