March 10, 2015

Representatives in Attendance: Sohel Anwar, Sally Catlin (alternate), Lauren Christopher (alternate), Mohamed El-Sharkawy, Charlie Feldhaus, Pat Fox, Patrick Gee, Marj Hovde, Julie Ji, Sarah Koskie, Hongbo Liu, David Mannell (alternate), Sungsoo Na, Chris Rogers, Paul Salama, Joseph Wallace, Likun Zhu

Guests: Doug Acheson, Karen Alfrey, Cori Renguette, Dr. Russomanno, John Schild, Wanda Worley

Presiding: Joy Starks, President

Meeting began at 11:00 a.m.

Joy Starks asked everyone to look at the agenda for the meeting, and the minutes from the February 2015 meeting after there was a quorum. 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 members via the E&T Faculty email at least one week prior to each Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made to accept the February 2015 minutes; all approved. The agenda for the March 2015 meeting was approved.

**Dean’s Report**

Dr. Russomanno presented the following report.

Dr. Russomanno advised the school recently had their second annual Connections event. This is a networking event for our women students, alumni, and industry partners. The attendance exceeded last year’s attendance. Last year 80 attended. Dr. Russomanno advised we had a particularly good turnout from our women alumni. One particular alumna had a group of our young women engineer and technology students around her. This was a great event, and is one specific outcome that came from merging our school diversity committee with the DIAC diversity committee. Those two committees were combined, so we have industry and faculty and staff working hand in hand.

We had our MS Tech program review recently. Dr. Russomanno anticipates what will follow from this review in a similar direction that we did with the advising review. A task force will look over the report, which should be available in another month. The task force will review the details and findings, and propose recommendations. Dr. Russomanno believes that John Schild will lead the task force, and then will have an implementation team to plan detailed actions.

Dr. Russomanno noted that Tami Tarpley, Assistant Dean for Development and External Relations, accompanied him on a trip to California last week. Dr. Russomanno had the opportunity to meet with a former graduate student of his at U.C. Berkeley, and while he was there she gave him a tour of their maker space. Dr. Russomanno took some photos and forwarded them to Jie Chen and the team who is planning on developing a maker space. The Stutz building is a possible location for maker space. The team is getting close to making recommendations for improvements that we need for the space as part of the lease negotiations that IU real estate will conduct on our behalf. Dr. Russomanno also visited with Google Foundation, the philanthropic arm, of Google. Dr. Russomanno also visited with some of our alums on the Google campus itself in Mountain View. Dr. Russomanno spent one afternoon on the campus, which he noted was very impressive.
Dr. Russomanno and Tami also went to San Diego for the day, and had the opportunity to visit with Ghassan Kassab. Ghassan is a former BME faculty member who left us to start his own research institute in La Jolla, CA. He has a basic science corporation that currently has four NIH R01’s. Ghassan advised he is writing more NIH grants than ever before. He has the basic science arm, and he has the for profit corporation in an adjacent hallway but keeps the enterprises separate and distinct. Ghassan is still a substantial donor to our school. He remains a significant connection for a variety of opportunities. Lauren Christopher will be speaking with him, which is an outcome from Dr. Russomanno’s visit. He is doing some work in 3D segmentation of echocardiograms, which fits well with Lauren’s expertise. Besides possible research collaboration, there is a host of other connections between us and the Silicon Valley of the health and life sciences.

Lastly, Dr. Russomanno was visited this morning by Mark Smith, Dean of the Graduate School at Purdue, West Lafayette. The meeting was requested by Dean Smith. Dr. Russomanno views this as a continuation from the President Daniels and Provost Dutta visit back in December. The provost was here again in January. Dean Smith echoed the same theme that Provost Dutta had in wanting to see the school go forward in terms of our graduate portfolio and research, which was good to hear. Mark Smith also asked for a detailed list of issues that he can work on. John and Dr. Russomanno will work on this list. Some of the issues are already in progress so Dr. Russomanno did not go into any details yet with Mark.

**Associate Dean’s Report**

Dean Worley presented the following report. The Associate Dean’s Report can be found under Attachment 1 at the end of this report.

**Common Core**

We have 3 new E&T courses in the Common Core this year:

- **Cultural Understanding**
  - TCM 18000, Exploring Intercultural Technical Communication

- **Arts & Humanities**
  - MUS-L 100, Guitar Elect/Secondary
  - MUS-L 101, Beginning Guitar Class

We are gradually making headway in the Common Core.

**Blue Online Course Evaluation System**

Last semester we piloted Blue, a new evaluation system and had very good results. We had 8 faculty members participate, and we have 23 faculty members participating in the pilot this semester. We have 49 class sections participating, 5 different departments (CIGT, MAT, TLC, ENGT, and ME), and 6 different programs (CIT, CGT, MAT, TCM, CEMT, and ME). We will get a much better feel for the online evaluation system based on this semester’s pilot. Worley noted that the faculty who piloted the system last semester gave her feedback on the pros and cons of the system and she shared this with the person from eXplorance in Montreal, Canada, that she speaks with weekly via conference call. Rola at eXplorance was very pleased to get the feedback.

**Advising Review**
The Advising Review Task Force and the Reorganization Committee are hard at work. The reorganization committee met once last week and is in the process of analyzing the details of how to make the changes work. We are splitting the advisors from the New Student Academic Advising Center from the Freshman Engineering group. The advisors will eventually be moving over to be under Student Services with Career Advising. The Advising Review recommended that academic and career advising be moved together. As far as the Advising Review Task Force, Worley is currently setting up a meeting for April of all advisors in our School, which will include faculty and staff. From there, we will decide how often we want the advisors to meet. At a minimum, Worley believes the advising group should meet at least once a semester. We have a lot to do following the Advising Review recommendations.

Reminder

We have an ABET mock visit on March 23 and 24. All of our engineering programs, as well as CIT and CGT, will be in the ABET mock review. The real visit will happen in 2016.

Lunch ‘n Learn

The February Lunch ‘n Learn was a huge success and Worley thanked all who attended. We had our largest attendance for a Lunch ‘n Learn. Jason Spratt, Dean of Students, and Julie Lash, Director of CAPS, did the presentation on identifying and responding to troubling behaviors of our students on campus. The session was very informative.

The March Lunch ‘n Learn will be on Thursday, March 26; topic will be “Using Technology as a Collaborative Tool” in our classes. Erich Bauer will be leading the presentation.

Discussion

John Schild asked how Freshman Engineering will be managed. Worley advised that Freshman Engineering will stay where it is currently, under Academic Affairs. The advisors will be moved under Terri Talbert-Hatch and combined with career advising under Student Services. As of right now, physically, that move will be in the future sometime. But Freshman Engineering will stay where they are in SL and the advisors will move over to Student Services in ET. Karen Alfrey also noted there will be a new curriculum committee with representation from all of the engineering programs to oversee the academic aspects of Freshman Engineering.

Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs

Research

Dean Nalim was unable to attend the meeting. Joy Starks read the following report from Dr. Nalim.

Research

1) The School received $3.8 M in 30 external awards contracted as of February 28 this fiscal year to date with PI at the School. The lower level of new awards (compared 50 awards for $5.3 M same time last year), may reflect the loss of our top producer in recent years, but the number of awards being smaller is troubling.
2) Year to date, 85 proposals were submitted requesting $23.4 M. The lower level of proposals is even more troubling. (110 proposals requesting $46.3 M last year).
3) The School is on organizing an ‘Open Labs’ event on IUPUI Research Day, this year on Friday, April 17. About a dozen labs will participate.
4) The deadline to apply for Purdue Research Foundation funding for summer faculty research, doctoral student, and international travel is March 25th. The Graduate Education Committee will make selections.

**Graduate Programs**

John Schild presented the following report.

John Schild advised he continues to work with the Graduate Education Committee. Schild, along with some other representatives from the school, are on a strategic planning committee with Dr. Blum to help shape our path forward for the graduate programs on the IUPUI campus. This was a directive from Dr. Blum’s boss, Dr. Paydar. Hopefully this report will address some of the challenges that we encounter.

Schild has arranged a meeting with Dr. Phil Pope, Associate Dean of Graduate Programs, in West Lafayette, to come to the campus to meet and greet Dr. Blum. This will give Dr. Pope a sense of the tools and facilities and resources that we have here and what we are capable of accomplishing in terms of managing our graduate programs on this campus. We are subtly trying to leverage more and more autonomy.

**Discussion**

Sohel Anwar questioned working with Mark Smith, and giving him an agenda of our needs. John Schild advised the list has been presented and sent and dealt with for years at West Lafayette. Every month there is a council of deans meetings, with a sub-group that meets prior to that meeting. This group focuses on the regional campuses. Schild has been attending these meetings regularly for two years and every month he brings up something of our needs. Schild advised he has always been impressed with the magnitude of the machine, West Lafayette, and administration, with regard to the many moving parts that have to be engaged in order to move anything forward. Schild advised what we are seeing now is that a lot of things are coming together, at the same time this is true for the School of Science. Schild agrees that we could step up and be aggressive about our needs, but feels we should stay the course right now and keep the current momentum going.

Dr. Russomanno also noted that we are not sitting back, and there are a lot of things going on in the background. Dr. Russomanno advised that initially he was somewhat reluctant to put together a detailed list of issues for fear that those would be the focus versus a more important strategic direction. This has been Dr. Russomanno’s hesitancy in terms of coming up with an enumerated list. We have been pushing very boldly behind closed doors, even with the top most leadership at West Lafayette, including the president, in terms of some of our key priorities. Dr. Russomanno noted that our grass roots working relationship faculty to faculty, has been reinforced and a very positive thing particularly for our school. Dr. Russomanno noted that you can characterize it by looking at the legacy in both the School of Science and School of E&T, quite frankly, Science has been a little ahead of us in terms of maturity and evolution for the graduate programs, especially when looking at the numbers. If you look at the Ph.D. numbers, particularly in biology and chemistry, they are quite substantial. The way Dr. Russomanno worded his requests both to President Daniels and Provost Dutta that for us seeing what happens with the School of Science, with regard to a degree of autonomy in Ph.D. programs, is a future indicator for our path as well.

**Student Affairs Committee**

Julie Ji advised the Student Affairs Committee was asked to discuss the possibility of adding the No Smoking ban information in the syllabus. The committee discussed this, but the general consensus was that the syllabus was intended to advise on academic material related to the course. The Smoking Ban applies to everyone, including visitors to the campus. In fact, some of our instructors and staff are smokers. Ji noted that adding something about the Smoking Ban may get lost in the syllabus.
The Student Affairs Committee suggests possibly informing students separately in a different medium. For example, sending out emails during the semester and pointing them to the student handbooks. Ji advised at this time the committee was not recommending that this item be required in the syllabus.

**Budgetary Affairs Committee** – No Report

**Computing Resources Committee (CRC)** – No Report

**Constitution and Bylaws Committee**

John Schild noted that during the February Faculty Senate meeting there was a request for the Bylaws Committee to examine how our constitution and bylaws suggest the number of times that convocations are held. Schild presented the bylaws for the senate to see and recapped what is required.

Changes for the constitution are rather involved. Schild gave an overview of requirements for bylaws and amendment changes. Schild questioned Marj Hovde to confirm that in the past we have sent faculty changes and allowed two months for feedback for changes to the constitution and one month for amendments. We also let the Board of Trustees know of any changes to the constitution; amendments are handled more easily and efficiently. For amendments senators take changes back to their faculty, discuss them, and then the next meeting they vote on changes.

The convocation is mentioned in both the Constitution and Bylaws. Schild started with the bylaws, and noted the convocation was mentioned in two places. Originally the convocations were to be held once during each academic term, taken to be each semester, which is how the school has been handling convocations. The Bylaws committee looking for the simplest way to handle the change suggested changing the word “term” to “year.” In the bylaws and constitution there are several places within the bylaws that allow faculty to petition to collectively assemble and to petition the dean to form a convocation. The Dean has the ability to accept or deny the request, and then the faculty have the opportunity take the request on to the senate. A convocation can be requested or held anytime during a semester. This change does not preclude additional convocations, but there would only be one required convocation per year, most likely it would occur in August. The convocation is mentioned twice within the Constitution and Bylaws, page 5 from the constitution, and later on page 9, in the bylaws.

*Page 5 - Constitution*

I. CONVOCATIONS OF THE FACULTY

The Faculty shall be convened at least once during each regular academic term **year** to receive appropriate communications from the Dean of the School of Engineering and Technology. Business may be transacted by a quorum of fifty percent.

*Page 9 - Bylaws*

I. Convocations of the Faculty

A. The Dean of the School of Engineering and Technology shall call at least one convocation of the Faculty each **term academic year**. The Dean shall set and publicize the specific time and place of such convocations after consultation with the Agenda and Administrative Advisory Committee of the Senate.
Along with this change, there are other items in the constitution that are inconsistent with the current governance on our campus. For example, it specifically calls out vice presidents and a few other identifiers that do not accurately reflect the current administrative structure for our school. There are really a handful of changes that the committee could make. The committee could possibly work through these and make all of the changes in mass to bring the document up to date, and then bring back to Faculty Senate. Faculty could then review for a couple months, take a vote on the changes, notify the campus, and then forward the final document with changes to the Board of Trustees.

The committee is proposing to take action on the bylaws so that they can begin to proceed; there will be a period of inconsistency between the bylaws and constitution, and then the committee can proceed starting with the next academic school year having convocations just once per academic year. By the end of this term the Constitution and Bylaws committee will submit the changes for the constitution that they will act upon during the next academic term, fall 2015. Schild questioned if this were acceptable that is the first request from the committee and then ask that the senate vote on the sending the changes to faculty for review.

Discussion

Dr. Russomanno noted that he was aware of but did not initiate this request. As a Dean he has learned that you cannot communicate enough. Even if we had a speaker like high schools do to give an announcements every day that probably would not be enough. It is so hard to disseminate information. Dr. Russomanno is not sure that even if this were adopted that we would immediately go to one convocation per year. We have already got some traditions in place with acknowledging awards among longevity in the spring. Dr. Russomanno noted that one positive of this is that you have the pressure to get the convocation in during a certain time because we are obligated to from more of a statutory responsibility. Dr. Russomanno does not foresee a time that we will not have a convocation or some type of meeting during each semester. Dr. Russomanno does not want this to be seen as an attempt to decrease communication, when he feels it is very important that we increase communication.

Pat Fox believes that if we change the requirement that we will have less people attend. Fox questioned why the committee is looking at changing this. Schild advised they were assigned this task. Joy Starks advised this request was based on comments from the past faculty senate meeting. Wanda Worley noted that she had a few people say to her that they felt one convocation was sufficient because most new people, faculty and staff, start in August. There are not many new people that start in the spring, and that was one of the reasons. Also, sometimes it is difficult to get to campus in January due to the weather. Those were the reasons; they did not see a real reason to have it and it did not add much to their knowledge base for their job. Joy Starks advised she had more than one person contact her that it was a good idea (they wanted to remain anonymous). Starks advised it is up to the senate to leave it alone or discuss with their faculty.

Dr. Russomanno did note that there is no obligation to have it at the start of the semester. This has been a tradition, but maybe we could look at doing the convocation mid-semester during the spring semester, or possibly later in spring when you have more budgetary information. Dr. Russomanno noted it does not have to be at the start of the semester. Wanda Worley countered with Pat Fox that if this were in the bylaws that more people may not attend; Worley believes that if the Dean calls a convocation that faculty and staff will attend. Many people do not know what is in the bylaws in general. Marj Hovde noted that she was intrigued that it was not just communication from the Dean but also a time to vote on information. Hovde noted she liked the idea of having the convocation later in the spring semester because faculty are rushing to get ready for classes, etc.
Schild noted the senate members can now take this information back to your departments for discussion, to make a determination from faculty if we want to vote on this or not.

**Faculty Senate unanimously agreed to take this information back to the departments to discuss and clarify how senators will vote and whether to make any changes regarding number of convocations required during each academic year.**

**Graduate Education Committee**

Brian King asked John Schild to present the Graduate Education Committee report.

Two courses were approved by the Graduate Education Committee:

- ECE 52301/ME 52301 Nanosystems Principles
- ECE 52601/ME 52601 Integrated Nanosystems Processes and Devices

These courses are co-listed and co-taught with ECE and in the past have been listed under experimental numbers. These courses and the contents have been offered for many semesters and they are now formalizing the course numbers. This course information is presented to Faculty Senate for informational purposes.

**LaTeX for Thesis Documents**

Schild noted that during the February Faculty Senate meeting there was a discussion regarding thesis formatting. During the last Graduate Education Committee the thesis formatting requirements were discussed at some length and a formal statement was created. Brian King asked that the letter be presented and added to the Faculty Senate minutes. Schild read the letter to Faculty Senate during the meeting.

After reading the letter, Schild clarified that there is a mechanism out there that is fairly fool-proof. The LaTeX formatting has been used for many years, often the errors that occur are extremely minor and one review is sufficient to take care of everything. This review happens with Valerie Lim-Diemer or Summer Layton in the Graduate Office. Rarely does anything need to be done when using LaTeX. If there are other document typesetting or processors used they have not been very successful. Last month they received a thesis document that did not use LaTeX and it took a lot of time to get the document in good shape. Joy Starks asked why is the Graduate Education office responsible to review the document, shouldn’t the student and advisor bear that responsibility? Schild noted this is a matter of quality control. What has happened in the past, the quality of the level of review of critiquing was not to the point where only minor issues would be left in the document prior to going to West Lafayette. Some of this is image related and some is insuring our school puts their best foot forward. This is a major issue at the campus level. The Graduate Office on our campus advised the School of Science the documents needed to be submitted in better quality; Schild noted that graduations were being delayed due to problems related to the documents. Schild also clarified that the ultimate responsibility rests with the student and the advisor. Sarah Koskie noted that she wishes the document would go further and state that department resources should not be used to help students meet the guidelines. Koskie advised the people who are unwilling to learn LaTeX then send their students to Valerie Lim-Diemer or Sherrie Tucker and they take a tremendous amount of time. Schild advised this statement is to clarify that the committee supports the departments to implement this requirement. Our resources will not be dedicated to this editing service. Schild noted it is as gentle a way as we can from a committee perspective to get people to use LaTeX. Students should be advised that ultimately it could impact their graduation date if they do not use LaTeX.
Joy Starks noted she received a lot of feedback from the February Faculty Senate meeting regarding the use of LaTeX; Starks believes the document reads well and notes they have a choice, and the onus is upon the student. However, the Graduate Education Committee strongly urges the use of LaTeX. Marj Hovde suggested the document be added to the MS Tech website and could be added to the graduate handbooks.

The Graduate Education Committee letter dated 3/10/2015, Statement Concerning Style Standards for Thesis Formatting, can be found under Attachment 2 at the end of this report.

**Grievance Board** – No Report

**Faculty Affairs Committee** - No Report

**Nominations**

Doug Acheson advised that committee elections are coming up. Acheson will open nominations starting from 8:00 a.m. Friday, March 13 through midnight, Friday, March 27. Elections will take place starting Monday, March 30 and conclude on Friday, April 3 at 5:00 p.m. (Elections open one week). Election results will be reported at the April 14 Faculty Senate meeting; Chairs of committees will be selected during the April 14 meeting also. Acheson will contact the members of the Nominations Committee this week with an individualized list of all School committees and highlight positions that need to be replaced for each respective department.

**Resource Policy Committee**

Dan Baldwin was unable to attend the meeting. Joy Starks reported the following:

2015 Trustee Teaching Awards:

*Tenure / Tenure Eligible (3 awards)*

1. Charles Feldhaus
2. Afshin Izadian
3. Dan Koo

*Lecturer / Clinical Eligible (1 award)*

1. David Nickolich

**Undergraduate Education Committee**

Karen Alfrey gave the following report. Alfrey advised the committee had a number of course changes and new course requests.

*CIT New Course Request*

CIT 30400 Database Programming

This course has been previously approved by this body, made it forward into remonstrance, and was blocked by Computer Science. There was concern from Computer Science regarding overlapping course content. Discussion between CIT and CS has resolved the issues without any changes to the course. Alfrey noted the CIT and CSCI courses will be taught in alternating semesters (CIT in the fall, CSCI in
the spring). Although there are some differences in the two courses, each program will accept the other
program’s version of the course toward their own requirements.

There was no new vote on this course, CIT 30400, presented for informational purposes only.

The next set of courses is also more administrative than academic in nature.

**MET Course Change Requests**

Course change: MET 10200 Production Design & Specs
Course change: MET 11100 Applied Statics
Course change: MET 21100 Applied Strength of Materials
Course change: MET 22000 Heat/Power
Course change: MET 23000 Fluid Power

For the above courses, the “Repeatability” option is being changed to “No” in the IU system. It is already
correct in the Purdue system; a clerical error on the IU side resulted in the repeatability option being
switched to “Yes”. This paperwork simply corrects that error.

The committee voted unanimously to move these course changes forward to Faculty Senate for approval.

**Faculty Senate unanimously approved the above MET 10200, 11100, 21100, 22000, and 23000 course change requests.**

**MET Course Change Requests**

Course change: MET 20400 Production Drawing
Course change: MET 32000 Applied Thermodynamics

For these courses, the “Credit Type” is being changed to allow for 2 credits Lecture + 2 credits Lab
format. MET 32000 is taught on multiple campuses; the IUPUI MET department has gotten verbal
agreement from Purdue West Lafayette to make this change. The credit hours are the same, but will be
portioned differently. The committee voted unanimously to move these course changes forward to Faculty
Senate for approval.

**Faculty Senate unanimously approved the above MET 20400 and MET 32000 course change requests.**

**TCM New Course Request**

TCM 36200: Technical Proposal and Grant Writing

Cori Renguette from TCM was in attendance and advised this course was offered last semester as a
variable topic course due to students demand and now the department is requesting a permanent course
number. The course basically teaches students the basics of how to write technical proposals or apply for
grants. Alfrey noted this would be open to any student as an elective course. There are no graduate
students who have taken the course at this time. This is a 3 credit hour, hybrid course.

Sarah Koskie noted they require their graduate students to take TCM 46000, and questioned the
differences between the two courses and the writing requirements. Renguette advised both of the courses
require a lot of writing, but are very different course. The two programs will discuss further outside of
Faculty Senate.
Faculty Senate unanimously approved TCM 36200 new course request.

TCM 22200: Introduction to Technical Documentation (1 credit)
TCM 41500: Technical Communication for Design Projects (1 credit)

MET/ECET programs requested these 1.0 credit hour courses be developed as support of their technical courses to scaffold student learning of communication in the context of senior design and workplace environment. Although these courses are geared toward MET/ECET they can be taken by other students. Renguette advised TCM 22200 was designed for IT people who do a lot of coding, which requires a different type of documentation.

Faculty Senate unanimously approved TCM 22200 and TCM 41500 new course requests.

Transfer Courses – Common Core

Karen Alfrey advised that Nancy Lamm brought the committee up to date on current challenges in the process of getting transfer credit approved for inclusion as part of the Common Core. This process is managed by Admissions: By campus policy developed and approved by Faculty Council, requests for approval of transferred credit to apply toward the core are sent first to the relevant IUPUI department (i.e. transferred History courses are considered by the History department, etc.). If the department does not make a ruling on the request within seven days, the request reverts to Admissions.

In practice, the NSAAC generally has no trouble getting math, physics, and some other science courses approved to articulate to the core; but they get no responses from any liberal arts department. Furthermore, the Sharepoint system used to submit such requests includes no tracking mechanism – so requests are submitted, but there is no response either from the department or from Admissions and no way to know where in the process the course request has gotten hung up.

Because transfer student files cannot be moved out of the NSAAC and into departments until all their transfer credit has been articulated, this has created a significant barrier to moving student files out of NSAAC. Furthermore, these courses must be articulated in order for students to graduate – so if the problem persists, it could impede the graduation of many transfer students with unarticulated but degree- and Gen Ed-appropriate prior credit.

IUPUI Faculty Council

Joy Starks noted that we have two people from our school that are running for at-large member to the IUPUI Faculty Council; they are Brian King and Hiroki Yokota. You can vote if you are tenure or tenure track for these faculty to be on the committee. You should have received an email; Starks will forward the email if you did not receive it.

Charlie Feldhaus advised of the following information from the February 3, 2015, IUPUI Faculty Council meeting. Feldhaus does not believe that any E&T faculty were able to attend the March meeting.

The meeting was called to order by Ed Berbari.

Chancellor Bantz’s reported started with quite a few bills in the Indiana Legislature that were discussed. These bills were in reference to performance funding for universities.

- North Hall will begin construction in the spring. North Hall is the north corner of Blake and North streets. There will be a lot of parking spaces lost. This will be another student housing area.
- Fairbanks School of Public Health is undergoing accreditation.
- Becky Porter is retiring at the end of this year.
- Chris Foley has been named Assistant Vice President for IU Online Initiatives.
- There are two dean searches, one in Nursing and one in Liberal Arts.
- IUPUI has been named in the top 20 in the number of first professional degrees awarded in all universities in the United States.

The next report was from Marianne Wokeck, President of IUPUI Faculty Council.

- The IFC and Marianne’s group in IFC is doing some research on student evaluations and should present a report in the next couple of months, or by the end of school year. The report will look at whether the evaluations matter, what is looked at, along with other things.
- The school will have an internal search only for the replacement of Chancellor Bantz; this resulted from a discussion with President McRobbie.

New Business

At the meeting on February 3, there was some discussion, questioning why we were having an internal search, and not having an external search. This discussion resulted in a motion to complete a national search for IUPUI Chancellor, but this motion failed to garner a second motion. At this point Feldhaus believes we are still doing an internal search only.

Additional Reports

Melissa Levitt, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, then reported that she is studying and submitting preliminary data on tenure track, clinical, and lecturer faculty.

Currently we have:

- 12% lecturer
- 18% clinical
- 706 tenure track faculty

We have seen a significant growth in adjunct faculty, or associate faculty, on this campus.

Jack Windsor, Chair of Nominating Committee, read the nominations. As noted there are two from Engineering and Technology. These are for election slates for At-Large Members (tenure track, non-tenure track), Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel, and Board of Review. Feldhaus advised you have a total of 17; number to slate 34; committee slated 41.

Academic Affairs Committee, John Watson, reported on transfer credits, and advised there was no decision. There was also a PUL report that his committee is working on.

Budgetary Affairs Committee, Jack Windsor, had a quick discussion about parking. There were no decisions made.
Campus Planning Committee, Miriam Murphy, advised there is a current review of the bicentennial strategic plan for this campus.

Technology Committee, Sara Hook, presented a Canvas overview, and an IU Online overview with the new FAR.

Get ready for construction on Michigan Street; Michigan Street will become 4 lanes, 2 lanes each way. There will also be a bicycle lane on the sidewalk, they will expand the sidewalk.

For details on IUPUI Faculty Council meetings and meeting minutes, please look at their website: www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil.

**Purdue Intercampus Faculty Council and Purdue University Senate**

Purdue Intercampus Faculty Council and Purdue University Senate meetings combined:

Marj Hovde advised the Intercampus Faculty Council is now meeting monthly, and presented the following information.

Purdue North Central and Purdue Calumet, which are 35 miles apart, are in the process of unifying, at least administratively and they are discussing the implications of this for faculty governance. They are also discussing other areas, are they going to merge two math departments, and be on both campuses, or have two separate math departments. They are also discussing what will happen to faculty tenure if areas are combined. This does not directly affect IUPUI faculty.

Purdue West Lafayette administration came up with a new leave policy for faculty and staff. Purdue West Lafayette had a meeting regarding this new policy, around 750 people, mostly staff attended. The new policy states that staff will go from 31 to 25 days off per year. Most in attendance were quite irate; Purdue has put this on hold. Hovde noted that another thing that emerged is if Purdue is acting like a system that this policy will affect all Purdue campuses and they did not take this into account. The policy is being revised and will need to be discussed by the regional campuses.

Hovde noted the P&T guidelines revision is still ongoing.

There was a proposal that they get rid of end of semester course evaluations and do mid-semester evaluations instead. There was not a lot of support for this.

Salaries and attracting good people was also discussed.

The next Purdue University Senate meeting will be on March 23.

**Old Business**

**New Business**

The meeting ended at 12:20 p.m. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 14, 2015, 11:00 a.m. in SL 165.
FACULTY SENATE REPORT
ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS
March 10, 2015
Submitted by Wanda L. Worley

UPDATES

1) COMMON CORE UPDATE
   We have 3 new E&T courses accepted in the Common Core:
   Cultural Understanding
   • TCM 18000 (Exploring Intercultural Technical Communication)
   Arts & Humanities
   • MUS-L 100 (Guitar Elect/Secondary)
   • MUS-L 101 (Beginning Guitar Class)

2) BLUE
   • As you know, IUPUI is piloting a new online course evaluation system, called BLUE.
   • The company is eXplorance, Montreal, Canada.
   • Participating this semester 23 Faculty (8 last semester); 49 Class Sections; 5 Different
     Departments (CIGT, MAT, TLC, ENT, ME); 6 Different Programs (CIT, CGT, MAT, TCM,
     CEMT, ME)

3) ADVISING REVIEW
   • The Advising Review Task Force and the Reorganization Committee are busy at work.
   • The Reorganization Committee has met once and begun analyzing the many details involved in
     splitting freshman engineering and the Advising Center and the combining career advising with
     academic advising under Student Services.
   • I’m currently in the process of setting up an all-academic E&T advising meeting in April. We
     will decide at that meeting how often the group wants to meet, but the minimum will be once a
     semester. The goal is to improve communication and consistency in advising across the School.

REMINDER
• ABET: Several programs will be participating in a mock visit on March 23 and 24. I emailed the
  program Self-Studies Thursday, March 5. Programs include Biomedical Engineering (BME),
  Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE), Mechanical Engineering (ME), Motorsports
  Engineering (MSTE), Energy Engineering (EEN), Computer and Information Technology (CIT),

LUNCH ‘N LEARN
• Our February Lunch ‘n Learn was a huge success. We had the largest attendance to date. Thank
  you to those who attended. Also thanks to Jason Spratt, dean of students, and Julie Lash, director
  of CAPS, for their presentation on identifying and responding to concerning, disruptive, or
  violent behaviors on Campus.
March: Thursday, March 26, 2015, Noon-1:30 p.m., SL 165
Topic: Using Technology as a Collaborative Tool in Our Classes
Speaker: Erich Bauer, Instructional Technology Consultant
RSVP by noon on Friday, March 20.
Attachment 2: Graduate Education Committee Report

Date: 03/10/2015

From: Graduate Education Committee
Purdue School of Engineering and Technology

To: Faculty Senate
Purdue School of Engineering and Technology

RE: Statement concerning style standards for thesis formatting

It is the responsibility of the student and the student's thesis advisor to ensure that the thesis conforms to the standard formatting guidelines established by the Purdue University Graduate School. It is recognized that the IUPUI Graduate School, the Purdue School of Engineering & Technology Graduate Program office and individual departments within our School do not have the resources to manage and guide students through the process of resolving formatting errors or style inconsistencies in the review of theses drafts. This leads to documents that do not meet the strict standards of the Purdue University Graduate School and prevents a timely deposit of the thesis document which is required for final approval of the graduation audit.

The use of LaTeX and the Purdue Thesis LaTeX formatting template (puthesis.cls available at https://engineering.purdue.edu/~mark/puthesis/), greatly reduces the occurrence of formatting errors and style inconsistencies, thereby reducing the number of review cycles during the submission phase of the thesis. The availability of LaTeX document editing software (Gummi, TexWorks, etc.) with highly intuitive, point-and-click type graphical interfaces has simplified the use of LaTeX such that the learning curve to use this document processing software is no more than the for MS Word and Word Templates. Workshops to introduce LaTeX and LaTeX document editing tools are regularly available in our School.

The Graduate Education Committee strongly encourages that theses preparation be carried out using the LaTeX typesetting system. The use of LaTeX for the thesis document does not preclude the use of other word processing tools to write and submit conference / journal papers. The thesis advisor and/or the graduate student may choose not to use LaTeX for preparation of the thesis. However, the burden of style and format compliance required by the Purdue University Graduate School would therefore be entirely the responsibility of the thesis advisor, who should be well versed in the formatting style for a Purdue thesis. This committee strongly encourages such faculty to attend the Purdue Thesis Format Review sessions offered by representatives of the Thesis/Dissertation Office in the Purdue University Graduate School. Format reviews will still be required by IUPUI Graduate School before the document can be forwarded on to the Purdue University Graduate School. However, such reviews are intended to be a final verification of document quality and no editing services will be provided. Editing and document review are the responsibility of the thesis adviser should a document typesetting system other than LaTeX be utilized.