

PURDUE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
Faculty Senate Minutes
October 12, 2010

Representatives in Attendance: Karen Alfrey, Mark Bannatyne, Andy Borne, Debra Burns, Elaine Cooney, Michael Drews, Eliza Du, Pat Fox, Patrick Gee (alternate), Cliff Goodwin, Afshin Izadian (alternate), Alan Jones, Connie Justice, Brian Kinsey, Sarah Koskie (alternate), Feng Li, Roberta Lindsey, Darrell Nickolson (alternate), John Schild

Guests: Charlie Feldhaus, Stephen Hundley, Nancy Lamm, Razi Nalim, Terri Talbert-Hatch

Presiding: Ken Rennels, Faculty Senate President

Meeting began at 11:02 a.m.

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 September 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 September 2010 minutes; all approved.

Administrative Report

Dean Russomanno was unable to attend the meeting; Razi Nalim presented the Dean's report.

Promotion and Tenure:

P&T candidates are required to submit on-line dossiers this year. Some issues with regard to page limits were encountered. The dossiers are stored in a directory on the G drive and were made available to the Unit Board P&T committee members to review. The Unit Board recommendations are due by October 21st to the Dean's office.

Raises:

Recommendations for faculty and staff have been entered into the system based on the chair or director recommendations. The pool was 3% overall, for faculty and staff categories. Some faculty who had already received a raise or salary based on a new hire, and their 3% is then available for others in the general pool. Notification will not be provided until approval is received. The raises are targeted to take effect on November 1st.

Budget:

In terms of enrollment, the credit hour projections have been exceeded. This is good news. Dr. Russomanno has some plans on creating strategies to have more items in the base budget, items we need in there for a systematic fashion. This will be included when developing the schools strategic plan.

Research and External Funding:

Dr. Nalim will provide information in his report, and will put out in regular fashion. There is an earmark process which Nalim will discuss. There is information in the Dean's report regarding campus visits today and tomorrow with Ronnie Sartain from the U.S. Army Research Laboratory in Adelphi, MD, and Kevin Roper from the University of Memphis.

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.

ABET visit for BME, CmpE, EE, and ME – We had a very positive outcome from the recent ABET visit. All of the programs had positive outcomes, with a few concerns for all noted and a few weaknesses for CmpE, EE, and ME. Many of the weaknesses were addressed and hopefully downgraded.

There are no ABET preparations for this year; the next visit we will be preparing for will be from the Technology Accreditation Commission in 2012. This year we will work with the Assessment committee looking at harmonizing and streamlining some of our processes and approaches across the school. We now have three commissions of ABET, which are EAB, TAC, and CAC. We will look at some ways we can harmonize our processes that ABET is doing, to try to have some synergy with them.

AIP, Accelerated Improvement Process – This is a project the campus is undertaking. The campus has invited subject matter experts to help with this endeavor. We have been asked to send a team to identify and support high potential undergraduate students in our school and encourage them to pursue graduate programs within engineering and technology. A group will be meeting this Thursday morning to begin a preliminary discussion of mapping out what this process will look like; how to capitalize on our current high ability students, which will connect to other campus goals of attracting and retaining students, RISE challenge, etc.

Articulation agreements with Ivy Tech – Several of our engineering programs have signed or plan to sign articulation agreements with Ivy Tech for A.S. in Pre-Engineering to B.S. Engineering programs. This does not include BME and Motorsports at this time. Our technology department, CILT, DCT and ENT, will need to review and update their articulations this year. We will try to use November and December to have internal discussions around these agreements, and then work with our Ivy Tech colleagues during the spring semester to review and modify current agreements. We have a December 1 deadline for the engineering programs, which came out of a proposal for the Energy Engineering degree program that was highly encouraged by the Higher Education Commission to move the proposal forward. As part of this agreement we agreed to have ongoing dialogue with regard to the Ivy Tech articulations. The language in the agreement calls for collaboration between both institutions to show good faith and to institutionalize them. The assessment committee has graciously agreed to allow Ivy Tech colleagues to join our E&T Assessment committee on a regular basis so that we can benefit from shared best practices and can align some of what we are doing downstream with the community colleges. Ivy Tech can in turn reap some benefits of what we are trying to accomplish and build on what we are trying to do. Mike Debourbon, Dean of Technology for Ivy Tech, under which all of these programs reside at Ivy Tech in Indianapolis, advised their programs at Ivy Tech are going through ABET accreditation in some of their technology programs so we are trying to align some work there. All of this is done in a political climate that is looking at higher education in a very systematic way in Indiana and certainly looking at how the 2-year and 4-year institutions collaborate and cooperate and this supports the campus goal to increase baccalaureate degree production and STEM disciplines.

Program-level Learning Outcomes – This is really a non item for most of our school because of our ABET accrediting discipline specific agencies we have them in place for most of our programs already. The campus accreditor, from the Higher Learning Commission – North Central Association asks that every program establish assessable program level learning outcomes, what should the student know and be able to do at the time of degree completion. All of our ABET, CIDA, and NASM accredited programs have this requirement satisfied. The OLS program, certificate programs, and the MS program all need to have program level learning outcomes established and to the Dean’s office by February 1, 2011.

Space and Scheduling – Many people attended the Lunch-n-Learn on transitioning courses to hybrid and/or online delivery. Hundley thanked people who attended from both engineering and technology. A lot of assistance is available from UITS, CTL, CNC and the Dean’s office, and representatives from all of these offices attended the meeting. One reason this is important besides promoting students to become more tech savvy, and leveraging our course management system, is space issues, especially general purpose classrooms. The Registrar’s office is asking that as we look to the future in our scheduling that we try to schedule courses, especially those that will need general inventory classrooms, to look at non-standard times to schedule our courses. When we teach during prime time only this poses problems regarding an allocation of space and also hurts our students because a lot of core courses the student needs conflict with each other and can potentially hurt the student due to scheduling issues. Hundley advised your assistance with this will be greatly appreciated. We will discuss more during the next scheduling cycle for the future. Please look at how you may be able to reallocate some of you courses; this would be helpful.

The non-prime time slots are:

- 7:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.
- 9:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.
- 12:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.
- 4:30 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.
- Friday – only and weekend classes
- Off-campus at Greenwood, Park 100, and Carmel
- Non-standard times are difficult to accommodate in general inventory classrooms

Capital Campaign – The campaign kicked off on Saturday, October 9, at the Campus Center. This is the day after Bloomington’s capital campaign closed, and raised over \$1B. We had a big showing on the campus and three initiatives in particular under the School of E&T profiled were: Dr. Lauren Christopher’s research, TASI-Delphi partnership, and Motorsports Engineering. It is nice to note this because in a lot of discussions and areas that are promoted the IU brand is certainly prominent. These initiatives will help promote the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology name within the IUPUI campus. The goal that has been announced is \$1.25B, a very ambitious goal. IUPUI has raised over \$850M so far. There are four broad goals around which the capital campaign is organized.

These goals are:

- Supporting student success
- Excelling as center for health and life sciences
- Championing civic engagement
- Thriving as an urban research campus

We touch on all four of these and do quite a good job in all four of them. We will have more information as the campaign continues.

Lunch-n-Learns – upcoming programs: Creating and Enhancing International Learning Opportunities for Students (November 3). See the attached report for Lunch-n-Learns in the spring semester.

Discussion:

Charlie Feldhaus questioned the program level learning outcomes; process wise if Dr. Hundley perceived the master programs will have to be approved by the Graduate Education Committee. What does the Dean's office look at in terms of the process for the graduate level programs? Hundley noted that we need the program level learning outcomes that are legitimate and accessible for your program. If you are in an accredited program the accrediting body calls for a very stakeholder driven process to be involved. If you are not, and the MS program is not, it would be helpful if you embodied the best practices to do this. If you would like to get them in and then have some concurrent validation after you get them in that would be fine. We essentially should get program level learning outcomes to campus in February. Feldhaus questioned the process and approval. Razi Nalim noted that graduate programs that are not accredited by an external agency should be reviewed by an internal process that ensures we have good quality graduate programs. Nalim would like the Assessment program to help the graduate programs this year in this area. Karen Alfrey noted in terms of the campus level there is a lot of discussion regarding principles of graduate learning. John Schild questioned if program level learning outcomes are tied to the degree program. Hundley noted that the program level learning outcomes are tied to the degree program.

Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs

Dr. Razi Nalim gave a brief summary on external grants. As of September 30, 2010, the total is \$4.9M; this is good progress, \$2M of this is earmarked (federal government funds). We are trying again this year for earmark grants, and have some proposals in the internal process.

On the graduate side, the Dean would like to look at strategies to expand the base budget. Dr. Russomanno is interested in providing support for research students to match the level of research activity we have now. Discussion is ongoing as to how this will happen in the base budget. Related to this, block grant applications will be due this fall sometime; as soon as Nalim receives information from campus he will forward it to the school.

Cliff Goodwin questioned what earmark money was. Nalim advised that earmark is congressionally directed funding from the federal government and the school has 3 grants so far. The advantages of earmark funds is funding that is not normally available to us through the competitive process through federal agencies. We go to Congress and asking them to write legislation that so many dollars will be given to IU through federal agencies. Potentially this could come from any federal agency.

Ken Rennels asked how the \$4.9M year to date compares to last year; Nalim is not sure if we are up from last year at this time. Grant accounting dates depends on when contracts were signed.

Budgetary Affairs Committee

Sarah Koskie advised the committee met and asked for more information.

Computing Resources Committee (CRC)

Connie Justice noted CRC will meet this month. Justice is part of the IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee, which met yesterday. The notes from these meetings are extremely lengthy. Justice will give highlights from these meetings during future Faculty Senate meetings and will forward the complete minutes to faculty via email. Ken Rennels advised this would be fine.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

John Schild noted there is still some confusion by the committee as to how the committee should proceed on aligning our school bylaws as they address the membership on the P&T committee and the recommendation from the school. Schild advised they are waiting for some feedback from others. Schild was hoping to discuss with Dr. Russomanno; Ken Rennels suggested inviting Dr. Russomanno to a Constitution and Bylaws Committee meeting.

Graduate Education Committee

Charlie Feldhaus advised the committee met on October 4th, and Dean Nalim attended. The committee discussed graduate recruitment and retention, Graduate programs assessment, and IUPUI Graduate school responsibilities. Feldhaus noted with regard to the graduate school programs Purdue West Lafayette has now walked away from the graduate piece that they support in terms of administration, and all masters programs that they support will now be handled here on the IUPUI campus through Sherry Queener's office. The committee had a good discussion about relationships with Purdue West Lafayette in terms of Ph.D. and M.S. programs, and discussed some interdisciplinary cross cutting programs to consider in terms of Ph.D. or M.S. degrees either within the School of Engineering and Technology or with other units on campus. There was also a brief discussion regarding assistance for students from the University of Tehran. Feldhaus mainly wanted to advise of the committee discussion.

Grievance Board – No Report

Faculty Affairs Committee

Cliff Goodwin advised the Faculty Affairs Committee met on September 22. The committee prioritized their tasks for this semester according to complexity.

The compensation policy for overload teaching is the first item the committee worked on. The committee requested a motion from Faculty Senate to accept the changes the committee has put in place regarding the compensation policy. Goodwin distributed information on the current policy and changes they are requesting.

The main item that will change is with regards to visiting lecturer/lecturer compensation. Over the years this has affected lecturers who are asked to teach an overload. Goodwin tried to find out when this policy was adopted, and went back to 2003; this policy has been around and is used in making compensation decisions.

Sarah Koskie questioned where the \$5,000 overload amount came from. Some noted the amount should possibly be increased. Goodwin believes the figure came from the idea that if you teach 10 ECH's, 3 or 4 courses, that you are paid one month's salary. Should you get an entire month's salary for teaching just one course? Discussion centered on what the basic average is, maybe this is not much incentive.

Pat Fox proposed that the overload payment be one month's salary for teaching an overload, 3 credit hour course. The amendment is now changed from \$5,000 to one month's salary not to exceed \$5,000. Goodwin questioned if a person should get one month's salary teaching one course, and also get one month's salary when teaching three courses.

Ken Rennels noted the following: Faculty Senate requests an amendment to modify the policy to remove the phrase "not to exceed \$5,000" in two places. The motion passed unanimously.

Mark Bannatyne noted that faculty are encouraged to have a variety of different courses, questioned if the “16 week” wording on the policy should be clarified by credit hour or contact hour, rather than by week. Rennels noted that a 3 credit hour course could be taught in 4 or 8 weeks for example; others noted the course requires the same amount of work.

Ken Rennels noted the following: Faculty Senate requests an amendment to modify the policy to: strike the phrase “or is taught for shorter than a regular 16 week semester.” The motion passed unanimously.

John Schild questioned the reason to crossing out the visiting lecturer statement; Schild remembered when the policy was instituted and it was to prevent visiting lecturers from having to teach an overload course. Goodwin noted that the committee felt visiting lecturers and lecturers should be included in the policy so they are not separated out if they teach an overload.

Ken Rennels questioned sending the policy back to the committee to make some changes; Cliff Goodwin requested Faculty Senate to finalize the policy during the meeting.

Ken Rennels called the motion for Faculty Senate to vote on the compensation policy for overload teaching as amended. The motion passed unanimously to accept the overload teaching policy as amended. The finalized policy is noted:

Compensation Policy for Overload Teaching

Passed by ET Senate 10/12/10

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 semester-long, three-credit course. If a course has less than three credit hours, then appropriate proportion of a month's salary is paid.

Faculty Requirements Discussion:

Cliff Goodwin asked everyone to think about the idea of having only master trained faculty, including part time faculty, to teach your courses. The Faculty Affairs Committee is looking at this issue next. Pat Fox noted she felt we already had to do this. Stephen Hundley noted some context...the regional accreditor does not speak to this. The campus has a framework around the expectations of faculty, including adjunct qualifications. The regional accreditor notes the presumption that those faculty teaching have one level higher than the degree level they are teaching; for example, if you are teaching at the B.S. level the instructor should have a M.S. degree. The regional accreditor advised the institution should have a policy and a process for evaluating faculty who have experience where there would be exceptions to this requirement. Hundley has asked the Faculty Affairs Committee in conjunction with the chairs to develop a policy and process for evaluation. Hundley noted we are one of the units that have a lot of adjuncts who were hired on the basis of experience. The administration line is not “don’t do it,” but if you are going to

do it make sure to have a policy and process that can be applied to evaluate the faculty qualifications if they do not have a M.S. degree.

Goodwin reminded everyone if you have ideas or thoughts, please let your representative or him know. Faculty Affairs Committee meets the first Monday of every month.

Nominations – No Report

Resource Policy Committee – No Report

Student Affairs Committee – No Report

Undergraduate Education Committee

Nancy Lamm advised the Undergraduate Education Committee has one action item. The Undergraduate Education Report can also be found under Attachment 3 at the end of this report.

Lamm advised they have a request to change the course title for OLS 45700 in accordance with a request from the Fort Wayne campus. The current title is: Contemporary Supervisor Training Issues; proposed new title is: Human Resource Development. The course has evolved from a focus on training to be an overview of the entire human resource development function.

Faculty Senate unanimously approved the course title change for OLS 47500 to Human Resource Development.

Lamm advised the committee has a number of information items; these items do not require senate approval.

Item 1 – Academic Misconduct Process

The first item is the change in the appeals process for academic misconduct. The current process for appeal is first to a faculty member, then Department Chair, then the Associate Dean's office, and then the Appeals Committee. The new process would eliminate the Associate Dean's office. Having the Associate Dean involved may be a conflict of interest. There have not been a huge number of appeals in the past. Lamm advised the committee heard from Tralicia Lewis and this change would be more in line with the campus. The committee voted to eliminate the Associate Dean from the process for this year.

Discussion regarding new process for academic misconduct:

Elaine Cooney questioned what she should tell the students; previously she advised the students to go see the Associate Dean. Stephen Hundley noted that we have more steps in the process than anyone else on campus, and since the Associate Dean sits on the Appeals Committee this could be considered a conflict of interest. Hundley noted eliminating the Associate Dean in the process pushes the appeal down to the department level; the faculty members and Department Chair will know the issues best. It will be best to resolve the appeal between the faculty member and the student at the department level. The Department Chair can include the Associate Dean for consultation, which Hundley encouraged. In terms of the Dean's office being involved, since the Associate Dean is on the Appeals Committee this person should be removed from the process. Hundley noted the Appeals board is the last stop. Pat Fox questioned who the Appeals Committee is comprised of. Hundley noted the Appeals Committee is comprised of three members of the Undergraduate Education Committee, two students from the Engineering Technology Student Council, and the Associate Dean (Stephen Hundley). The Associate Dean serves as the

coordinating entity of this committee. Karen Alfrey noted the Associate Dean position would not make a decision but rather explain the appeals process. Cliff Goodwin is concerned with the change in process, because many grievances were stopped at the level of Associate Dean. Hundley believes if you bring the Associate Dean into the Department Chairs meeting to get some advice up front this will be helpful; Hundley advised they are one phone call or email away. Mark Bannatyne questioned if there was any institutional policy that stipulates the chair's role in this process. Stephen Hundley is not aware of any particular policy; Hundley noted we had to re-affirm our process last year. The Appeals Board for Academic Misconduct had not been used for many years. The Office of Rights and Responsibilities helped with this process. Ken Rennels questioned where our school policy was documented for students. Hundley noted we need to distribute this information for our students.

Item 2 – Residency Policy

Nancy Lamm said there have been questions regarding the extent to which credit by credentials and credit from other Purdue campuses count toward residency. The Undergraduate Education Committee discussed the current policy. The committee agreed to reaffirm the current policy which is in the current bulletin. Resident study at IUPUI means only courses taken at IUPUI. Students would still need to meet all of the program requirements. Ken Rennels questioned if MAT fell under these rules; MAT faculty agreed they fall under these rules also.

IUPUI Faculty Council

Cliff Goodwin, Mark Bannatyne and Stephen Hundley are the current representatives. IUPUI Faculty Council met on October 5th. Goodwin summarized as noted.

1. Bantz spoke about the firing of the coach for the women's basketball team without cause.
2. Bantz was very proud of the Multi-Cultural Center, Adaptive Education Services Center, and the Veterans Center that are housed at various locations on the campus. The Veterans Center is housed in the Student Center.
3. IUPUI received another prestigious award from Washington, D.C. on Civic Engagement; Chancellor Bantz went to Washington to accept the award.
4. Raises were discussed.
5. Dean searches for University College, School of Science, and Vice Chancellor for Student Life are all going well.
6. Jack Windsor, who is president, discussed the new Health Engagement program, which is somewhat controversial to faculty. There are efforts being made to reduce this controversy.
7. One area of interest, that Goodwin heard in the Executive Faculty Council is a list of suggestions or concerns that the Graduate Student President sent to Michael McRobbie and the Board of Trustees. One item on this list was to encourage the use of Oncourse...the student wanted to make it a policy. There was discussion about this, but the committee felt it would be hard to enforce. Goodwin noted the idea of using Oncourse in an intricate way was the essence of the request. Other items on the request included a reading day prior to final exams and giving final exams within the accepted time period, because this is not totally observed.

8. A General Education curriculum was also discussed which will come our way. Begin to think about what this may mean to your program.
9. Discussed the video surveillance and HIPPA adherence; perception that we will be filmed at all times and in all places. Connie Justice noted this was also discussed at the IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee and there have been concerns voiced by the campus, questioning where it will be applied. Justice noted it will not be put in the education arena, but will be used in the main facilities areas. Goodwin noted one controversy is if it were installed in hospitals where they could see people entering and exiting the hospital, with regard to HIPPA.

Note:

Pat Fox noted she saw a heart defibulator installed in the hallway of the SL building; questioned if there are more of these, if we will receive information on this.

The meeting ended at 12:00 p.m. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, November 9, 2010, 11:00 a.m. in SL 165.

Dean's Report
October 13, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Promotion and Tenure

P&T candidates were required to submit on-line dossiers this year. The process has gone relatively well. In one case, a candidate has exceeded the page limit for documenting scholarly work. The additional material must be removed from the dossier and moved to the supplementary materials which are stored in the dean's office for primary and unit board review. Dossiers are stored in a directory on the G: drive and have been made available to unit board P&T committee members to review. Unit board recommendations are due to the dean's office no later than October 21.

Raises

Raise recommendations for faculty and staff have been entered into the system by Sherri Alexander. Raises were recommended by the department chairs or direct supervisors given a 3% pool from their direct reports. There were separate 3% pools for faculty, PL staff, and CL staff. I made some additional recommendations for raise supplements from funds of those not receiving raises (for example, Yurtseven, Russomanno, and others hired since June 30, 2010) but whose salaries were part of the 3% pool. The office of Finance and Administration are reviewing the recommended raises. Notification of the raises will not be provided before they are approved. Raises are targeted to take effect on November 1.

Budget

The School has exceeded the estimated credit hour projection for Fall 2010 which has generated a strong cash position. The dean's office will be working with the Budgetary Affairs Committee and others on strategies to increase the base budget and decrease the cash position. Increasing the base budget will facilitate more systematic allocation of resources as the School's strategic plan evolves.

Research and External Funding

The dean's office is working toward publishing all research awards on-line. In the interim, Razi Nalim will provide an update on research awards since the last meeting as part of his report. Ronnie Sartain from the U.S. Army Research Laboratory in Adelphi, MD is on campus today and tomorrow meeting with a variety of faculty within the School to learn more about their research capabilities. Ronnie has worked extensively with me in the past on various research projects. Kevin Roper from the U. of Memphis will be on campus on Wednesday. He is the Executive Assistant to the President of the U. of Memphis for Government Relations. He works with elected officials on legislative and funding issues on behalf of the U. of Memphis. In

addition, he coordinates with faculty on federal and agency funding for research programs and with state legislators and officials on capital funding and legislative and contract issues. He will be meeting with a variety of researchers and administrators pursuing opportunities for collaboration between U. of Memphis and IUPUI.

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

Report from Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Undergraduate Programs

October 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

ABET, Inc. Visit

- EAC Team visited IUPUI Sunday, September 19-Tuesday, September 21
- BME, CmpE, EE, and ME are all underwent ABET review during this cycle
- Overall, very positive outcomes; some concerns (all) and weaknesses (CmpE; EE; ME) to address
- No ABET preparations this year; TAC programs will undergo ABET review in 2012
- We will use this year to review and harmonize some of our approaches and processes

Accelerated Improvement Process (AIP) Project

- Goal: identifying and supporting high-potential undergraduates and encouraging them to pursue E&T-based graduate programs
- Thursday, October 14, 8:30am-12:30pm; AIP meeting to map out processes related to this project
- E&T will have 11 individuals participating in this event and we will likely have some follow-up action meetings after the initial AIP meeting

Articulation Agreements with Ivy Tech

- Several Engineering programs (CmpE; EE; Energy; ME) have signed or plan to sign articulation agreements with Ivy Tech for A.S. in Pre-Engineering to baccalaureate Engineering programs; the target-date for this to occur in December 1 (BME and Motorsports are on back-burner for now)
- Several Technology departments (CILT; DCT; ENT) need to review and update articulation agreements this year; we will use November/December to have internal discussions to identify issues/priorities and 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
- To support these efforts and align assessment/continuous improvement activities, Ivy Tech colleagues will join E&T Assessment Committee starting with October 2010 meeting
- These agreements support goal of increased baccalaureate degree production in STEM disciplines

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

Space and Scheduling

- Increased interest in transitioning courses to hybrid and/or online delivery in E&T; assistance from CTL, UITS, CNC, and Dean's office is available
- Campus is asking for more general inventory classroom offerings to be scheduled in "non-prime time" slots:
 - 7:30 am–8:45 am
 - 9:00 am–10:15 am
 - 12:00 pm–1:15 pm
 - 4:30 pm–5:45 pm
 - Friday-only and weekend classes
 - Off-campus at Greenwood, Park 100, and Carmel
 - Non-standard times are difficult to accommodate in general inventory classrooms

Capital Campaign Kickoff

- Saturday, October 9 in the IUPUI Campus Center; E&T initiatives profiled:
 - Dr. Lauren Christopher's research
 - TASI-Delphi partnership
 - Motorsports Engineering (video)
- \$1.25B goal announced, organized around 4 goals:
 - Supporting student success
 - Excelling as center for health and life sciences
 - Championing civic engagement
 - Thriving as an urban research campus

Past and Upcoming E&T Lunch-n-Learn Professional Development Programs

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

**Undergraduate Education Committee Report
October 12, 2010**

Action Item

- Request to change course title for OLS 47500 in accordance with request from the Fort Wayne campus.
Current title: Topics: Contemporary Supervisor Training Issues
Proposed new title: Human Resource Development
Rationale for change: Current title is cumbersome and does not adequately describe the content of the course. Course has evolved from a focus on training to be an overview of the entire human resource development function.

The Undergraduate Education Committee recommends approval of the title change.

Information items:

- Change in appeals process for academic misconduct. The current process is to appeal first to Faculty Member, then Department Chair, then Associate Dean's Office, then Appeals Committee. Because the Associate Dean is also on the Appeals Committee, there is a possibility of conflict of interest. Also the Associate Dean's Office step is not part of the process in other IUPUI Schools. So the new process would eliminate the Associate Dean's office from the process. The new process would be Faculty Member, then Department Chair, then Appeals Committee.

- Reaffirmation of the residency policy as stated in 2010 bulletin.

Undergraduate Engineering Requirements:

2. *Students must complete at least two semesters of resident study at IUPUI, and they must complete at least 32 credit hours of appropriate course work, of which 12 credit hours must be completed in the major at the junior level or higher. Students are also expected to complete the senior year in residence: however, with the approval of the dean, students who have had at least four semesters of resident study may complete a maximum of 20 credit hours of the senior year in another approved college or university. For the purpose of this rule, two summer sessions are considered equivalent to one semester.*

Undergraduate Technology Requirements:

BS Degree:

2. *Students must complete at least two semesters of resident study at IUPUI, and they must complete at least 32 credit hours of appropriate course work, of which 12 credit hours are required to be in the major at the junior level or higher. Students are generally expected to complete the senior year in residence; however, with the approval of the dean, students who have had at least four semesters of resident study may complete a maximum of 20 credit hours of the senior year in another approved college or university. For the purpose of this rule, two summer sessions are considered equivalent to one semester.*

AS Degree:

2. *Students must complete at least two semesters of resident study at IUPUI, and they must complete at least 15 credit hours of appropriate course work, of which 6 credit hours must be in the major. Students are generally expected to complete the entire second year in residence; however, with the approval of the dean of the school, students who have at least three semesters of resident study may complete a maximum of 16 credit hours of the second year in another approved college or university. For the purpose of this rule, two summer sessions are considered equivalent to one semester.*

The Undergraduate Education Committee voted to reaffirm the policy as stated.