<u>**PURDUE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY**</u>
<u>**Faculty Senate Minutes**</u>
<u>**November 9, 2010**</u>

Representatives in Attendance: Karen Alfrey, Mark Bannatyne, Debra Burns, Elaine Cooney, Eliza Du, Pat Fox, Dave Goodman, Cliff Goodwin, Alan Jones, Connie Justice, Brian Kinsey, Feng Li, Roberta Lindsey, Darrell Nickolson (alternate), Maher Rizkalla, Steven Rovnyak, Paul Salama, John Schild

Guests: Doug Acheson, Stephen Hundley, Sarah Koskie, Razi Nalim, Dean Russomanno

Presiding: Ken Rennels, Faculty Senate President

Meeting began at 11:02 a.m.

There was not a quorum at the beginning of the meeting; Ken Rennels advised he is taking attendance, and will see if there is a quorum later in the meeting. Dr. Russomanno gave his report first.

Ken Rennels asked everyone to look at the agenda for the meeting; agenda was approved.

Ken Rennels asked everyone to look at the minutes from the October 2010 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 October2010 minutes; all approved.

<u>**Administrative Report**</u>

Dr. Russomanno advised Faculty Senate of the following:

Promotion and Tenure:

There were 6 candidates for P&T this fall and we have been through all six candidates. The recommendations have been sent on to the Executive Vice Chancellor's office. Dr. Russomanno felt it was a fairly smooth process and he thanked everyone for serving on the various committees.

Personnel:

Dr. Guofeng Wang with ME is going to the University of Pittsburgh January 2011. This will relate to some comments later in the report regarding merit raises.

There is a search/screen meeting this Thursday for Paula's replacement. Laurie Woodhouse advised Dr. Russomanno we have a good pool of candidates. The school hopes to have the new Assistant Dean in place no later than January 2011.

The search for the Director for the Lugar Center is ongoing. There have been more delays than Dr. Russomanno would like with regard to getting ads out; Alan Jones advised we have about 8 applications to date.

Raises:

All faculty and staff should have notification of their raises. We were initially given a 3% pool; Dr. Russomanno pushed in terms of trying to get an increase in the pool, and not until late in the process did

he find out by how much he could increase the pool. The school was allowed to increase the pool by 1/2%, making the total pool 3 ½%. Dr. Russomanno spoke with the chairs and did some additional supplements above some of the previous recommendations; however, none of the chairs' recommendations for salary increases were lowered. Part of the guiding motivation is that ABET noted some shortcomings with respect to engineering faculty salaries. Dr. Russomanno also has some peer data that shows we are really lacking in salaries for faculty, particularly engineering faculty. Dr. Russomanno made some additional targeted supplements using the .5% pool to make some merit raises and some equity adjustments. We are in a little better shape, but we are still inadequate in our engineering salaries. Dr. Russomanno still needs to look at the technology and other department salaries.

Budget:

In terms of the budget, there was a "fire drill" in terms of responding to a campus capture of R&R funds. The state is not providing funding for repair and rehabilitation of our physical plant. The campus "captured" 50% of our unbudgeted, undergraduate tuition. We have suffered from having such a large cash position. Dr. Russomanno has previously noted we need to increase our base budget; we have such a large cash position because we have increased enrollment while we have faculty who are lagging with peers in regards to salaries, inadequate funding for graduate students, etc. This unbudgeted cash will most likely be captured by campus in part to address R&R. We were able to submit some requests, some of which were accepted, some were denied. Dawn Rhodes, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, forwarded the following recommended R&R projects to Chancellor Bantz for our school.

- o ET student lounge project ($200,000)
- o Upgrade video/telecom technology in ET 103 ($40,000)
- o Lighting control project in ET ($50,000*)
- o New weather enclosure to elevated walkway connecting to North Street Garage (energy saving opportunity) ($150,000*)
- o Upgrade restrooms in ET, $127,357* will be added to that previously planned R&R project

Around $500,000 may be captured from our school for R&R. There are some items that we did request; for example, we are trying to upgrade the student areas to be more accommodating and inviting similar to the School of Business. There is a request to upgrade the digital telecom in ET 103, so we added this to the list. The other three projects are really projects that were in the cue from campus; we are supplementing these projects.

Dr. Russomanno wants the faculty to be aware there is a campus committee that is looking at redefining the RCM model. We currently have a three driver model; the committee is looking at numerous models that they are calling a consumption model, which looks at how much you use the library and other services. We could potentially lose $2.5M or more if this new budget model goes through. This would fundamentally alter our strategic planning process if this new budget model goes through. Dr. Russomanno has been advised this is still a draft and no decisions have been made. The committee still has to look at the appropriations side. We potentially would have the largest percent increase in assessment of any school on campus; when you look at our overall budget. It was emphasized that this is a draft, something to be aware of. Several Deans are very concerned about the impact of possible budget changes. There will be a meeting with the Chancellor soon on this topic. This potential change may be a serious budget threat to our school.

Research and External Funding:

Razi Nalim will give an update on research and external funding.

SELB Building:

There has likely been an underestimate of the costs for this building. The reality of the building costs is coming in; it is highly likely that $25M will not build out the footprint that was originally planned. They are looking at eliminating fixtures and furnishings, etc. Discussions are ongoing with schools, what are their priorities for the building, and schools may need to plan for some contingencies. There are discussions regarding the shell space of the building. Dr. Russomanno wants to have a documented set of priorities; it needs to be very systematic in case some areas must be shelled.

Cliff Goodwin noted that in the State of Chancellor address, it was noted that this is the first building that will be built with research dollars. Goodwin questioned how much money came from the Angel sale. Dr. Yurtseven documented this information in some previous reports to the senate. Some dollars went into a pseudo endowment to support the Cyberlab going forward; all of the proceeds did not go exclusively to the building.

Faculty questioned if you are paying rent from indirect cost recovery. Bart Ng and Dr. Russomanno have had discussions regarding this. Dr. Russomanno still feels we should have some allocation from the school. With research programs you could go up and down in funds coming in, we cannot have musical chairs in the building. If a department/program is occupying space in the new building and there was a sustained period of no external funding to cover the rent then we may have to look at moving research in that can best utilize the space and also have external funding. It is hoped that space allocation will be a school decision. Certain areas in the building may not be suitable for all of the different research coming and going in the building.

John Schild questioned the start up package for the Director position for the Lugar Center, if there are any prospects. Alan Jones put together a financial package that he felt would be attractive to candidates. Dr. Russomanno advised we may have to consider the scenario of the rising associate professor that is about to transition to full professor who may not require the same package as someone who has an international reputation, depending on the financial package that can be assembled. This is a very pragmatic decision we will have to make once we know the true funding in place. We have the revised RCM model in the wings, and we do not yet know the state budget cuts. We are very much in a moment of budget flux. The good news is we have strong enrollments and research productivity is increasing, which are areas we have control of.

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

Associate Dean's Report

Stephen Hundley presented the following report. The Associate Dean Report can also be found under Attachment 2 at the end of this report.

Unit Planning and Budget Report to Campus:

Stephen Hundley advised we are in process of reporting our academic unit accomplishments for AY 2009-2010 and activities planned for AY 2010-2011 to the campus. This will help form some of the strategic planning that units will be doing in the next few months. We are gathering information and reporting it around the campus mission, which is teaching and learning; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and civic engagement. The unit, Engineering and Technology, has 73 different objectives that we are implementing and doing; Hundley advised he would be reaching out to departments in the next few weeks, individually, programmatically, and departmentally to clarify information.

ABET, Inc.:

In terms of ABET follow up, Stephen will be meeting with the CGT and CIT programs, to close the loop for their reports. We are still awaiting feedback for the engineering programs that went through accreditation in September. This is typically an off year for the school; Elaine's colleagues in the Engineering Technology Department that are under the TAC accreditation will be meeting in January to begin the preliminary work to seize the timeframe prior to 2012. Hundley also noted that 2012 will be a busy year for the campus with the campus wide accreditation that will be occurring.

Ken Rennels noted that the Harmonized criteria did pass on October 30th. The TAC visit in 2012 will be under the Harmonized criteria. The actual criteria will not be published until December, but if you wish to see this information, the self-study documents online are already built around the Harmonized criteria.

Dr. Russomanno noted we should try to have a unified ABET visit schedule for our school; many other schools do this.

Targeted project for high-ability undergraduates:

Several colleagues met in October to kick-off a project looking at our high-ability undergraduate students. This will be known as "IPSE" Identify, Prepare, Support, and Encourage our high ability undergraduates to pursue our graduate programs in Engineering and Technology. The group has met and defined these items, done some data collection, will meet a few more times, and then hope to present to the Chairs, Deans, and Directors group in March to get some recommendation on ways to strengthen and better serve this population.

Articulation Agreements with Ivy Tech:

We are making some progress with our engineering programs at least some select engineering programs (CmpE, EE, and ME). The school meets with Ivy Tech on Friday, November 19, to clarify and update the information. Our goal is to sign an articulation agreement with them preferably in December.

Our technology programs are in varying stages of having their articulation agreements updated. Our goal is to have all articulation agreements updated by May 2011. All of these will go into effect in AY 2010-11, with periodic reviews.

There were questions regarding the articulation agreements with Ivy Tech. Hundley noted that Ivy Tech campus leadership treats Ivy Tech as a system. Therefore, some of the issues of quality among various Ivy Tech campuses need to be called out and spelled out in the articulation agreements. We are taking steps to ensure this, and one of the ways we are doing this is to have Ivy Tech faculty work with IUPUI faculty to share course syllabi, learning outcomes, and textbook information. We have invited Ivy Tech colleagues to join the schools assessment committee as well to ensure alignment of improvement in assessment between the two campuses. There will be some hiccups along the way in the implementation, but we are trying to be strategic in this process to guarantee consistency in learning between the two campuses, and will have faculty talk to each other early and often in the process.

Program-Level Learning Outcomes:

Many programs are currently working on program-level learning outcomes. Hundley has worked with OLS on the BS and certificate levels. The Technology graduate program is also working on these. Hundley will coordinate this information on our behalf to the campus. The Certificate programs, OLS

B.S., and Master's programs all need to have program-learning outcomes established and submitted to the Dean's office by February 1, 2011.

Lunch-n-Learn Professional Development Programs:

For past and future program information please see the attached report from Stephen Hundley.

Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs

Razi Nalim presented the following report. The Associate Dean Report can also be found under Attachment 3 at the end of this report.

Research:

As of October 31st we have reached $5.9M in external grants for the school. A complete list of grants was distributed during the meeting and will be available on the website. Nalim advised he would like to have some information about ongoing research activities updated more frequently than in the past on the website.

Four earmark proposals went out for IU internal review; two of these were for continuation of previous applications and two were new.

Campus has had a number of discussions about focus areas that they want to try to support with grant writing help from the Office of Kody Varahramyan. ET faculty were represented in STEM education, Imaging, and large collaborative centers in new areas. There was some general discussion about what those areas might be. This cuts across different areas within the campus. There is still ongoing discussion; we had representative's at all three meetings. If you have any ideas please forward them to Dr. Nalim.

At the IU system wide levels the new VP for Research, Jorge Jose, is trying to encourage collaboration throughout the IU University, and has a solicitation out for collaborative research proposals. Hopefully, we will have some research proposals from our school.

Finally, we are trying to have research committee meetings open to anyone interested. We had a speaker at the last meeting on the grant management software tool, and we hope to have speakers from IURTC speaking on intellectual property issues and someone from the IU Research Development office on grant writing.

Graduate Programs:

Block grant proposals are due to the school on November 16th and we will assemble and submit these to campus on November 30th. Nalim advised the school would like to see the applications focus on graduate student achievements in the previous academic year that are completed and block grant funds that were given and how those were used. The other area of focus is funding plans for research students in the next academic year. This proposal is only for block grants, we do not have information on teaching assistantships this year. We asked and still have not received information. We don't know if we will receive support from the campus this year.

We do expect to have another type of support as in the past; the fellowship grant supports. These applications are usually due around January. We would like to get students applying by January 1st for fellowship funding. Recruitment of top students with high GRE scores should start early for 2011-12 fellowship students. The faculty member needs to really take initiative to identify good students and

nominate those students for fellowships. Nalim encouraged those who are interested in this to start thinking about possible students to nominate.

We have had many discussions regarding IUPUI registered Ph.D. students taking classes from Purdue West Lafayette (except EPE) and how to manage the payments. In some cases non-resident students receive non-resident rate, because of the different financial systems the universities have. We are trying to figure out how to get the fee reduced. We have a fee reduction agreement with Purdue, but this is not real clear. There is a limit of on the number of credits in order to get significant fee reduction. Please talk to Valerie Lim-Diemer if you have a student or your department has students taking courses at West Lafayette. Nalim will try to send additional information out on this issue.

Budgetary Affairs Committee No report

Computing Resources Committee (CRC)

Connie Justice advised that CRC met about 2-3 weeks ago. One task is to look at where we are with the Student Technology Fee transition. The committee wants to keep a view on how this transition is taking place, and if it is successful. CRC will also be talking with each department to see if there are any other issues they should be aware of or need to work on.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

John Schild advised the committee is looking for direction from the Senate. The bylaws need to be changed to reflect the most recent changes in the recommendations on P&T procedures that were passed at the campus level.

The main area is the desire from campus to place as much distance as possible between the faculty in a particular unit and those who comprise the P&T committee, the administration, the department and the school, which has some legal issues also. All of the recommendations are ironclad and there is very little wiggle room for faculty, etc. to come in later and say there were issues with the P&T procedure. Schild is asking Faculty Senate if the committee should go through and be very descriptive in the bylaws to say for example what the role of the chairman is, or they can be more generic and say that we will be consistent with the school guidelines and highlight some particular issues.

Schild noted he tried going through the Constitution and Bylaws and tried to be descriptive of the role of the chairman, but it gets a little tedious. Ken Rennels noted he believes the big issues are the department chair participating in a program level committee even without vote could be viewed as a conflict by having the chair present in the room, and the same thing at the unit level with the Dean attending the unit committee meeting, even without vote. The issue is should the Chair be in the room. Schild noted this was specified in the campus guidelines that the administrator can be present but is not suppose to influence the committee. Dr. Russomanno advise he had some discussions with Mary Fisher and she advised that at the campus level Dr. Sukhatme will sit in the room but not make any comments (for those cases that may have some controversy).

Schild believes that our school bylaws can be amended to reflect additional constraints or suggestions, but there cannot be anything that conflicts with the campus requirements.

Elaine Cooney would like to hear how other departments in the university comply with these rules. Cooney noted her department does not have many full professors, and it would be helpful to use all of the full professors on the primary committee that would include her, and she is also on the unit committee.

Schild advised this is noted if there are not enough professors you will need to pull from another department. It was noted that a faculty can only vote once.

Ken Rennels believes there should be discussion with regard as to how much goes into the bylaws and how much goes into the P&T documents. Cliff Goodwin is chair of Faculty Affairs and Ken Rennels has discussed this issue with Cliff. Schild believes the constitution and bylaws should be general and consistent with the campus guidelines. Keep the changes as clean as possible. Goodwin noted Faculty Affairs can write guidelines for procedure but they cannot write policy. Goodwin advised the committee would like to have a strong, clear message on the interpretation of the information from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

Cooney questioned if we need to look at whether administrators can serve on the Unit committee. Rennels noted that we really have not defined what an administrator is in this school. Dr. Russomanno believes an Administrator is a lateral position from his prior life. Rennels believes that the bylaws need to be brought in to compliance with campus, but maybe do minimal information in the Bylaws and get more specific at the policy level. The bylaws should show that the school needs to be in compliance with campus administration.

Rennels noted the Constitution and Bylaws committee can simplify the bylaws; the policy and procedures can be completed by the Faculty Affairs committee. There will be a larger voice through Faculty Affairs committee since there is representation from every department.

Goodwin asked where information about the makeup of the unit committee can be found; there are cases where there could be people on the Unit Committee making decisions in areas they have no expertise in. Schild advised from his experience this relies on the composition of the chair and if the chair believes they do not have enough representation they will look for outsiders (faculty) with expertise in the areas required. Dr. Russomanno believes that it is only natural the higher you go in terms of a review board the more distant you will get with regard to expertise in the discipline. This is why clear and concise department guidelines in terms of expectations are critically important because when you get to the unit level you are referring to and looking at the department guidelines with regard to the candidate qualifications.

Mark Bannatyne noted over the last 48 months there have been many P&T changes, which have taken the departments by surprise. Therefore, this is a good time to review these changes to avoid problems.

Schild will go back and work with his committee to update the Constitution and Bylaws so as to be in more direct agreement with the guidelines approved at the campus level. A summary attachment of these guidelines has been included in Attachment 5 of these minutes.

Graduate Education Committee – No Report

Grievance Board – No Report

Faculty Affairs Committee

Cliff Goodwin presented a re-reading from the last Faculty Senate meeting. During the October Faculty Senate meeting faculty passed a revision to the compensation policy for overload teaching. After Goodwin forwarded the updated policy to Sherri Alexander she pointed out that the first sentence of the second paragraph stated, "The compensation for overload teaching is based on the assumption that a faculty member is paid one month salary for a semester-long, three-credit course." Alexander pointed out that faculty teach 12 week, 8 week, condensed 1week courses, etc. Goodwin brought the policy back to

update this sentence to reflect the various three credit hour courses that are taught. The motion is to strike "semester long" from the first sentence in the second paragraph.

Ken Rennels called the motion for Faculty Senate to modify the Compensation Policy for Overload Teaching to: strike the phrase "semester long" from the first sentence in the second paragraph. The motion passed unanimously.

The policy can now apply to all three hour courses including those delivered in compressed formats (e.g. 12 week, 8 week, and one week).

Compensation Policy for Overload Teaching

Passed by ET Senate 11/09/10

> A full-time faculty member may teach above and beyond the expected teaching load assigned to him/her during a fall or a spring semester with the approval of the department chair and the dean. Overload teaching is done under the extenuating circumstances, such as unexpected illness, or absence of a colleague in the department, or similar situation.
>
> The compensation for overload teaching is based on the assumption that a faculty member is paid one month salary for a three-credit course. If a course has less than three credit hours, then appropriate proportion of a month's salary is paid.

Nominations

Doug Acheson presented an information item.

Kevin Marshall from DCT resigned recently; he held two departmentally appointed positions on the Computer Resources Committee and Nominations Committee. Paresh Mehta will now be on these committees to represent the DCT department.

Acheson also advised the Nominations Committee will send out a call for nominations for IUPUI Faculty Council at large. Currently Mark Bannatyne is on the committee and his term expires 2012; Cliff Goodwin is on the committee and his term expires 2011. Our school will need to add two members to these Faculty-at-large positions.

Resource Policy Committee – No Report

Student Affairs Committee – No Report

Undergraduate Education Committee

Karen Alfrey advised CGT would like to introduce three new tracks for their existing CGT degree. They are requesting these tracks be acknowledged on the transcripts. These are all Architectural Technology Visualization with an emphasis on animation, interactive multimedia, or illustration. The idea is that the existing two year architectural technology associates degree would provide the first two years that would then lead into completing a four year CGT degree with one of these specific areas. These were distributed for review previously. These are in addition to the CGT existing tracks.

Faculty Senate unanimously approved the three tracks for the Architectural Technology specialty within the Computer Graphics Technology degree program.

IUPUI Faculty Council

Cliff Goodwin advised IUPUI Faculty Council met on November 2, 2010. This was a short meeting because of the Chancellors State of the Union address.

- o There was a United Way presentation and they asked faculty to be generous in these difficult times. IUPUI is one of the top five contributors in Indianapolis.

- o Scott Evenbeck gave a very interesting and wonderful presentation on the contributions of University College. Scott Evenbeck is leaving in January to go to a university in New York. Rick Ward will be the interim Dean of University College. Evenbeck's presentation is on the University College website.

- o Chancellor Bantz presentation is on the university website. Chancellor Bantz used a road map metaphor for IUPUI's advancing in the next several years to coincide with the initiatives that President McRobbie has set for the university. Bantz and McRobbie initiatives are in close alignment with one another.

Purdue Intercampus Faculty: No Report

Purdue Faculty Senate (Jeff Watt): No Report

New Business

Ken Rennels distributed and read the memorial resolution for Roy Edward Westcott during the Faculty Senate meeting. The resolution is attached to these minutes as Attachment 4.

The meeting ended at 12:10 p.m. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, December 14, 2010, 11:00 a.m. in SL 165.

Attachment 1: Administrative Report from Dr. Russomanno

Dean's Report

November 9, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Promotion and Tenure

There were 6 candidates for P&T this fall. All 6 candidates have been provided the vote tallies and copies of the recommendations made by the primary and unit boards, as well as the recommendations of the department chair and dean. Dossiers were routed to the Executive Vice Chancellor's office on November 5.

Personnel

Dr. Guofeng Wang, assistant professor of mechanical engineering, has accepted an offer to join the U. of Pittsburgh starting in January, 2011.

The second search/screen committee meeting for the Assistant Dean for Development is scheduled for November 11. According to Laurie Woodhouse, IUF who is coordinating the search, there are several strong applicants for the position. Our goal is to have the new Assistant Dean in place no later than January 2011.

The search for the Director for the Lugar Center is ongoing. Advertisements for the position are starting to appear in various media. It will probably be mid-January or later before the search/screen committee starts reviewing the applications. Assembling an attractive start-up package for the position may be a challenge and will likely require a significant investment from the campus.

Raises

All faculty and staff should have received notification regarding their raise, which took effect November 1. Department chairs and other supervisors were asked to make raise recommendations given a 3% pool, which was the IU pool. Ultimately, the School had a 3.5% pool. The additional 0.5% was permitted for the School of E&T to make targeted merit increases, as well as to address (in part) the most serious gaps in faculty salaries with respect to peer institutions. Recall that faculty salaries were a source of shortcomings in the recent EAC of ABET review of our engineering programs.

Budget

The School has exceeded the estimated credit hour projection for Fall 2010, which has generated a strong cash position.

The State is not providing funds for repair and rehabilitation (R&R) this year. Therefore, IU is capturing 50% of each School's net unbudgeted undergraduate fee income for FY 2010-11 for R&R. We received notification that our amount to be captured was $567,357 on October 20. Each School had until October 25 to provide a list of recommended R&R projects with cost estimates and rationale. The projects recommended by Dawn Rhodes, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, to Chancellor Bantz for

our School are listed below. Those marked with an asterisk were already planned campus R&R projects, which replaced some of our initial requests.

1. ET student lounge project ($200,000)
2. Upgrade video/telecom technology in ET 103 ($40,000)
3. Lighting control project in ET ($50,000*)
4. New weather enclosure to elevated walkway connecting to North Street Garage (energy saving opportunity) ($150,000*)
5. Upgrade restrooms in ET. $127,357* will be added to that previously planned R&R project.

A campus committee has proposed a new RCM budget model, which increases the model from 3 parameters to numerous parameters, referred to as a consumption model. This model would increase E&T's assessment by approximately $2.5M per year. It was presented to the deans by Dawn Rhodes as a recommended draft, and it does not reflect any changes to the appropriation side of the budget; therefore, the impact could be less than $2.5M. Representatives on the campus committee said the appropriation side must be considered too. Under the new model, the School of Medicine and the School of Law's assessment would decrease by approximately $11.2M, and $2M, respectively. It is clear that E&T's budget would be adversely impacted based on what we know today if the new model is adopted.

Research and External Funding

The School currently has $5.9M in awards for FY 2011. The list of extramural awards received will be posted to the School's website within 2 weeks. The list will start with this fiscal year and will be updated monthly.

SELB Building

Bi-weekly meetings continue with the architect to develop floor plans for the new SELB building. It appears that the cost to construct the building may have been underestimated. Therefore, contingency plans must be developed to potentially increase the assigned square footage that must be assigned to shelled areas. Also, furniture, fixtures, and other ancillary expenses were not included in the original $25M approved for construction.

Attachment 2:   Faculty Senate Report from Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Undergraduate
Programs

Report from Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Undergraduate Programs

November 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Unit Planning and Budgeting Report to Campus

- Reporting on accomplishments from AY 2009-10 and activities planned for AY 2010-11 due to campus soon
- Information is aligned around campus mission (teaching and learning; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and civic engagement)
- We will be reaching out to departments programs to clarify information items very soon

ABET, Inc.

- Follow-up meetings with CGT and CIT in November/December
- Awaiting reports for BME, CmpE, EE, and ME
- Planning meetings for programs in ENT Department start in January 2011

Targeted project for high-ability undergraduates

- Goal: identifying, preparing, supporting, and encouraging high-potential undergraduates to pursue E&T-based graduate programs
- Group meeting 3-4 times for this process
- Will present recommendations to CDD group in March 2011

Articulation Agreements with Ivy Tech

- Progress meeting between CmpE, EE, and ME with Ivy Tech colleagues in November 19; goal is to have articulation agreements signed by December
- Several Technology departments (CILT; DCT; ENT) need to review and update articulation agreements this year; we will use the spring semester to review, modify, and update agreements with Ivy Tech
- All agreements (ENGR and TECH) will be effective in AY 11-12 and beyond, with periodic review

Program-level Learning Outcomes

- To comply with IUPUI's regional accreditation (HLC-NCA), all programs must establish and assess program-level learning outcomes
- Our discipline-specific programs (ABET; CIDA; NASM) already have this requirement satisfied
- Certificate programs, OLS baccalaureate degree, and master's programs all need to have program-level learning outcomes established and submitted to the Dean's office by February 1, 2011

<u>Past and Upcoming E&T Lunch-n-Learn Professional Development Programs</u>

- Fall semester programs:
    - o Assessing PUL and Discipline-specific Learning Outcomes (August 31)
    - o Minimizing Academic Misconduct: Policies, Strategies, and Resources (September 8)
    - o Transitioning Courses to Hybrid or Online Delivery (October 5)
    - o Creating and Enhancing International Learning Opportunities for Students (November 3)
- Spring semester programs:
    - o Helping Students Become Workforce Ready (January 25)
    - o Reaching Out to At-Risk and Probationary Students (February 16)
    - o Preparing for Promotion and Tenure: What Every Faculty Member Should Know (March 1)
    - o Incorporating STEM Best Practices in Courses and Programs (April 6)

Attachment 3:   Faculty Senate Report from Associate Dean for Research and Grad Programs

Research

1) Awards started since July 1 with PI at the School: $5.97M (see attachment)
2) Four earmark proposals were selected for submission for IU internal review and possible congressional action. Two of these were for continuation of previous applications (by Yaobin Chen and Rongrong Chen) and two were new (by Jian Xie and Paul Salama).
3) IUPUI has organized summit discussions recently on major research focus areas for the campus, led by VC for research, Kody Varahramyan. ET faculty were represented in the 3 summits on:
   a) STEM education
   b) Imaging
   c) Large collaborative centers in new areas. Some topics discussed included health/environmental impact of energy extraction and use.
4) IU is currently soliciting proposals for NEW collaborative research among IU campuses and department, at the initiative of VP for research, Jorge Jose. Proposals are due Nov. 15th.
5) Last research committee meeting had speaker on the MyRA grant management tool. Next meetings may have speakers from IURTC and IUPUI research offices.

Graduate Programs

1) Block grant proposals due to School Nov. 16th, and will be assembled and submitted to campus by Nov. 30th. Applications should focus on 2009-10 grad student research achievements and funding plans for research students in 2011-12.
2) Fellowship students also now receive non-resident tuition subsidy. Recruitment of top students with high GRE scores should start early for 2011-12 fellowship students, with applications due Jan 1.
3) All IUPUI-registered students taking classes from Purdue West Lafayette (except EPE) must file the reciprocal fee reduction agreement form with help from Valerie Lim. There are limits on the number of credits in order to get fee reduction.

Memorial Resolution on Behalf of
Roy Edward Westcott

November 11, 1934 – September 26, 2010
Associate Professor Emeritus
Purdue School of Engineering and Technology

It is with great sadness that the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology announces the passing of Associate Professor Emeritus, Roy E. Westcott who died peacefully at home on September 26, 2010.

Roy Westcott, born November 11, 1934 in Indianapolis, IN, was an Associate Professor and long-time faculty member of the Department of Mechanical Engineering Technology. Nationally, Professor Westcott held the position of Key Professor with the Foundry Education Foundation.

After spending many years as a machinist and a tool and die maker, Roy decided to pursue a postsecondary degree, eventually obtaining a Bachelor of Science in Industrial Education at Purdue University and a Master of Science in Vocational Education at Indiana University. While engaged in his academic pursuits, he worked at J. Everett Light Career Center as a machine trades instructor and then began his tenure at IUPUI. As a faculty member of Mechanical Engineering Technology in the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology, IUPUI from 1979 – 1999, Roy Westcott was a beloved teacher and friend to countless students, faculty, staff, alumni, and members of the local Indianapolis community.

While at IUPUI, Roy's number one focus was always the students. He took interest in not just their academic success, but their personal success as well. Many faculty members today still remember Roy as the "unofficial job placement counselor" as he helped a myriad of students find employment upon completion of their degrees and took a personal interest in ensuring they were contributing members of society.

During his career, he received numerous awards for his teaching, including the Amoco Outstanding Undergraduate Teaching Award (1985), SME Outstanding Teaching Award (1981, 1987, and 1988) and Purdue School of Engineering and Technology, IUPUI Outstanding Teaching Award (1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1993). To enhance his professional growth and complement his career, Roy was also active in several professional organizations, such as the American Foundry Society, the American Vocational Association, and the Foundry Educational Foundation.

In honor of Roy Westcott and his dedicated commitment to educating students in the field of manufacturing technology, the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology, IUPUI has established the *Roy Westcott Outstanding Manufacturing Technology Student Scholarship* within the Department of Engineering Technology. The scholarship will be awarded annually to an outstanding student in manufacturing technology and presented at the School's annual Honors Convocation.

Most importantly, Professor Westcott was a faithful and devoted father to his five children, Roy A., David E., Harry F., Hank T. Westcott and Cynthia Westcott Rice; 17 grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. He was preceded in death by his wife, Mary Eckel Westcott.

THUS, BE IT RESOLVED: that this memorial resolution be adopted by the Faculty Senate of the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology at IUPUI and placed in the school's minutes and its permanent archives; that a copy of this memorial resolution be delivered to his family. This memorial resolution will also be placed in the minutes of Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis Faculty Council with a moment of silence observed in his honor.

This resolution is written on behalf of Professor Westcott by the staff and faculty of the Department of Engineering Technology along with the emeriti faculty and alumni of the Department of Mechanical Engineering Technology, Purdue School of Engineering and Technology.

Attachment 5: Summary of P&T Guidelines from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee

JOINT FACULTY/ ADMINISTRATIVE P&T COMMITTEE
Recommendations on Promotion & Tenure Procedures
on Indiana University Campuses

Introduction

In March of 2008, President Michael McRobbie, along with then Co-Chairs of the University Faculty Council, Bart Ng and Lisa Pratt, created a Joint Committee to Review Indiana University Promotion and Tenure Procedures. This committee was composed of the University Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee, and representatives of the administration from each campus.

The committee's charge was delivered and the committee began to deliberate in June and deliberations were made throughout the summer and fall of 2008. Copies of the charge to the committee and the list of committee members is added as an attachment. The committee worked to make this process as transparent as possible, posting working drafts on an Oncourse site with a way for interested parties to leave comments. Drafts were also circulated on several campuses with opportunities for faculty comments. Below, the committee presents its recommendations for baseline procedures made in the spirit of that charge.

Faculty Review Committees

1. At least one-third of the members of each campus-wide faculty review committee should be faculty with Professor or Librarian rank.

2. Only faculty who are tenured and have at least associate rank should serve on campus-wide tenure and promotion committees for tenure-eligible faculty cases.

3. All committee votes on all review committees should be reported as the number of yes-no-abstain votes. There should be no absentee voting or ballots on campus-wide review committees.

4. Only those faculty participating fully in the contemporaneous evaluation meeting and consequential discussions should be eligible to vote. This does not preclude committee members' participation through interactive technology such as video- or tele-conferencing. (Note that some campuses wanted this recommendation to only apply to the campus-wide committees.)

5. On all review committees, each committee member, voting on or taking part in deliberations regarding a case, should have access to all the materials in the dossier.

6. An administrator may make a recommendation or vote only once on any given case.

7. A faculty member can participate in deliberations in only one level per candidate. He or she must recuse himself or herself from participating at any other level.

8. Each level of review is a critical component of the review process. Each level should have access to the previous levels' assessments.

9. Committee deliberations are confidential matters and should not be opened up, or communicated, to others outside the promotion and tenure process, except as required by university procedures.

10. At all levels of review, the recommendation and its rationale should be clearly communicated to both the candidate and subsequent levels of review. Recommendations should be clear and explicitly based on the dossier.

11. Campuses should develop guidelines for the membership of evaluation committees at the unit, school, or college level that ensure appropriate representation, with consideration of such factors as tenure, and rank or seniority. The development of such guidelines may be delegated to units, schools, or colleges. However, the guidelines should be consistent, as appropriate, with the above points.

Dossier Preparation: Primary External Letters

Although the candidate's area of excellence, the rank to which a candidate aspires, and the characteristics of the candidate's discipline may factor into the type and number of peer reviews expected in a dossier, a minimum of four external letters may give sufficient evidence of the quality of a case while not giving undue weight to an individual review.

1. Dossiers for faculty with the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor are expected to have at least four external letters. External is defined as "not from the candidate's home campus."

2. External reviewers should give a credible review of the impact or quality of the candidate's work, avoiding the appearance of a conflict of interest. Normally, a reviewer would not have had a significant relationship with the candidate (such as thesis advisor, post doctoral mentor, co-author, former colleague or classmate) and be of rank or position comparable or senior to that sought by the candidate.

3. Exceptions to these guidelines are to be explained in the dossier by the candidate's supervisor.

4. Units and/or campuses will establish guidelines on external letters of review and other letters of support. Campus guidelines will be transmitted to the appropriate EVP's office each year. These guidelines should also be given to the candidate and placed in the dossier.

5. Librarians will follow the guidelines in the Indiana University Libraries Handbook regarding letters of review or support.

Further Recommendations from the Joint P&T Committee

1. The designation of the area(s) of excellence will be by the candidate. Tenure candidates are urged to make this designation in consultation with senior members of their division or department.

2. Recommendations from each review committee should include a rating of "excellent", "satisfactory", or "unsatisfactory" in each category of teaching, research and service for faculty, or a rating of excellent, beyond satisfactory, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each category of performance, professional development and service for librarians.

3. It was noted by the committee that there is currently no process for a faculty member to file an appeal regarding a decision made above the campus level. The committee strongly endorses the idea of creating such a process.

Respectfully Submitted,

_____   _____
Joseph L. Wert, co-chair   Alfred Guillaume, co-chair
Associate Professor of Political Science, IU Southeast   VCAA, IU South Bend

Kwesi E. Aggrey, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
IU Northwest

Gilbert W. Atnip, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
IU Southeast

George Bodmer, Professor of English
IU Northwest

Rosanne Cordell, Associate Librarian,
IU South Bend

Andre De Tienne, Associate Professor of Philosophy
IUPUI

Stuart Green, Interim Chancellor
IU Kokomo

Marilyn Kintzele, Professor of Accounting
IU Kokomo

Lloyd Kolbe, Professor of Applied Health Science
IU Bloomington

David Malik, Associate Executive Vice President
IUPUI

Markus Pomper, Associate Professor of Mathematics
IU East

Larry Richards, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
IU East

Jeanne Sept, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
IU Bloomington