

**Indiana University School of Social Work
Faculty Senate Agenda
February 15, 2013**

Attendance: S. Armstead, I. Barbosa, W. Barton, J. Bell, C. Black, L. Blackman, K. Bloomquist, S. Boys, K. Brandon, K. Byers, J. Carlson, M. Dale, J. Daley, C. Davis, S. Dennis, E. Fitzgerald, G. Folaron, S. Gass, C. Gentle-Genitty, J. Hall, M. Harris, C. Hostetter, P. Howes, S. Khamis, H. Kim, K. Lay, L. Lecklider, C. Luca-Sugawara, D. Lynch, G. Majewski, H. McCabe, C. Massat, K. Moffett, J. A. Murphy-Nugen, J. Nes, L. Olvey, A. Omorayo-Adenrele, A. Osborn, P. Ouellette, M. Patchner, C. Pike, C. Satre, R. Schneider, C. Snyder, R. Sovereign, V. Starnino, A. Tamburro, J. Thigpen, M. Thomas, R. Vernon, B., Wahler, M. Walker, B. Walton, B. Weiler, D. Wilkerson

Approval of November 16, 2012 Minutes.

Passed unanimously

Items for Our Consideration

1. Social Media Policy presented by Sherry Gass

Sherry moved for passage of the policy on social media as described below and passed by the BSW and MSW committees. Bob Vernon 2nd.

Social Media Policy for BSW and MSW Students

Students are expected to adhere to the standards and guidelines of the social work profession when interacting with classmates, field instructors and colleagues using social media or social networking sites such as, but not limited to, LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, MySpace, Flickr and LiveJournal. Establishing informal relationships with faculty and clients through social media and networking sites can make it difficult to maintain professional boundaries and are thus not appropriate.

Students should be aware that all social networking postings can potentially be made available to the public at large including their prospective clients, employers and colleagues. Privacy settings are never absolute, and confidential or personal information about peers, clients, and faculty should not be posted online. It is expected that students follow confidentiality standards in *both* face to face and online environments.

Before communicating online, students are cautioned to think through carefully their postings which reflect on themselves, their field agency, the IUSSW and the social work profession itself. All postings should be professional and respectful in tone including those “private” posts between site members. Violations of the NASW Code of Ethics as evidenced online can result in disciplinary action including an official student review and/or possible dismissal.

Note the applicable portions of the NASW Code of Ethics include: 2. SOCIAL WORKERS’ ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO COLLEAGUES 2.01 Respect and 2.02 Confidentiality; 4.06 Misrepresentation (a) Social workers should make clear distinctions between statements made and actions engaged in as a private individual and as a representative of the social work profession, a professional social work organization, or the social worker’s employing agency. (b)

Social workers who speak on behalf of professional social work organizations should accurately represent the official and authorized positions of the organizations; 5. SOCIAL WORKERS' ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE SOCIAL WORK PROFESSION 5.01 Integrity of the Profession (a) Social workers should work toward the maintenance and promotion of high standards of practice.

Discussion included information on what the current policy is and a clarification on why Labor Studies was not included. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Establishing Diversity Committee presented by Anita Osborn

Anita moved that we reinstate the Diversity Committee. Carolyn Gentle-Genitty seconded the motion

Anita's concerns include EuroAmerican students who are unable to understand culturagrams. She explained that IUPUI gathering is predominately white and gave example where IUPUI has not welcoming to persons of color. She suggested that we might want to look at where we were, are and want to be.

Northwest expressed similar concerns suggesting that it's not just IUPUI but all campuses.

Carolyn Gentle-Genitty said that many students who come from IVY Tech have the most difficulty.

JB, would like to resurrect committee with focus on both recruitment as well as retention. She asked, Once students are here—how do we nurture them? She said that GLBTQ students do not always speak up in class for fear of retaliation.

Kathy B. talked about student strikes in Bloomington. There were promises to increase diversity on campus which has not yet been realized.

Ed asked about the charge for the committee? Kathy L. suggested that the committee should work with respective committees on campus e.g. Diversity department on this campus. Bob V. suggested that one charge is recruitment, welcoming and integration of the 14 categories from CSWE.

Anita added that students feel like they can't talk about their faith.

Ginny suggested that if not a committee, than task force. She suggested that we identify the campus committees. In her work on the self-study she tried to collect surveys on diversity climate on all campuses. She supported the idea that a group be formed that comes up with its charge.

Anita added that it should include first generation college.

The leadership of such a committee was discussed and JB asked why the leadership has to be a tenure-track faculty. Ed said it depends on how welcoming we want to be within campus; but there might be legitimate issues of perceived power and authority. Mike P. said issues of non-tenure and tenure track is longstanding issue in higher ed; this School has historically not made this distinction with exception of P& T; operate as one family. Faculty are faculty. He agree that this is an artificial distinction; non-tenure, full-time faculty could take charge; don't want to go down this path b/c it introduces division

Membership was also discussed. Ginny suggested we include staff; Sheila added students.

MOTION: Bob moved that we create a change in constitution to establish a standing diversity committee. Phil-seconded. Carolyn added that the direct committee revisit former document; "the former document limited its focus to African-Americans and Latino populations and that consideration needs to be given to other diverse under-represented populations."

The motion passed unanimously

Anita is interested in co-chairing. Bob V—volunteered to co-chair.

3. Changes to End-of Semester course evaluations presented by Cathy Pike

Cathy proposed a standard platform for evaluating courses and provided the following rationale: (1) Create a standard End-of-Course evaluation for both face-to-face and online teaching, (2) Make section titles relevant to item content, and (3) make evaluations more about the course in which students were enrolled and less about instructor characteristics.

Changes included a shift would emphasis student effort rather than content; instructor effectiveness to course effectiveness. She explained that instructor enthusiasm doesn't come across on-line. Instructor values diversity was deleted. Deleted that instructor understands clear understanding of content. Instructor evaluate work in fair manner there are other mechanisms to address this. Instructor cares about student was deleted. Questions are out of date for on-line courses. Course objectives should be the same for each course. Open ended questions were tweaked a tiny bit.

Motion was made to accept changes in course evaluation to make evaluation usable across all platforms.

Change from instructor to course was explained in terms of critical thinking. Ed suggested that course delivery facilitated critical thinking. Carol H. was concerned about divorcing the instructor from the course. Also concerned about shift from active to passive voice. Suggest that open ended questions – challenging needs to be defined. On line communication can be measured. Marquita was concern that if the instructor effectiveness is taken out and replaced with effectiveness of course it would impact P&T. Bill said that there are two distinct purposes for evaluation tools – what we need to know to improve what we do. The other is the evaluation of the faculty member to demonstrate to a review committee that you are a good teacher. Maybe we need to look to other schools that have an on-line presence. Summative needs matrix. Other is less quantifiable. Kathy B. Doesn't understand the basic assumption that we need to divorce faculty from course.

The vote failed with Approved -17 ; Opposed -21; Abstain-7.

Jim pointed out that two partner campuses have unanimous opposed. Carol H. offered to redesign the evaluation tool. Marquita should also be included due to extensive experience with on-line teaching.

4. Chair BSW Curriculum Committee – Adding Course Objective S460 – presented by Andrea Tamburro

Andrea proposed that scholarly writing be included in the process of changing course number and would like to include additional objective to include a presentation and change to four credits from 3.

Rationale: Students who are getting financial aid must take an additional course over the summer to keep aid. It is intense and the workload is 4 hours of work. It's an elective. Four hours is full time for a grade school. Ginny wondering if how this compares to other writing courses throughout the university.

Approved unanimously

5. *Interprofessional Education (IPE) Center presented by James Hall*

Point of information - Center for Interprofessional Health Education and Practice directed by Judith Halstead, executive associate dean for academic affairs at the IU School of Nursing. This Center will facilitate the engagement of students and faculty from the various health and life sciences schools to collaborate in the classroom and clinical setting in an effort to deliver higher quality, more comprehensive patient care. The Center will also be responsible for implementing, integrating and evaluating interprofessional health education programs and exemplary practice sites and translating outcomes into collaborative practice models. Jim is coordinating a committee for the center (one of eight) which currently includes Jim Hall, Susan Larimer, Heather McCabe and Jennifer Anderson. The center will be hiring assistant deans. If you are interested in interdisciplinary training at a 25% positions please look for notice. Contracts start July 1.

6. *Faculty professional and scholarship updates – Network Magazine – presented by Rob Schneider*

Rob Schneider is interested in improving section in school magazine on faculty updates. The next issue will be showcasing faculty publications. Magazine goes out to alumni and all schools of social work throughout the country. Jo Varga wrote a good description of Right to Work bill. This has been requested by several unions. ***Please provide research reports and Rob will edit it into an article.***

Mike P. added that we need to showcase faculty work if we want to move into the top 20. ***Don't be modest. Just send Rob materials.*** He will interview you and work with materials.

7. *Status of Field Education – “Where do we go from Here?” presented by Sheila Dennis and Sabrina Sullenberger*

Sheila Dennis – Introduced field education for further discussion in our next meeting. Want to look at culture of field as a school knowing there will be individual nuances.

Old Business

Anita -Scholars program – 50 candidates for 30 slots this year.

Andrea – recognition of good work for site visit.

Adjourn 11:28