

**Indiana University East  
Faculty Senate 2009/2010  
April 27, 2010  
11:00 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.  
Whitewater Hall 132**

**Presiding:** Laverne Nishihara, Faculty Senate President

*Present:* Baker, D; Baldwin, L; Battraw, J; Baumann, P; Blakefield, M; Bow, C; Breymier, T; Bullock, D; Cheung, O; Clapp-Itnyre, A; Clark, K; Cooksey, A; Curry, M; Dempsey, K; DeSantis, K; Dulemba, L; Felton, K; Folkerth, M; Frantz, D; Harper, J; Heffron Williamson, M; Henderson, T; Humphries, P; Jance, M; Kriese, P; Kunshek, R; Lafuze, J; Ludlum Foos, C; Lundy, D; Ma, H; Mahaffey, J; McFadden, B; McFadden, S; McKinley, E; Morgan, A; Morse, M; Nishihara, L; Olson, D; Passet, J; Paydar, N; Peacock, F; Pomper, M; Ramsey, R; Rankin, S; Richards, L; Rivard, T; Roswell, R; Rybas, N; Sabine, N; Samborsky, E; Scales, T; Scane, M; Seddighin, M; Shapiro, S; Simon, J; Slattery, E; Stager, J; Stanforth, D; Stolle, C; Thomas Evans, M; Thornburg, E; Tolley, R; Watkins, M; Weber, G

*Absent:* Armstead, S; Barbre, J; Beach, D; Bingaman, R; Branstrator, P; Braxton-Brown, G; Buckner, B; Doerger, D; Fell, M; Fitzgerald, E; Gabston, M; Greer, K; Helton, E (*on leave*); Huffman, E; Jayasuriya, K; Kathuria, H; Knuths, J; Maurer, J; Mohamed, W; Scott, W; Whitt, P; Wilde, J; Wilson, E; Yates, F

*Guests:* Hicks, D, *Registrar*; Itnyre, R, *Visiting Faculty*; Libert, J, *Visiting Faculty*; Knight, M, *Student Gov't Rep*

*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. Approval of Minutes-** The minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting on April 6, 2010 were approved as presented.

**II. Standing Committees**

**A. Nominating Committee – LaDonna Hatley Dulemba**

The Committee officially presented faculty members with results from the April 6 elections. Results from these elections were previously released to Senate members via listserv and can be found in Circular E47-10 included on page 7 of the Senate packet.

**B. Faculty Affairs Committee -- Markus Pomper**

The Committee reported on the Executive Review of promotion and tenure cases. Executive Review refers to a change that President McRobbie proposes to the way in which a dossier is reviewed. In past processes, candidates at Indiana University East were reviewed by the Vice Chancellor and then by the Chancellor. The Chancellor would then write a letter to the candidate formally stating if he supports the candidate. The dossier was then forwarded to the President who would then make the final decision. In December of 2008, the President decided he wanted to do away with the Chancellor's review. Instead he wanted to collaborate with the Chancellor and the Vice President in a three-way conference where the final decision would be made. This in turn would eliminate one of the steps in Indiana University East's tenure and promotion process.

Last May the UFC voted that for this academic year the existing Executive Review process would be utilized and at the end of this academic year, individual campuses would review this process.

FAC has looked at this and does not feel like it is a good idea to institute this Executive Review as presented by the President because it eliminates one level in the process. For example, in situations where a person goes up for promotion and tenure early, it removes one level in which something might go wrong.

FAC feels that setting the procedures for promotion and tenure is a faculty matter and can't be instituted unilaterally by the President.

**Discussion:** Members formerly involved in the UFC Agenda Committee added that multiple faculty members were opposed to this review process and gave lots of reasons. It was clearly unilateral and against the better judgment of many faculty members.

The description of the process is not exact. The Chancellor does review dossiers and does make a recommendation and does write to the faculty. The President has the right to talk with the Chancellor about his opinion as does the Chancellor if they have questions or disagree on one case or another. Already, the faculty members who have gone through the process should have already received a letter from the Chancellor on his recommendation.

Faculty members suggested that the President's memo specifically contradicts the previous statement, specifying that the Chancellor will not write such a letter until the President, Vice President, and the Chancellor have met and come to a decision. Faculty members admire and appreciate the Chancellor for following their procedure. However, they do not think this was the intention of the President when he sent his memo.

It was noted that the President would be addressing this issue further at the UFC meeting later in the day. For the record, the Chancellor would like to make sure his actions are reflected.

Senate members inquired on the rationale behind this change in review. The rationale that was given and repeated multiple times is this: the President takes promotion and tenure very seriously and he believes this is the basis of the review change. It was also implied that the emphasis behind this change was that the executive level review be identified, presenting a more unified front. For instance, if there was a difficult case where some reviews were positive and some were negative, the President did not want to have a situation where the Chancellor would give one recommendation and the President give another. The President wants them to reach an agreement together without the faculty members knowing that they were at a disagreement before an agreement was achieved.

Faculty wonders if this is in fact a voting item. At the time, this was included in a report and was not a voting item on the agenda. Faculty also wonders if this will actually be a voting item for UFC in the future. UFC argued that this should be a voting item but this got instituted without a formal vote. Today, President McRobbie is going to address and speak about the practice of Executive Review and it is unknown what he is planning to say. Additional comments should be posted on the listserv.

**C. Curriculum Committee – Bob Ramsey**

1. Master of Science in Nursing

This is an exciting time at Indiana University East as we continue to move toward fulfilling our mission to provide selected advanced degree programs. We already have a Master of Science in Education, Master of Social Work, last week we approved a Master of Science in Management, and today we are considering a Master of Science in Nursing. The specifics of this are included on pages 11-15 of the Senate packet. This has been brought forth because

there is a critical need in this area for nursing students with graduate degrees to work in administration and education. The components would include a minimum of 39 credit hours and bridge courses broken into three parts: administrative track, education track, and there is a culminating experience.

IUE would be the only regional campus aside from IUPUI to offer this MS in Nursing. Currently, students must drive 60 miles each way to gain this experience. Now, we could offer this program on campus and we are well suited due to our affiliation with Reid Hospital, Ivy Tech, and our social service agencies around the area. This is a good program for this area and it should pay for itself with the potential students. It has been reviewed by the Curriculum Committee and brought to the Senate in Circular E49-10 moved and seconded by the Curriculum Committee.

**Discussion:** Senate wonders if the Master's in Nursing follows the IUPUI master's degree. The answer was that IU East Nursing School is no longer a system school and has been individuated. Because of this, the curriculum is very similar to IUPUI but there are a few differences. For example, there are three classes that will be developed that go along with the American Association of Colleges of Nursing which are not in IUPUI's curriculum. Apart from whatever discussion on the details of this proposal, faculty would like to speak in favor of the general idea of putting this forward. Consider the problem of attracting nurses to teach here because there is a nursing shortage. For IU East in particular, offering a master's degree with the focus that they have designed on leadership and education is an excellent idea and IU East should move forward with this. People may want to change certain details or specifics but the general idea is good.

Faculty inquired about the availability of PhD instructors. In all actuality IU East will have four people who will graduate in December, which will provide 6-7 PhDs available for the program. Some of these will also transfer over to tenure track.

There is concern about the \$85,000-100,000/year needed for each new instructor. However this includes benefits. Increase in expense is said to be partly due to a 42% benefits rate.

In both tracks there will be a culminating experience (practicum, project, service, or student teaching) which will not be a thesis but a service that may be connected with the student's practicum experience.

The Master of Science in Nursing was passed by unanimous vote and was approved.

2. Minor in Informatics (Cir. E50-10)

IU East is currently the only regional campus which does not offer this program and it is to be implemented at IU East beginning in the fall. Employers currently want more informatics and computer skills. In addition to these courses, this minor would require two lower division and three higher level courses.

The Minor in Informatics was moved and seconded by the Curriculum Committee.

**Discussion:** Is this modeled after other Informatics programs offered on other regional campuses? The Informatics Committee answers this stating that there is a wide range of possibilities, but there are certain course specifics.

Faculty notices that there are no course numbers or names included with the courses. Have they been assigned course numbers or are they new courses, and can students take whatever they want?

All listed classes would be acceptable and faculty will not see all fourteen classes until next week. Those limited classes are included within the specified ranges and they would all be acceptable.

The two 100-level courses listed would be the only required course specifics. All optional classes will still give an overview of Informatics outside of that discipline. Students will not be forced into certain programs and will be given leverage. People are not being forced to become programmers; instead, classes are included which focus on how to use Excel, programming, and web design.

Faculty recognizes that there are only 15 cr. hrs. required for this minor which contradicts the usual 18-19 credit hours with the exception of some such as criminal justice. Committee indicated that they based their decision on surveys conducted on other minors.

Senate comments on the language use in the assessment section, and what the inputs are going to be. Members would like to know how what is stated in the assessment matches the explanation, which seems to be vague.

Because of the nature of the minor, feedback would be coming from those students who go through it. Assessment is being worked on to tell if the students who graduate have the ability to understand and utilize technology in the workplace. It is admitted that the vagueness comes from lack of details that are yet to come.

The Curriculum Committee has looked at these courses and these courses have been released electronically.

Faculty notes that all three of the stated program outcomes are specifically stated so that no matter what classes the students take they will achieve each of those learning outcomes. There is confidence that these learning objects will exist in each of the proposed classes.

By unanimous vote, the motion to approve the Minor in Informatics carried.

### 3. Revision of Second Baccalaureate Policy

The wording of the existing policy does not reflect what the Curriculum Committee meant at that time.

The new policy would make it clear that students would have to complete the requirements of the two degrees unless they are returning and not continuing students. Faculty also do not want students to put off graduation in order to graduate with both degrees because funding depends on the graduation rate.

Revisions to the Second Baccalaureate Degrees Policy came moved and seconded from the curriculum committee and are located in Circular E51-10.

**Discussion** - This can be read to state that credit hours would be doubled if it is in the same Schools and does not include any electives.

Members feel there is confusion in the difference between second degree and double major.

It was explained that a second major is a case where the student is getting one degree in say, a bachelor of arts and they also want to get another degree from the same discipline. In this case, when all is said and done, the student will receive one degree with multiple majors. This is different from a student who gets a degree in Criminal Justice and a degree in Natural Science and Math. The distinction has always been within the Schools that have the ultimate

decision. It is believed that these issues are aimed at the bottom line instead of the integrity of the School.

There was a motion to add back the stricken sentence at the top of the page stating that students must also meet the requirements of their School.

There was an amendment to the first sentence indicating that students must also meet any other School requirements/second degree requirements of the School in which they are candidates.

Members inquired about whether or not every School would have to develop its own second degree, if it chose. This would be a favorable policy when dealing with the specifics of the humanities degree.

There was a motion to add a sentence reading: "Students applying for another degree must also meet any second degree requirements of the School in which they are candidates." The motion to add this sentence carried.

If a School is being funded by the number of degrees, should faculty encourage multiple degree programs? Members responded that they should not encourage multiple degrees.

A member questioned a phrase removed from the policy which indicates that someone could take these courses from some other campus and use these to get their degree from Indiana University East. Clarification is given by recognizing that students must complete 30 additional hours before earning a degree.

The motion to approve this policy carried.

4. Revision to the First Year Seminar Policy

One of the problems with this course is that it is similar to the honors program course. This revision would eliminate the possibility that the student would have to take both courses. Students would now be able to interchange honors seminar with first year seminar.

This revision came moved and seconded by the Curriculum Committee.

**Discussion-** It was suggested that perhaps we should insert the phrase "within the first semester." The response was that this is not necessary because this is already stated in item A of the policy, and it is not necessary to spell this out.

The revision to the First Year Seminar Policy in Circular E52-a-10 was approved and the motion carried.

5. New Course Requests

a. BUSE Course Requests

These courses can be found in Circulars E49-10 through E65-10. All of these came moved and seconded from the Curriculum Committee.

The motion to approve the new course requests carried.

b. EDU-X165 Course Request

This motion came moved and seconded by the Curriculum Committee.

**Discussion-** Senate members inquired as to whether or not this class had been taught before and in response it was made clear that nothing similar to this course had been taught before. Members also inquired as to who the target audience would be for this course. To answer this question, it was suggested that students who may have dropped a course and need an additional credit would find this course desirable. This course would also be offered to them as a second seven-week course. It was also asked whether or not the three credit textbook class would also still be offered. It was confirmed that this course would also still be offered.

The motion to approve this course carried.

c. HIST Course Requests

The courses were addressed as a bundle instead of singly.

The courses HIST-B306, HIST-B408/508, and HIST- B444/544 came moved and seconded from the Curriculum Committee.

**Discussion-** Corrections have been made to pages of the Senate packet where course learning objectives have been incorrectly numbered due to conversion of documentation.

The motion for all three history courses carried.

d. REL-R180 Course Change Request (Cir. E70-10)

Changing REL-R180 to REL-A250 has been done to match the courses being used at Indiana University Bloomington.

**Discussion-** Senate inquired about whether the number change would indicate a change in difficulty. It was explained that the change from a 100 level to 200 level does not denote differences in difficulty level. The course will not be taught differently to reflect the number change.

The motion for the course change request carried.

**6. Information Items**

These information items were previously distributed via the Senate listserv. No discussion was requested:

Online Degree Completion Track for existing BS in Criminal Justice (Cir. E39-10)

Offering existing BS in Criminal Justice at New Castle (Cir. E40-10)

MCI Course Activations:

EDUC-H538 Critical Thinking and Education (Cir. E41-a-10, Cir. E41-b-10)

EDUC-S591 Research Project in Secondary Education (Cir. E42-a-10, Cir. E42-b-10)

EDUC-Y510 Action Research (Cir. E43-a-10, Cir. E43-b-10)

ENG-L360 American Prose (Excluding Fiction) (Cir. E44-a-10, Cir. E44-b-10)

Change in HSS Minimum Overall GPA for BS degrees (Cir. E45-10)

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

