

Indiana University Kokomo Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, September 12th, 2016 at 2:30pm in KC130B

Attended by: Aamidor, Alnusair, Alshuwayer, Bever, Blackwell, Boruff-Jones, Bradley, Brown, Canada, Carrigan, Casey, Chauret C., Clark, Connolly, Cook, Cox, Darr, Dodd, Douglas, Downey, Finkler, Fisher, Gottemoller, Grice, Hampshire, Hancock, Hansen, Heckman, Holcomb, Horn, Hughey, Hur, Jones Scott, Kaiser, Keener, Kim, Knudson-Stanley, Krabbenhoft, Leffler, Lukes, Madsen, Masuda, McFarland, McGovern, Medley-Rath, Meybodi, Mihai, Morgan, Poe-Greskamp, Preece, Rassel, Rifai, Rink, Roden, Rosales, Saam, Sebastian, Snoddy, Steel, Sullivan, Thorpe, Tormoehlen, Townsend, Tupa, VanAlstine, Wallace, Whang, White, Whitmore. Note: *Quorum was met*

1-Topic: Approval of April 2016 minutes (Steel)

Discussion: None.

Action: approved

1a- Supplemental: seeking shelter (Canada)

in the event of an emergency (such as tornados) – we must follow the safety wardens instructions.

Action: none

2-Topic: Remarks by the president of Faculty Senate (Steel)

Discussion: Gregory Steel started his remarks by stating that he was looking for faculty to set agenda. He also discussed the “community of scholars” topic, and was addressing the quest to try and get a stronger sense of community on campus and for the faculty senate to work on that topic for the year. He invited faculty to join him into getting into community creation. A brief discussion ensued where it was stated that a sense of community was very important. Ligaya McGovern commented that there is need to define what scholarship means and the importance on defining that as well as promoting social justice.

Action: none

3-Topic: Election for Vice-President

Discussion: TJ Sullivan had been nominated previously as the Vice-President, he accepted the nomination during the meeting, there were no nominations from floor. There was no need for an election process, faculty were asked to vote by agreeing or disagreeing with the nomination.

Action: T.J. Sullivan was voted in as the Vice-President for the Faculty senate

4-Topic: Degree approval (Cox)

Discussion: Steve Cox presented the new degree proposal in Computer science. He also mentioned that this degree would be able to use a computer science lab in Hunt Hall that was not at its full capacity, and therefore will not ‘spike’ the shortage. Cox stated that slight changes were made to the proposal since it was sent out to faculty (changes: Section 4.a.i.: number of programs listed were expended, Section 4.c- willingness to participate was added). A few questions came up from faculty, such as if laptops will be required or not, and it was pointed out that the School of Nursing already required the presence of laptops. Christian Chauret answered that laptops will become a requirement as this program moves forward. Another question was if this new degree would compete with the already existing New Media program, it was however pointed out that these are completely different programs and no competition would occur.

Action: vote: approved, proposal passes

5-Topic: Assessment report for last year (Downey & Saam)

Discussion: Christina Downey and Julie Saam discussed the assessment reports that came in last year through the qualtrix survey for reporting. Not every area reported, out of 22 expected programs they received data from 9.

Assessment is not happening as expected. It is either not being reported or coming in, and they asked faculty to please report if there are any issues with the reporting system.

No comments (besides “thank you”) from faculty.

Action:none

5a- Added item: Policies regarding academic appointee ownership (Jones)

Scott Jones commented on the document that was shared with faculty, that it was shared with faculty to make sure there are proper safe guards to not use students for free labor.

Action: none

6-Topic: Discussion for representative senate (Steel)

Discussion: Gregory Steel opened the discussion on this topic that had already been started last year. It was pointed out that at some point it will have to happen since the faculty is growing. Especially since last year we did not meet quorum in two meetings. Several additional comments from faculty:

- important to define the duties of the representative (they will represent the departments, not themselves) which can be negotiated with their departments to represent the majority.

- Committees are supposed to work represent their departments/units, but there can be potential issues when the representative does not communicate with their department before making decisions that affect the department

- checks should be put in place so that someone does not misrepresent the department.

Chris Darr commented that faculty affairs worked a little bit on this issue and found that people have different details, so he made the friendly suggestion, that TJ Sullivan as the new chair of the faculty affairs committee, could start to work on a preliminary proposal to get something in writing so everyone with details to be able to see where they want to go with this.

- could be in competition with the idea of sense of community

- senate is great, in reality it doesn't always work

- need more than one representative

- Gregory Steel commented that one representative per each 5 faculty was mentioned in previous discussions.

- everybody should be invited, but when there is no quorum then we can still get things done.

- suggestion: for a significant issues all can vote

- all of IU campuses have representatives except for IUK

Action: moved over to faculty affairs to work on it

7-Topic: Workplace survey results (Steel)

Discussion: Gregory Steel discussed the results for this survey, in which about half of the faculty participated. He commented that a large portion of people did not feel like they are decision makers (50%) and that most (59%) also felt like they were not fairly compensated for their work. Also, 42% of faculty taking the survey did not feel like the institution belonged to them, although most very positive about their relationship with colleagues (87%). Steel also commented on the fairly large amount of people answering who were currently seeking (20%) or will be seeking employment elsewhere (28%), with 21% of respondents looking forward to leaving IU Kokomo.

These results sparked a discussion on what it means to be part of the Kokomo experience, and what the Kokomo experience is or is grounded on.

Christina Downey commented cautioned to try to make changes based on the people who are not satisfied with the institution or their situation at the institution, before finding out how these changes would affect people who are satisfied or happy with the situation.

Other comments included suggestions to gather more comprehensive data (such as what the dissatisfaction is based on, seems like mostly money maybe) and to correlate this data with the activities or participation within the campus community.

Action: none