

INDIANA UNIVERSITY EAST
2005-2006 FACULTY SENATE
March 7, 2006
Whitewater Hall - 132
11:00 AM

Presiding: Cathy Ludlum Foos, Faculty Senate President

Present: Barton, G.; Batdraw, J.; Baumann, P.; Beck, V.; Bingaman, R.; Blakefield, M.; Boys, S.; Branstrator, P.; Breymer, T.; Bullock, D.; Chang, W.; Clapp-Itnyre, A.; Clark, K.; Connerly, P.; Cowling, J.; Curry, M.; Dempsey, K.; Desantis, K.; Ette, E.; Fell, M.; Felton, K.; Folkerth, M.; Foos, M.; Frantz, D.; Fulton, D.; Harper, J.; Helton, E.; Henderson, T.; Jerzak, P.; Kirk, B.; Kriese, P.; Lafuze, J.; Ludlum Foos, C.; Mahaffey, J.; McFadden, S.; Meadow, L.; Morse, M.; Naaeke, A.; Nishihara, L.; Passet, J.; Peacock, F.; Pomper, M.; Ramsey, R.; Rankin, S.; Rao, V.; Richards, L.; Rivard, T.; Sabine, N.; Scott, W.; Seddighin, M.; Slattey, E.; Stanforth, D.; Stolle, C.; Thomas-Evans, M.; Tolley, R.; Weber, G.; Williamson, M.; Winburn, E.

Absent: Armstead, S.; Baker, D.; Baldwin, L.; Bergen, M.; Bow, C.; Braxton-Brown, G.; Buckner, D.; Cooksey, A.; Dhawale, K.; Doerger, D.; Dulemba, S.; Fitzgerald, E.; Huffman, E.; Humphries, P.; Jayasuriya, K.; Knuths, J.; Kreamelmeyer, K.; Lemming, E.; McFadden, B.; Osgood, T.; Powell, M.; Roberts, M.; Roman-Royer, J.; Roswell, R.; Scales, T.; Shapiro, S.; Szopa, A.; Thomas, T.; Wagor, W.; Watkins, M.; Wilde, J.

Purdue: Kozak, M

Call to order

Quorum was reached and the meeting was called to order at 11:05AM by Cathy Ludlum Foos, Faculty Senate President.

I. Approval of Minutes

A motion to accept the minutes for the February 7, 2006 meeting was presented. The Representative Senate Motion actually passed with opposition rather than without as noted. The minutes were approved as corrected.

II. President's Report

Cathy apologized for being unprepared to select the slate for the Nominating Committee and the Promotion & Tenure Committee as stipulated in the bylaws. Slate selection will be done at the April meeting instead.

Today will be a first reading of the proposed dissolution of the General Studies Committee as a Senate Committee. Since it is a bylaws change we will not vote today. The proposal is to dissolve the committee as a Senate Committee and recommend an Administrative Committee be developed in its place. We will also discuss the structuring of the Workload Committee and its possible dissolution.

University Faculty Council and the Trustees have approved the guidelines for proposing new Graduate Study programs. The Guidelines can be found on the University Faculty Council's website under approved policies or circulars.

III. Curriculum Committee

Greg Weber presented one informational item. One course is being brought forward from the Master Course List: NEWM N100 *Introduction to Digital Media Principles* (Cir E29-06). It was noted with Peoplesoft the course number should read NEWM-N 100.

IV. Standing Committees

A. General Studies

TJ Rivard presented the proposed revisions to the General Studies Committee Bylaws. The rationale for the proposal to shift the committee from Senate to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is highlighted in Circular E30-06 on page 2.

The Faculty Senate President requested the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Larry Richards speak to the Administration's position on the proposal. The VCAA spoke in support of the AVCAA as the Administrative overseer of the program with the Committee functioning as General Studies Divisional Faculty.

Clarification was requested for the functionality of the administrative committee; the function of the director of General Studies being similar to that of a Division Chair; the status of the past proposals to involve the Chairs of the three Arts and Sciences Divisions; the intent for the three Arts and Sciences Divisions be represented on the new committee; whether being part of the General Studies Division will have any recognition; faculty responsibility for the program; and the need to work closely with Advisors for better placement.

This proposal will be voted on at the April Faculty Senate meeting.

B. Workload Committee

The Workload Committee would like to discuss the structure of the Committee to allow for a proposal accordingly. Some ideas are: should the Committee be dissolved entirely? Should it be re-described as a legislative committee rather than a recommending committee? Should the duties be moved over to Faculty Affairs or to the Divisions?

Marsha Heffron-Williamson indicated the Committee feels the committee doesn't have any decision making power; it only makes recommendations to the VCAA on reassigned time. Any other issues could be handled by the Faculty Affairs Committee and workload seems to be division specific.

Mort Seddighin spoke of Committee charges from when he Chaired the committee. He indicated transparency is needed regardless of whether the committee remains in existence.

Cathy Ludlum Foos read the specific committee charges are noted in the bylaws.

Markus Pomper noted the Committee seems to only focus on reassigned time. There are other aspects of the Committee: troubleshooting ways to handle various workload issues including greater uniformity in how issues are handled. If the Workload Committee responsibilities are shifted to Faculty Affairs then FAC will need a subcommittee to help out for the next few years.

Cathy Ludlum Foos summarized the items now before us:

- 1) If we eliminate the Committee how do we take care of the items the Committee used to do?
- 2) We can redefine the Committee
- 3) Re-look at the current charges of the Committee and enforce them being carried out.

Peggy Branstrator asked whether all the charges have ever been done by the committee. No one indicated it has.

Mary Fell noted that for some reason the Committee has never fulfilled its charges; the focus has been on reassigned time. We need to define workload and work out the charges of the Committee.

Joanne Passet noted the Committee seems to be stunted by dealing with faculty issues it doesn't have the authority to address. Are the issues ones that the VCAA needs to address or does the Senate need to address them? Inequality between and within Divisions needs to be addressed.

Denise Bullock noted the need for internal research on what our workload consists of including differences among Divisions, pre-tenure, post-tenure, and issues with research expectations.

TJ Rivard indicated that if there has been a change in the expectations for research Division Chairs need to be notified.

Walter Wagar reminded the Faculty of the time when Chancellor Nelms created a task force to address workload issues resulting in some interesting recommendations. There were issues deemed urgent at the Committee's conception that still have not been addressed for various reasons including the turn over in personnel, the lack of deadlines, Committee systems themselves.

Maybe rather than a Committee we could have a task force that's given a specific due date. Is producing institutional research data really the role of a Senate committee? There are also Committee representation issues.

Joanne Passet mentioned that workload is more than just teaching.

Jerome Mahaffey noted that arguments typically come back to not continuing the committee. One reason is the feeling of inadequacy when evaluating colleagues outside ones area of expertise. The VCAA and the Chairs do not have to take the recommendations of the committee. The committee's conclusions is that the work they're not qualified to do doesn't really matter. There are other issues that may be better served through a task force. The committee is not currently doing what needs to be done.

David Frantz indicated the task force appears to make sense. It might be time to migrate to another model. Maybe a task force from the Faculty Affairs Committee makes the most sense. Laverne Nishihara stated the workload committee has been charged with many things over the years. Members have worked very hard and produced surveys and lists of ideas to be considered but positive outcomes have not come forth (aside from reassigned time applications). The most productive things with regard to workload seem to come out of individual divisions. She does not favor a task force if the outcome is going to be a report or recommendation. Workload issues are probably best dealt with within divisions since there is so much defensiveness when divisions are compared. She favors dissolving the committee.

TJ Rivard indicated we've never had a discussion about what is the appropriate amount of work? The other end of this is that some people are doing too much. We're always looking for permission to do a little bit less but never permission to do more. Why not get approval from the Workload Committee to do join another committee? Productivity is never considered.

Mary Mahank indicated productivity is the operative word. It would be nice to have some type of frame work for what the appropriate workload in terms of divisions. Administration tends to look at workload based on output; faculty look at it in terms of courses, students, advisees, committees, etc. Administration and Faculty should work to define it.

Mary Fell recalled years back when Workload Committee interviewed faculty members and the average was 60 hours a week. Can you really be good at what you do working that many hours? Cathy Foos spoke of the study she did last year. Many faculty members are on 8-10 committees. David Fulton spoke as faculty not as Chancellor. People look at Higher Education in view of productivity. Your professional life should be your concern or someone will decide it for you. The Workload Committee is a way for faculty to tell the Administration what work life should be like. Walter Wagor noted that we don't seem to know where to start. Maybe we should look at what other institutions do (ex: collective bargaining agreements).

Larry Richards said it's important to look at what others do but be warned against union contracts. Wendy Chang recommended we figure out what outputs we want to generate. Cathy Foos indicated the current Board of Trustees may be inclined to look at outputs.

V. Chancellor's Report

The President will be here Friday, March 31st to speak with faculty between 3 and 5pm. It's important for you to be here.

Two degree programs were approved by the Academic Leadership Council: Masters of Science in Education and the Biotechnology Degree. The President has agreed to put both on the Agenda for the Trustees. He has said he is willing to support the Masters Programs. He is concerned with the financial implications. We need to demonstrate our ability to put the Programs through without sacrificing the Bachelor programs. Based on the current budget status this is a concern.

We will have an open session on the budget.

VI. Academic Affairs Report

The Carnegie classifications are out and are different than in the past. They are classifying institutions by a number of characteristics. We're still a 4-year public. Larry Richards looked to see if there are any other institutions with our same 5 characteristics. There are none. We are unique. The differences between us and certain institutions that seem to be doing very well. 1) they are larger 2) they're more selective (not offering remedial courses) 3) they all have graduate courses.

VII. New Business

None.

Meeting adjourned 12:08pm.