

## Indiana University Kokomo Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, April 18th, 2016 at 2:30pm in Kresge Auditorium

*Attended by:* Aamidor, Batis, Bever, Blackwell, Blumenthal, Bourke, Bradley, Clark, Cook, Coppola, Costello-Harris, Cox, Darr, Davis, P., Davis, R., Deerly, Doss, Douglas, Downey, Finkler, He, Heath, Heckman, Henry-Hollingsworth, Holcomb, Kaiser, Keener, Koerner, Krause, Lukes, Madsen, Mason, McGovern, McLean, Medley-Rath, Meybodi, Mishler, Morgan, Narwold, Nur, Rink, Roden, Rosales, Sciame-Giesecke, Sebastian, Smith, Sposato, Steel, Sullivan, Pico, Pratt, Preece, Weller, Whitmore, & Zody.

*Guest(s):* None.

**Topic:** Approval of March 2016 minutes (Steel)

**Discussion:** None.

**Action:** Approved.

**Topic:** Board of Review Grievance Process and Constitutional Amendment discussion (Darr)

**Discussion:** Chris Darr began with an overview of the proposed changes to the BoR Grievance Process: all changes highlighted in the document in yellow. Most significant are the changes to the proposed timeline: the Petitioner's Chair will now have 15 business days rather than only 10 to respond to a grievance or claim. Wayne Madsen asked what sort of mechanism might be in place for a Chair who did not handle a complaint or grievance in the allotted time. Several past members of the BoR pointed out that they had never encountered such an issue in their time on the BoR. A resource person or faculty resource person can be selected by the Petitioner: Chris went over the various restrictions and limitations placed on the role of faculty resource person, who can serve in this role, etc. Chancellor Sciame-Giesecke pointed out to the Faculty Senate membership that there is a separate process for appeals that go off-campus to the President and Board of Trustees.

In other words, President McRobbie has released a statement that the President and the BoT don't actually hear the cases, but they do appoint a body that serves that role. The Chancellor also pointed out that the President and the BoT have clarified their role with respect to the Board of Review and its jurisdiction. Steve Cox then pointed out that the Board of Review could have an opinion about a grievance, but that the BoR does not have final authority or jurisdiction over a particular case involving administrators. Linda Ficht clarified that there is a functional distinction between so-called junior administrators (chairs, coordinators, program directors, etc.) and administrators (deans, provosts, chancellors, assistant deans, etc.); she also exhorted faculty to take advantage of their rights and not merely assume that they don't have the ability to file a grievance. Mary Bourke then pointed out that if there ever was a situation in which a dean, for instance, was removed, then that would constitute a failure of leadership. Someone called to question and the vote carried.

**Action:** Changes approved.

**Topic:** Bylaws amendment changes (Darr)

**Discussion:** Chris Darr continued to outline and clarify changes to the BoR discussion. Ria Lukes pointed out that at times selecting a chair for BoR is problematic because few people want

to take on this complicated task. Erik Deerly suggested adding an amendment that we add a clause that the President of the Faculty Senate would appoint the chair of the BoR. The appointed chair could decline.

**Action:** Approved.

**Topic:** Election of Board of Review, Affirmative Action, and Vice President (Sebastian)

**Discussion:** None.

**Action:** Roden, White, Bradley, Batis, Thorpe, Tormoehlen (alternate).

**Topic:** EPC, Part 1: Probation & Dismissal, PHIL-P 105, admin changes to GenEd (Cox)

**Discussion:** None.

**Action:** Approved.

**Topic:** Amendment of the Due Process Procedure (Darr)

**Discussion:** Todd Bradley raised a question concerning the meaning of the term “reasonable” in the context of the document’s mention of “reasonable time” to respond to a grievance or complain. The matter was discussed.

**Action:** Approved.

**Topic:** EPC, Part 2: IU Kokomo Experience (Cox)

**Discussion:** Steve Cox gave a careful overview of the proposal. Diane Bever asked what the acronym DQP meant in this context. Shirley Aamidor and Christina Downey answered the question. Dianne Roden expressed her appreciation for making a proposal that would be flexible across various disciplines and academic areas. Ligaya McGovern made an impassioned plea for listening to students and letting their interests guide the Kokomo Experience. Sarah Heath noted that there has been a discussion about “stacking” service opportunities—we need to remember to streamline and even eliminate programs whenever possible so that we aren’t duplicating our efforts. Ligaya also asked a question about available funding and opportunities for faculty. Ria Lukes pointed out that the acronym IUKE might be a tad confusing for some people.

**Action:** Approved.

**Topic:** MA in Mental Health Counseling (Preece)

**Discussion:** Christina pointed out that she had received some requests for minor editorial changes to the document. Diane Bever asked about whether anyone had checked to make sure that other campuses have the available resources to meet the requirements of the program.

**Action:** Approved.

**Topic:** Research Affairs Committee report (Batis)

**Discussion:** Jeff Batis presented an overview of the committee’s proposed changes to the Undergraduate Research Program (URP). Wayne Madsen asked a question regarding how often a student could receive an award and Michael Finkler asked about how the funding would be allocated in various contexts. Donna McLean asked whether creative works would be covered under the URP.

**Action:** Approved.