PURDUE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
Faculty Senate Minutes
September 9, 2008

Representatives in Attendance: Doug Acheson, Karen Alfrey, Sohel Anwar, Mark Bannatyne, Ed Berbari, Jie Chen, Barb Christe, Elaine Cooney, Jan Cowen, Mohamed El-Sharkawy, Charles Feldhaus, Becky Fitterling, Tom Ho, Stephen Hundley, Connie Justice, John Lee (alternate), Razi Nalim, Peter Orono, Ken Rennels, John Schild, Erdogan Sener, Jan Stevens, Bill White

Guests: Hasan Akay, Marj Rush Hovde, Dean Yurtseven

 Meeting began at 11:05 a.m.

Mohamed asked everyone to look at the agenda for the meeting, the agenda was approved.

Mohamed asked everyone to look at the minutes from the May 2008 meeting. Copies of the minutes are not distributed at the meeting, but can be found at G\COMMON\Senate documents in addition to being distributed to all faculty via the E&T Faculty email at least one week prior to each Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made to accept the May 2008 minutes; all approved.

After committee reports Joe Abella will give a report on the Engineering Professional Practice Plan.

Administrative Report

Academic Programs:

Dr. Yurtseven mentioned there were no MAT representatives; Mohamed will check on. Sheila will also make sure they are aware of all future meetings.

Dr. Yurteven advised our school was up by 4% on student credit hours; student headcount increased by 3.4% for fall 2008 semester. These numbers include MAT, and this is good news financially.

IUPUI headcount exceeded 30,000 for the first time; 72% of IUPUI undergraduate students are full time; highest minority student enrollment to date (4,541); our school has the largest number of international non-resident students (297); and our school has the second largest non-resident headcount growth (102).

Music Technology-BS degree program will be on the agenda at the Indiana Commission of Higher Education on Friday, September 12, 2008 at West Lafayette. The degree will be effective January 2009; the school believes the degree will be approved.

Faculty News:

Yaobin Chen (ECE) received a new research grant of $8,095 from Computelligence for his proposal.

Charles Feldhaus (CILT) received a non-competing grant of $25,000 from Indiana Association of Vocational Education for his proposal.

Patrick Gee (New Student Academic Advising Center) received a new service grant of $17,050 from INDOT for his proposal.

Ping Zhang (BME) received a new research grant of $75,500 from NIH for his proposal.
Charles Turner (BME) received a non-competing continuing research grant of $305,430 from NIH for his proposal.

Huanmei Wu (CILT/Informatics) received a new research grant of $54,932 from NIH for her proposal.

Yingzi Du (ECE) received a supplement research grant of $7,460 from Purdue University for her proposal.

Stephen Hundley (CILT) published the book, "Employee Engagement Fundamentals: A Guide for Managers and Supervisors." This book is a follow-up and companion to last year's "Workforce Engagement: Strategies to Attract, Motivate, and Retain Talent." Both books are published by World-at-Work Press.

Joy Starks (CILT) published two books within the last year; "Publisher 2007 Complete Concepts and Techniques" and "Photoshop CS3 Complete Concepts and Techniques." Both are part of the Shelly Cashman Series.

Yingzi Du (ECE) and Emrah Aslanturk (ECE) submitted an Invention Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Transfer.

Yingzi Du (ECE) and Zhi Zhou (ECE) submitted an Invention Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Transfer.

Hiroki Yokota (BME) and Ping Zhang (BME) submitted an Invention Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Transfer.

Staff News:

Kyle Cline, recently hired, is the new Program Manager for the Lugar Center for Renewable Energy; funding comes through a Lugar Center grant.

The job assignments of Heather Chalkley and Anne Shepherd were recently modified.

Haishan Wang will now be the full-time database/web manager for CNC.

Events:

Staff and Faculty convocation was held on August 18, 2008. Dr. Yurtseven asked for feedback on the morning program of I-STEM information and the afternoon program which focused on the merger of our school and the School of Music.

The Engineering and Technology Freshman Barbeque was held on Saturday, August 23, 2008 at the Campus Center fourth floor terrace, the event was successful. Over 100 students attended the event, along with faculty, staff and administrators.

Purdue House Barbeque was held on September 2, 2008 to meet the residents of the Purdue House.

Academic Support Services:

Hasan Akay reported on the following information. The Dean's office, New Student Academic Advising Center, Computer Network Center and the offices of the associate/assistant deans and directors are always available for academic support. The following information is for various other school support:

- Eugenia Fernandez is helping with Faculty Development Mentoring.

- Cori Renguette from TCM is helping with Grant Writing; she is currently working on an hourly basis and will also give workshops on grant writing.

- Center for Teaching and Learning – Barbara Christe is working out negotiations for us, looking for a source to help for online development and Oncourse questions; hope the person will have an office in the school.

- This will be the second year the school has been working with Melissa Todd for marketing and publicity to promote students, staff and faculty from our school; contact Terri's office if you have a story that needs publicized.

For further details of the Dean's Report see Attachment 1.

Administrative Report from Dean Akay

Hasan advised that the school has a Research Committee, which is not a Faculty Senate committee. This is an ad hoc committee which was formed last year based on a recommendation from the Faculty Senate. The committee is open to faculty who are interested in research. The committee will discuss the policies and services available related to research on our campus and school and advise the associate dean on research related activities in the school. It is also expected to contribute to research directions in the school. The first meeting of this year will be held this Friday, September 12, from 12:00-1:30 p.m. Invitations were sent to those who were interested last year. You may contact Anne Rabie if you wish to get your name on the distribution list. This will be a forum for ideas that should help junior faculty learn more about research opportunities in the school and campus. A series of workshops on grant or proposal writing has been scheduled; the first one will be on September 26. There will be 8 workshops during this semester. Dr. Yurtseven mentioned that Cori Renguette will be offering proposal writing help to faculty, she will also be organizing these workshops. Cori is an associate faculty in TCM and is working on her Ph.D. in linguistics at Ball State. Anytime you have a proposal that needs editing, you are welcome to use her services.

Hasan talked about the undergrad research opportunities. Our school has MURI, which is a good program for undergraduate research. MURI provides up to $10,000 worth of funds to faculty (per faculty) competitively; the proposal deadline for this year is Sept 10. Hasan encouraged faculty to get involved in the program. It is a good program to work with students, and is good for faculty research as well. Hasan noted that Huanmei Wu, who just received am NIH grant, as announced by the dean today, has been one of the recipients of MURI awards for the past 2-3 years; and has collected preliminary data for her proposals with MURI students. Yingzi Du, who has recently received another external grant, has also collected quite a bit of preliminary data through MURI. MURI encourages collaboration among faculty as well.

Eugenia Fernandez is the senior advisor to the Dean for Faculty Development. Eugenia will work with junior faculty or any faculty on teaching and teaching scholarly portfolios. Feel free to contact Eugenia or Hasan. She will work with mentors to junior faculty also.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Marj Hovde advised this committee developed the Faculty Mentoring Guidelines last year. These guidelines spell out the requirements that junior or new faculty should have a mentor assigned to him or her; Marj emphasized that department chairs should be the ones to begin the process for their junior faculty.

Budgetary Affairs Committee – No Report

Computing Resources Committee (CRC) – No Report

Connie Justice advised there is no report, and she just recently scheduled their meetings.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee – No Report

Graduate Education Committee – No Report

Grievance Board – No Report

Faculty Affairs Committee – No Report

Marj Rush Hovde advised there is no report, and the committee will meet soon.

Nominations Committee

Doug Acheson gave the following report (he was representing Rob Wolter). The following is pressing business for Faculty Senate:

1. After the election last spring for Chairs of different committees; one of the individuals elected to be Chair for a certain committee let Doug know they were not able to serve as Chair on this committee. Technically, Chairs of committees are elected in the Faculty Senate after having been nominated by the Nominations Committee; however, the Nominations Committee received only one nomination as a replacement for this vacated Chair position. Due to receiving only one nomination, Doug Acheson asked for Faculty Senate approval to allow the sole nominee (Darrell Nickolson of Design Technology) to serve as Chair on the Resource Policy Committee. This would require a motion to make Darrell Nickolson chair of this committee. **A motion was made to make Darrell Nickolson chair of the Resource Policy Committee; Faculty Senate approved this motion.**

2. Doug advised that Dave Williamson is taking a medical leave as of 9/15/08 and that he represented the "combined programs" of Freshman Engineering and Freshman Technology on many committees. All of the departmentally-appointed positions have been taken care of.. However, Dave Williamson was on the Student Affairs committee, which is a school wide elected committee. Doug is not sure how to handle this, but provided a suggestion. Doug recommended that perhaps we could have the new members of our school (MAT department) who have been plugged into the departmentally-appointed committees; Agenda committee recommends for the academic year only that we invited the MAT representatives as guests in the Student Affairs Committee, Budgetary Affairs and Faculty Affairs. Doug recommends that John Alvardo now a guest to serve on the committee, unless we need to have an election for this committee, since Student Affairs is a school wide elected position. Dave Williamson cannot serve on this so we have a vacancy.

Mark Bannatyne asked if Dave has resigned, he is only taking a medical leave but has advised he will not be on any committees at this time. Doug recommends a faculty member from MAT, but has checked with the Dean's office and they have updated the database that we draw names from, if we need to have an election. Charlie Feldhaus asked about MAT faculty representatives; they are not elected members because they were not a part of the election this past spring, but have been appointed to departmentally appointed committees to have representation. The Agenda committee recommended to invite them as guests, Doug would like to appoint the person on this committee to be a regular member, and not a guest.

3. Dave was also on the Grievance board, and there is no one in Freshman Engineering or Freshman Technology that is tenured, so no one is qualified to serve on this committee. Need a discussion on this committee; Doug is not aware of any stipulations regarding this issue in the Constitution and Bylaws. Barb Christe advised the Grievance committee has not had an issue for a long time…urgency may not be too critical. Perhaps leave the vacancy and then if there is a need could look for someone then. May need to amend the bylaws; Ken feels Grievance committee is a special situation, can only have tenured faculty on Grievance board…maybe just leave open since no one meets qualification. One other solution would be to have faculty in the "combined programs" elect a tenured faculty person from another department to represent them.

Constitution and Bylaws…John Schild advised on page 15, "standing committees" section E third paragraph. Vacancies on school wide elected committees or boards that arise prior to the next election cycle shall be filled by the nominee who received the next highest number of votes for the position occupied by the vacating member; should this nominee be unwilling or unable to serve this process will continue until the election list is exhausted, at which point the presiding officer will offer a nominee to the Faculty Senate, a simple majority vote will be required to confirm the selection of this new committee board member who will serve until the next election cycle. Doug advised he will look up who was next on the list to serve on the Student Affairs committee.

Faculty Senate decided to leave the vacancy on the Grievance Board at this time.

Doug will pass on to Rob, Chair of Nominations Committee, that Darrell Nickolson was approved to serve as Chair of the Resource Policy Committee.

Doug will ask the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to give consideration to the change of wording regarding when departments or programs do not have anyone qualified to serve on a committee.

Doug will look at the database from last spring elections to see who can fill the vacancy for Dave Williamson on the Student Affairs Committee.

Reminder to all – all of the committees are on the G drive, common, senate documents, committee assignments; if you have any issue within department look there to see who your representative is. It is critical to know who is on each committee to represent departments.

Resource Policy Committee – No Report

Student Affairs Committee - No Report

Undergraduate Education Committee

Karen Alfrey advised the committee met 1½ weeks ago; two items will be brought to the departments from your representatives over the next month:

1. Last spring discussed new cross listed courses, ECE 326/ME 326 – Engineering Project Management and ECE 327/ME 327 – Engineering Economics, and there was some concern that these courses may be duplicating courses already available in the school. The proposal that is currently on the table is that departments who want to use these courses as required courses should look to see if there is a least a 70% overlap with this course and another course offered elsewhere that these courses might be declared equivalent in which case ECE wants to require an economics course but if the E&T version of Engineering Economics is declared an equivalent course then ECE students would be allowed to take either the Economics version or the E&T version; if it is not a required course even if there is less than 70% overlap then if an elective can accept courses from other departments. ECE, ME, and OLS will be affected with possible overlap of courses. This item should be discussed with your faculty in the departments who are affected.

2. The World Languages Department forwarded a proposed plan of study for Spanish and Engineering dual degree program; there is already an ECE and German Studies dual degree program in existence. Ken Rennels asked about the proposal, is it for Spanish and ECE, Spanish and ME, and Spanish and BME.

IUPUI Faculty Council

Ed Berbari advised the IUPUI Faculty Council met on Tuesday, September 2, and are now meeting in the new Campus Center in room 409. The next meeting which will include the State of the Campus address is normally held at the University Place Hotel, Ballroom West.

Slate of nominees presented for the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, none of them are from our school this year.

Chancellor made his remarks, noted 30,000 student benchmark high for the campus; very large list of new administrators hired, likened to changing of guard; change of Vice Chancellors; passed out nice brochure at Faculty Council that Ed passed around to Faculty Senate.

IU system has over $400M in research, over $300M is on this campus.

Campus Housing had a 400 student waitlist for 1,100 beds; big concern as campus pushes forward for international students need to have housing, will be difficult to recruit without housing; huge push for new housing, 500 beds a year for the next 4 years, may make a difference in recruiting efforts. Campus is not sure where the new housing will be, not sure about land/suitability around the river.

Chancellor advised there will be Dean reviews for Library and Social Work that will take place.

Simon Atkinson from the Medical School is the new president of Faculty Council; reported on some trustee activity, first he pointed out there was no change in makeup of Board of Trustees.

The Intellectual Property Policy was adopted over the summer.

The Family Leave Policy was also adopted over the summer. There was an exception written into the Family Leave Policy for the Clinical faculty in the School of Medicine. This group is still covered under the old policy. Everyone will be covered after one year on this policy.

Campus is very concerned about rapid increase of health costs as a major issue.

Chancellor Bantz will have a five year review this year.

Establishment of a system wide Promotion and Tenure committee is being developed to look at the baseline procedures for P&T.

There will be a core school review this year, does not affect our school (Kelley is an example of a core school).

Razi Nalim asked what was different in the Intellectual Property information. The distribution is different – sliding scale of income for those of you who make a lot of income from intellectual property. This will be a fixed amount off of intellectual property, fixed amount is 35%; but an added 15% is now added for lab; if you wanted to go to another institution, you would get your 35% but not 15%. Discretionary income account; rest goes to Deans, President, others.

For details on the above information and all other IUPUI Faculty Council meeting notes, please look at their website: www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil.

IUPUI Graduate Affairs Committee

Hasan Akay advised that this campus committee consists of Stephen Hundley, MAT chair, David Peters and himself from the School of E&T as members; Hasan attended one meeting last week; one of the agenda items that relates to us is related to the ESL requirement for International students, testing and English requirements for graduate students; we are not alone in complaining that our students are asked to take too many English classes, sometimes 2 and 3, and high tuition for these. They showed our school as a good example that we do some of this teaching ourselves and they wanted to know how we do this, in this respect we are a good model; according to our agreement with the ESL program, if a student is required to take only one course, this can be replaced by TCM 460, Technical Communication course for graduate students.

This committee continues to review graduate course proposals and graduate program proposals. They also decide on the distribution of graduate scholarships; and block grants that are distributed to different schools.

Mohamed questioned the block grant use. Hasan advised the graduate committee requires that the block grant should be used only for stipend for new students, not tuition, this is the purpose of this grant; asking schools to come up with the tuition; scholarships are like this also. The tuition should be covered by faculty member who is working with this student. On the other hand, there is a supplement to the block grant provided by our school. This portion from school, roughly 50% of block grant, can be used for tuition. A stipend has tax requirements. If you give tuition waivers to RAs or TAs it is not taxable per Barb Christe.

Purdue Intercampus Faculty – No Report

Mark Bannatyne advised there is no report. The committee meets at West Lafayette; there are no meetings scheduled for this semester yet.

Purdue Technology Senate - No Report

Purdue Faculty Senate – No Report

Purdue Graduate Council – No Report

Assessment Committee

Elaine Cooney advised the Assessment Committee will meet for the first time the week of 9/15/08. Elaine wanted to call to Faculty Senate attention that this year the committee will be reflecting accreditation materials for the CGT and CIT programs. The committee may be going to faculty and colleagues from other departments to collect assessment information to support their documentation. Even if your department is not going up for accreditation in the near future it is still important to be collecting this information from students for other programs.

Old Business

Ken Rennels asked about the report from Budgetary Affairs from last spring; it is not on the G drive and he would like to see a copy.

Mohamed advised everyone Faculty Senate needs committee reports from last year.

New Business

Joe Abella, Director of Industry Relations, presented the Engineering Professional Practice Plan. Joe works on a ½ time basis and facilitates the DIAC and works with industry to promote research. Joe joined the school September 2007.

Many have heard about this initiative; the idea is to establish a not for profit corporation (501c3) and Joe will discuss why we may want to do this.

The primary purpose is to find a mechanism to increase compensation opportunities for faculty members.

Also to establish an entity that over time could be branded and would better promote research affiliated with the School of Engineering and Technology. It would address complaints about getting contracts through sponsored research in a timely manner. Joe believes this may be improving, and time will tell. The Plan would be a more flexible arrangement and hopefully more responsive to our industry partners.

It is also a way to improve the research opportunities and enhance our faculty competence and establish tighter relationships with industry partners. It would also provide more research opportunities for students.

As a not for profit, there are some limitations. The Plan only exists only for charitable or educational purposes, and cannot benefit an individual, or have anything to do with politics.

Tom Ho asked if it would be easier to help a not for profit organization rather than to help a for profit organization. Joe agreed that is a good question but is not sure why exactly it would be easier. There are IRS rules as interpreted by IU. The purpose is to work with industry, not for profits and for profits. The Plan can't have profit that will benefit any shareholder.

Why do we need such an item? Joe advised the Faculty Senate that we are not doing as much research activity as our peer organizations. Some of the schools Joe looked at include Cincinnati and the University of Illinois - Chicago which do more research than we do. Campus would like to improve these numbers. Salaries are below many comparable schools and below industry. The idea is to find a mechanism to increase compensation; and also address the **entrepreneurship** element within the faculty ranks.

The Plan would be a not for profit corporation. It would contract with industry to execute projects; focus is on industry. Many government organizations such as NIH and NSF will continue to and must contract directly with the university.

In terms of structure, the Dean will be the chairman; he will be granted some limited authority, at dollar thresholds to be established, to enter into contracts and obligate IUPUI and ultimately IU.. When looking at other plans, and Joe has talked to School of Medicine and the School of Dentistry, because IU still has an implied obligation that will be entered into by this plan, it works out well if the school fiscal officer, who is Sherri Alexander, is also the CFO of this corporation. She will have responsibility to make sure fiscally everything is correct.

There will be a board and five elected directors with staggered terms, who would have voting rights to amend the articles of incorporation. There would be an annual membership meeting. There is still some question what it should be called, plan or center. It could be called the Engineering Professional Practice Center and this is not written in stone at this time. The powers of the plan are to enter into contracts with industry and would take in funds to satisfy the commitments of the contracts and expend funds. It will not hold much in the way of assets. It will not borrow funds or invest funds.

The Dean is the director and chairman of the board. The other directors, who are members, will approve the budget and rates. The threshold of where these contracts will lie in terms of what the plan can really commit to is TBD. Obviously IUPUI and ultimately IU will need to weigh in on this.

There are many details to be worked out. There are reasons for what is written, but this is not cast in stone. Before incorporating, we   will need to figure out exactly how this will work. Membership will be composed of full time faculty members, recommended by the Dean and approved by the board.

Critical Issues

Exclusivity - All of members' industry research and consulting activity must be performed through the Plan (activity not flowing through the Plan gets no recognition for meeting faculty goals.)

It is like this in Medical School. The idea is to avoid a conflict of interest, such as doing certain profitable jobs on your own and high risk ones through the Plan. Elaine advised occasionally there are calls for proposals that a company will put out specifically to universities; specifically thinking of one that will donate equipment for educational purposes. If faculty can get an industry to donate equipment, but has to be donated to the university, what is the impact? In terms of strict donations, they would be donated to the university. Calls for proposals that have to be done by the university, such as this example, that activity will go directly through the university. Similarly to NSF or NIH, which typically require you to go through the university.

Stephen Hundley asked for a point of clarification. If he joined the Plan, would he be restricted to do anything on his own, or if he did something on his own, would it not count toward faculty goals? You are not restricting the individual from doing their own **entrepreneurial activity by virtue of membership, are you? Joe advised that** this is the intent. The idea is that an individual is either all in or all out and a question is what are the enforcement mechanisms? Framed in another way, Stephen asked what the incentive is for the individual faculty who can take advantage of the flexible faculty arrangement to use 20% of their time for outside endeavors? What is the benefit to the faculty member to run their consulting work through the university? Joe advised that the idea is that you will get more consulting work if you are in the plan than outside. Razi Nalim believes the difference is that you are using university resources and facilities.

Optional Membership – Tenured faculty would have the option to join or not to join. New faculty would not have a choice. Membership is a requirement for them.

Mohamed believes the issue would be: Is the university liable and accountable for providing research opportunities? New faculty applying for promotion and tenure, may take issue that the plan did not provide enough research opportunities.

If already a tenured faculty member versus a brand new faculty member, the Plan looks different to each. Plan states if you are a new faculty member, you must be in the plan. Promotion and Tenure committee may want to look at this according to Mohamed to see if we are taking on a responsibility to provide enough research opportunities to new faculty.

Marj: faculty – what is definition of faculty, all full time faculty members? There are also lecturers and clinical appointments. At this time, this includes all full time faculty members. Clinical appointment don't do research. This needs some clarification. Lecturers may do consulting. Barb Christe advised we attract some very good full time lecturers. There is one faculty in particular in her department who has a fabulous consulting business on the side who would never be willing to give up a percentage to the school; would not want to give any percentage to the school. Therefore may not teach here. Elaine also advised that lecturers are not evaluated on their creative activity or research.

Stephen mentioned he likes the concept of the plan, but believes there is nothing at present to restrict a faculty member from being entrepreneurial and taking advantage of the flexible employment arrangements as defined by the faculty handbook and the structure of faculty appointment and doing what they want to do. Stephen has had the privilege and ability to do this over the years. What is the value to the faculty member? In some ways knowing how the university operates, he is afraid something might get screwed up or would become too bureaucratic to run his consulting work through the university so that the university can get "credit" for it. Stephen appreciates using the resources of the university to make this happen; consultants build this in their scope of business and arrangements anyway. Stephen questioned the selling points and had the following questions:

- What is in it for the faculty?

- What value is created for the university, for the faculty and for the enterprise for whom the consulting is provided?

- What value is created that is not duplicated by an individual doing this on their own?

This is the value proposition that has to be answered with this structure. The value needs to be understood.

Mohamed questioned the insurance issue. Stephen believes consultants have professional liability insurance on their own. He noted he has this.

Mohamed believes it is for industry research and consulting. Elaine does not carry professional liability insurance at this time since she does everything through the university and they carry the insurance; this plan will cost her. Now she will have to pay money, and what is the value for her. Right now when she has to go through the hoops to get industrial research done through the university, she will have to do it through this plan. Still get funding through sponsored programs? There are questions/confusion on this. Did not consider option of going directly through the university, needs to be a certain level of business.

Tom Ho believes some faculty are looking through different lenses. Some are more like medical or dental faculty, who could not have a practice without the infrastructure of the clinics and laboratories. Others of you can probably have a viable consulting business without the infrastructure of the university because you don't need expensive equipment, for example, to do your research or consulting.

Marj Hovde would like to see a side by side comparison of the three options, going through Research and Sponsored programs, the proposed Plan or freelancing on your own. Need to see the pros and cons of each option. Looking for lower overhead and more opportunities. Razi Nalim advised the school might lose overhead. Sometimes a company will pay more to resolve legal issues with the university than the project is worth. This is not acceptable to them.

Regarding the estimate for professional liability insurance, Stephen has a $1M umbrella policy, and it is not terribly expensive. It depends on the scope of work and the risk involved.

Dr. Yurtseven discussed how industry works and medical clinic works. He notes that now they are trying to combine all medical clinics and put them under one umbrella, Clarion. Dr. Yurtseven asked Joe to give us an idea how the system works.

Joe advised the Medical School is interesting. They have an umbrella plan and under the plan there are 100 or so various subsidiary plans and many of them are different. Some are for profit and some or most have employees. The plan operates a clinic with dental chairs, x-ray machines, etc. They also provide the infrastructure; infrastructure that you don't necessarily need in E&T for consulting and research, but is important in medical area. This is one place where the plans diverge. For instance, we don't bill Medicare or negotiate medical insurance reimbursements.

Faculty membership in the Medical and Dental Schools is optional but exclusive. You are either in the plan or you are not. It is your option. But if you are in, all of your clinical practice must be done through the Plan.

In the Medical School in many cases, members are employees of the plan and that gives them opportunities to do more interesting things with compensation, deferred comp or Long Term Care insurance for instance. This is probably not an issue for our school at this point. The Medical school Plans do not do anything with intellectual property. If there is the possibility of an intellectual property issue, the effort and the intellectual property stays with the university. It is really clinical practice for radiology, oncology, etc. or the dental school. There are some interesting aspects that apply and some that do not apply.

Joe is trying to speak with Joe Scodro, who is the University Council on this regarding what is happening with these plans now. Joe Scodro advised a couple months ago that any new initiatives in this area are currently on hold. The Dean has also indicated there is a move to combine some of the 100 some medical plans into one plan. Joe Abella has a call into Joe Scodro who has been on vacation.

Ken Rennels asked what the IP issues are with this Plan. Industry wants to retain IP rights. This is a big hurdle. We would hope to be more flexible relative to IP rights than the university is, but that is going to be a sticking point in the negotiations as the university sees this as in their interest to retain rights when possible. Joe feels they will be moving in the direction of becoming more flexible in order to generate more research dollars but that is just an opinion.

When you think about this, Joe mentioned, IP issues, industry liability, these are the sticking points in the negotiations that take so long to get these contracts going. We need blanket authority ahead of time, or we will not be able to streamline the contracting process.

Additional thoughts…On very small consulting efforts, if you have to go through negotiations, you eat up the whole budget. Why make this mandatory for the new faculty? Joe believes it is to provide some critical mass to the plan. Hasan Akay questioned tenure track and non-tenured track faculty in this plan. Faculty should have a choice, should not be made mandatory.

Stephen gave a hypothetical issue…say $100,000 coming into school, $100,000 for consulting services, industry research, etc. If you run it through the plan or you run it through Research and Sponsored Programs, when it comes time for the school to report to the campus research productivity in terms of grants and contracts, it is Stephen's understanding, if it is run through the plan, the school does not get credit from a campus reporting standpoint for the $100,000. If you run it through Research and Sponsored Programs, the school gets credit for the $100,000, is this correct? Charlie Feldhaus also mentioned tenure track faculty, and their credit received. Stephen advised the issue behind is this: Are we not potentially setting up infrastructure to compete with the broader institutional priority? And if the issue is to do business with industry and do consulting services, might we spend our time better working through the infrastructure of things that will count and get credit through Research and Sponsored Programs to make that process a little more streamlined and user friendly than creating yet another potentially conflicting entity? An entity that the faculty member can set up to benefit themselves on their own. They can probably do this to benefit themselves financially. It sounds like we are setting up a plan that will potential cannibalize efforts that could lead to advancement of the broader institution priority when it comes to research productivity so we can keep all of the money in house. Concern is we might have a short term gain financially for the faculty member which may or may not be a plus when it goes to the Promotion and Tenure process and elevates up. If it is not counted in the official university inventory, blessed by Research and Sponsored Programs, they will say this is a school thing, may not help in rankings or campus. Are we are creating a unit that might be well intentioned but in direct competition with another institutional goal?

One issue is how the school and the university take credit for the research even though they did not get the dollars and secondly how does this apply to the requirements for getting promotion and tenure within the school. These are valid questions.

Ken Rennels questioned textbook publishing…if he signs a contract with a publisher, is this a consulting contract with industry? Ken brought this up because a few years ago he sat on a campus committee and there was a former Executive Vice Chancellor that was trying to get textbook royalties funneled through the university. He felt the university owned the royalties of faculty textbook writing. This is an issue that needs to be directly addressed.

Joe advised they have talked to chairs, other individuals, and the School of Medicine and School of Dentistry, but this is the first group discussion among faculty to get their input and concerns.

Mohamed questioned insurance for students…Barb Christe advised that her students have had insurance; it is $100.00 or so, not an issue.

International students can only work for the university, and then only 20 hours per week (per immigration laws). In this case international students would be employed through the university and the plan would contract with the university for their student workers.

The plan would also take over the billing responsibilities, which is good. Envisioning the clinics or medical schools, there is a lot of capital equipment. Will this plan have any capital equipment? No, the plan assumes the capital equipment either belongs to the company or to the school.

If new equipment needs to be purchased to conduct this research, it will be provided by clients or provided by the school. Elaine advised now if new equipment needs to be purchased as part of contract, it can be purchased and the company will give it to the university as part of the package; but the company will not be able to give it to the plan. The idea is that he plan does not have assets and in this case the company could give it to the University and it would be made available for use on the project.

Hypothetical now – Razi Nalim, to see if the Plan is viable, how much business can this plan attract in different situations? Suppose we made all of the industrial research that is currently conducted through the university part of this plan. How much would we have gotten from this plan over last three years? International students would be employees of university. Look at money received over the last three years….see what it would have been like through the plan. Mohamed advised a committee did look at the last three years to see the differences.

If a proposal exceeds certain dollar limits, then you will need to contract with the university and get authority from the university. If below a certain dollar amount, do not need authority.

Rolls Royce grant, what is overhead? We need to negotiate a lower rate with the university. If the University is not doing billing, they should give us a lower rate, the benefit is in streamlining and lower overhead within the plan. Joe does not feel there will be tremendous savings, but some.

Assume $1M in research today. To provide these billing services and pay for the director of the plan we are talking $100,000. Stephen asked $1M looking back over three years; presently this money has gone through the school through Research and Sponsored Programs. We take the $1M off the table from Research and Sponsored Programs and put it in the plan, what does it do to school when Dr. Sukhatme asks Dr. Yurtseven why the bottom line is going down in Research and Sponsored programs…how do we answer this question? How does this factor into broader questions and stakeholder responsibilities to campus? Will campus look at this as competition?

The Medical School brings in far more research dollars and attracts faculty through these plans; a good faculty member who uses 20% of their time for private consulting can do as well. Stephen believes there are plenty of people with capability to market themselves as a consultant to industry for the purposes of generating extra money for compensation purposes. The Plan has some merit, but may be in direct competition with broader goals of the institution. Not convinced this has been deliberated enough.

Stephen would not want to answer upward as to why we are setting up duplication and competition within our school, and if the only answer is that our faculty will make more money, he is not sure about this. Razi questioned if this can bring in new business, and why. Marj asked if we have subjects research will we still need to go through the IRB. Joe believes so.

Elaine still has trouble being compared to the dental and medical school clinics and their research. Their clinic work would never go through Research and Sponsored Programs, and ours would.

Tom asked if this plan differs from the previous proposal that was crafted by Gary Burkhart. Dr. Yurtseven advised they started with that plan, but this has many changes and more detail.

Mark Bannatyne asked Joe what other schools have this plan. Joe advised they did not find anything comparable, they looked at Harvey Mudd College, and Rose Hulman Ventures. They looked at the web, but did not call other schools. They are much more geared toward bringing in student projects but not promoting more faculty research.

Elaine believes the name should be changed, to include technology departments.

Bring in small grants that we don't want to go through school; does not feel we need to have overhead; Razi noted there has been a lot of discussion, this applies to small businesses…need to come up with a way to do this. This may help as a business structure. Joe feels this may apply to the small quick service contracts.

Stephen mentioned to do $1M with the university or $20,000 with the university, the IU system treats it as the same process. Maybe we would be better served advocating upward through the Research and Sponsored Programs and administration to find a way to differentiate the process, to get it counted for the faculty and school. May need some process improvement in this area.

Dean Yurtseven and Anne Rabie did negotiate with Sponsored Research a year ago, that contracts under $50,000 should go through very rapidly. There is a pre-approved form that should be approved very quickly. However, there is a resource limitation in Sponsored Programs so contracts are currently taking some time.

Suggestion to show process, steps with this plan, compare to Research and Sponsored programs, our proposed plan, my own plan, what are the differences?…Mohamed believes plan is to help faculty, it is our proposal and ideas.

This plan will now go to the Faculty Affairs committee and possibly the Unit and Promotion Board. If you have further questions or comments please contact Joe. Joe advised this plan is just for industry research; NIH and NSF do not have to go through this plan.

Charlie Feldhaus believes junior faculty still ought to be able to decide what counts for their tenure and promotion. When it gets out of our school, there is a university wide promotion and tenure committee that may feel a faculty is thin in the research area. If school cannot count towards research goal, why will faculty be able to count it?

Conflict of interest and conflict of commitment policy in place…ensures faculty to be honest.

The Powerpoint from the presentation of the Engineering Professional Practice Plan can be found at G:\COMMON_Senate documents\September 2008 documents.

The meeting ended at 12:45 p.m. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 14, 2008, 11:00 a.m. in SL 165.

Dean's Report for September 9, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting

Academic Programs
- Our number of student credit hours went up by 4.0% and the student headcount by 3.4% for fall semester 2008 as compared to fall 2007. This is the official final count for fall 2008 semester. Some of the interesting enrollment milestones for the campus and for our school are:
    - IUPUI headcount exceeded 30,000 for the first time.
    - 72% of IUPUI undergraduate students are full-time.
    - IUPUI has enrolled the highest number of minority students (4,541) to date.
    - Our school has the largest number (297) of international non-resident students.
    - We have the second largest non-resident headcount growth (102)
- Music Technology-BS degree program is on the agenda of the Indiana Commission of Higher Education. The meeting will be held on September 12, 2008 at W. Lafayette.

Faculty News
- Yaobin Chen (ECE) received new research grant of $8,095 from Computelligence for his proposal, "Cognitive Models for Learning to Control Dynamic Systems".
- Charles Feldhaus (CILT) received non-competing grant of $25,000 from Indiana Association of Vocational Education for his proposal, "IAAVD Five Year Longitudinal Study".
- Charles Feldhaus (CILT) received new service grant of $17,050 from INDOT for his proposal, "Indiana Summer Transportation Institute (ISTI)".
- Ping Zhang (BME) received new research grant of $75,500 from NIH for his proposal, "Load Driven Bone Lengthening".
- Charles Turner (BME) received non-competing continuing research grant of $305,430 from NIH for his proposal, "Genetic Determinates of Bone Fragility".
- Huanmei Wu (CILT/Informatics) received new research grant of $54,932 from NIH with her proposal, "Lung Tumor Motion Behavior Analysis Using 4DCT".
- Yingzi Du (ECE) received supplement research grant of $7,460 from Purdue University for her proposal, "Budget Expansion of the Research Project Site Verification of Weigh-in-motion Traffic and TIRTLE Certification".
- Stephen Hundley (CILT) published the book, "Employee Engagement Fundamentals: A Guide for Managers and Supervisors". This is a follow-up and companion to last year's "Workforce Engagement: Strategies to Attract, Motivate, and Retain Talent". Both of these are published by World-at-Work Press.
- Joy Starks (CILT) published two books within the last year; "Publisher 2007 Complete Concepts and Techniques" and "Photoshop CS3 Complete Concepts and Techniques". Both are part of the Shelly Cashman series.
- Yingzi Du (BME) and Emrah Aslanturk (ECE) submitted Invention Disclosure "Non-cooperative Iris Segmentation" to the IU Office of Technology Transfer.
- Yingzi Du (ECE) and Zhi Zhou (ECE) submitted Invention Disclosure "Iris Quality and Segmentation Evaluation Plug-ins" to the IU Office of Technology Transfer.
- Hiroki Yokota (BME) and Ping Zhang (BME) submitted Invention Disclosure "New Drug for Bone Growth for Treatment of Osteoporosis and Bone Fracture Healing" to the IU Office of Technology Transfer.

Staff News
- Kyle Cline joined us as the Program Manager of the Lugar Center for Renewable Energy.
- We modified the job assignments of Heather Chalkley and Anne Shepherd. Heather will spend her full time at the Dean's Office (half-time for graduate programs and the other half-time as staff support for Joe Abella and Sam White).
- Haishan Wang will join us full-time as the database/web manager in CNC.

Events

Attachment 1 – Administrative Report from Dr. Yurtseven

- Fall 2008 Faculty and Staff Convocation was held on August 18, 2008. The morning theme was I-STEM and the afternoon theme focused on the merger of our school with the School of Music, IUPUI.
- Engineering and Technology Freshman Barbeque was held on Saturday, August 23, 2008 at the Campus Center fourth floor terrace. We had over one hundred students who participated in the event as well as faculty, staff, and administrators.
- Purdue House Barbeque was held on September 2, 2008 to meet with the residents of the Purdue House.

Academic Support Services

In addition to existing academic support provided by the Dean's Office (including the services of the New Student Academic Advising Center, Computer Network Center, and the offices of associate/assistant deans and directors) for all of our faculty, staff, and students, the following academic support functions will be available for our faculty members this academic year:
- Faculty development and mentoring (Eugenia Fernandez)
- Grant writing (Cori Renguette)
- Online course development and Oncourse (TBD)
- Marketing and publicity (Melissa Todd)