

## Indiana University Kokomo Faculty Senate Minutes

Sept. 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012 2:30-3:30 KC 130 Meeting

*Attended by:* Aamidor, Alnusair, Armstrong, Becker, Bever, Boschmann, Bourke, Bradley, Calhoon, Cameron, Casey, Chauret, Cheng, Cook, Covington, Cox, Darr, Davis, Deerly, Douglas, Downey, Ficht, Finkler, Gillette, Gottemoller, Grabner-Hagen, Greenwood, Greskamp, Hampshire, Harris, Harris, Heath, Heckman, Holcomb, Hughey, Ison, Jeong, Jones, Kaiser, Kingsley, Keener, Krause, Lindsey, McGovern, Meybodi, Mishler, Motl, Narwold, Nur, Ogawa, Paese, Parkison, Pico, Preece, Provost, Rifai, Rink, Roden, Rosales, Ross, Saam, Sciame-Giesecke, Sebastian, Smith, Steel, Sullivan, Tormoehlen, Tulley, VanAlstine, Wallace, Weller, Whang, White, Whitmore. *Guests:* Dodd, Thomas, Barnes, Stroman, Ross

**Topic:** Approval of April 2012 Minutes

**Discussion:** None

**Action:** Approved

**Topic:** Approval of Nominating Committee (Darr)

**Discussion:** Moved from Agenda Item 5 to 2.

Committee Members:

*David Rink, Tara Kingsley, Heidi Sebastian, Cindy Ison, and T.J. Sullivan.*

No further discussion.

**Action:** Nominating Committee Approved

**Topic:** Voting for Affirmative Action Liaison Position and Faculty Board of Review

**Discussion:** No nominations from the floor for either. Bridget Whitmore moved from Tenured Nominees to Non-Tenured Nominees on Faculty Board of Review and agrees to run under this designation.

**Action:** The Affirmative Action Liaison required a run-off. *J.R. Pico* elected to this position.

Elected Faculty Board of Review Members:

*Shirley Aamidor, Dianne Roden, Eva White, Bridget Whitmore, and Sarah Heath*

**Topic:** President's Remarks

**Discussion:**

- Christian Chauret introduces visiting scholar
- Introduced the working principles of this year's senate and previewed agenda items for the upcoming year, including general education exception policy, online courses, third year review policy, updating/revising Board of Review, research and teaching awards, greater involvement in budget process, consolidation of committees, graduation with distinction, summer teaching, graduate programs and plagiarism, and advising.
- Highlight Principles: Quality, Integrity, and Respect
- The job of the senate being to identify problems/issues and propose solutions.
- Use of Oncourse for senate informational items

**Action:** None

**Topic:** Chancellor Harris's Remarks

**Discussion:**

- Enrollment—goal of 4100 by next year

- Online courses
- Building of patio
- Inspire Campaign
- Wants to work on faculty senate agenda
- Cross country

**Action:** None

**Topic:** Executive Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs Sue Sciame-Giesecke's Remarks

**Discussion:** The EVCAA discussed several issues including:

- Portable computer labs
- Renovation of nursing advising center
- Pushing for math lab renovations
- New faculty positions
- Faculty mentoring—goal of every junior have a one hour session with faculty member. Details to be worked out.

**Action:** None

**Topic:** Discussion of Role of Faculty in 4 Year Completion Initiative and Sample Degree Plans (Darr)

**Discussion:**

- Thank you for effort
- What we mean by accurate and what we want
- Faculty wants degree plan for every degree and every concentration (Example, both BA and BS)
- Some worried about confusing students
- Cards have to be limited: 300 on table.
- Original purpose of cards and plans discussed
- Cathy Barnes discussed the AAR, how it drives students to advisors, and future plans.
- Bigger advisor warnings needed
- Other institutions' success with plans

**Action:** Faculty agreed that they wanted to see four major changes to the sample plans: (a) Every degree will be represented. (b) Every concentration within those degrees will be represented. (c) The "see an advisor" warning label will be more prominent, and (d) each degree will be properly labeled. Executive Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs Sue Sciame-Giesecke agrees corrections to plans can be sent to her or president Chris Darr and that these corrections will be in place by the beginning of Spring 2013, when the cards will be used again.

**Topic:** Discussion of Student Evaluations (Gregory Steel)

**Discussion:**

- Effectiveness and how used for P&T
- Should there be a common template?
- How they are used in Annual Review? By the Chair? Too subjective?
- One size does not fit all—online versus in person.
- Possible set of core questions with customized tools (some do this already).
- No policy in place for core questions.

- Problems with online evaluations—student responses low. Bloomington withholds grades until completed.
- Study of those who do not fill out evaluations
- Too much emphasis. Peer reviews, evaluating course materials, online teaching. Broader evaluations needed.
- What is good teaching? How do evaluations fit into this definition?

**Action:** Faculty Affairs plans to work on student evaluations. Some changes possibly made by school and/or department.