Representatives in Attendance: Sohel Anwar, Sally Catlin (alternate), Lauren Christopher (alternate), Bob Durkin, Eugenia Fernandez (alternate), Pat Fox, David Goodman, Afshin Izadian, Julie Ji, Dan Koo, Sarah Koskie, Feng Li, Hongbo Liu, David Mannell, Sungsoo Na, Paul Salama, Joseph Wallace, Tamer Wasfy, Likun Zhu

Guests: Doug Acheson, Sherri Alexander, Karen Alfrey, Stephen Hundley, John Schild, Dr. Russomanno, 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 October 2014 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 October 2014 minutes; all approved. The agenda for the November 2014 meeting was approved.

**Dean’s Report**

Dr. Russomanno presented the following report.

President Daniels will visit IUPUI on Monday, December 1. President Daniels will meet with the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor, and then with Deans Rhodes and Russomanno. President Daniels will present a Town Hall meeting 10:00-10:45 a.m. in Hine Hall auditorium for faculty and staff that support Purdue programs, as well as students. There will be a reception from 10:45-11:30 a.m. The school is delighted and looking forward to his visit.

Dr. Russomanno advised he has received several comments and questions regarding President McRobbie’s State of the University address, as well as some things in the bicentennial strategic plan around engineering programs being established in Bloomington. Dr. Russomanno noted that the IUPUI campus (from Academic Affairs) has no objection to IUB looking at the feasibility of program creation that builds on their strengths, resources, and interests. This sets the tone that remonstrance and setting up roadblocks is probably not the most effective way to approach this announcement. Dr. Russomanno’s focus from the very beginning has been on how we can get the engineering programmatic needs on this campus to be considered in a broader process of potentially developing engineering programs at IUB. How are we included in this conversation? As many of you know, in the IUPUI Strategic Plan there is a major emphasis on more site approved Ph.D. programs for our campus. This is an area where our campus comes up woefully short compared to the IUPUI campus peers. We do very well, but when it comes to Ph.D. production outside the School of Medicine we are short. Dr. Russomanno’s primary focus will be on the Ph.D. programs in engineering for our school as the top priority in terms of the engineering programmatic needs in this broader discussion of engineering within Indiana University relative to the President’s announcement.

Dr. Russomanno was delighted to announce that the September alumni golf tournament set an all-time record in terms of funding raised for scholarships.
The school recently had a program advising review. Wanda Worley will present additional information from the review and exit statement, along with advising items that are already ongoing. The school recently received the completed report. Dr. Russomanno will be meeting with the chairs and associate dean’s this afternoon and they will create a task force to implement actions suggested from the program review. The task force will look at implementation details around trying to make the most of the program advising review. There will be more details to follow.

**Associate Dean’s Report**

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

**Common Core** – if you would like to propose new courses to be included in the Common Core, those are due to Wanda by November 15.

**ABET** – we are having a mock visit on March 23 and 24, with all of the engineering programs as well as Computer Graphics Technology and Computer Information Technology. The real visit will occur in 2016.

**Advising Program** – The advising program review, as you know, went very well. The team was here September 29 and 30. The team met with Dr. Russomanno for an hour, the department faculty and staff advisors, New Student Academic Advising Center advisors, as well as a very large group of students. Overall, the team found our school to be very good and strong when it comes to advising, and that faculty and staff find it very important to have a good advising program. The final report is included at the end of this report.

Recommendations that came out of the final report:

1) Develop a culture and common perspective on advising across the school. We have many different perspectives on advising and each department handles advising differently.

2) Create and implement systems and processes that support coordinated and intrusive advising; the team recommends that not every department has to do exactly the same thing, but we need to set processes that everyone follows. There should be a systematic approach to advising in the school instead of 7 departments doing things their own way, and the New Student Academic Advising Center doing advising their way.

3) Study advising and teaching loads; some advisors in the Advising Center teach a lot of credit hours. The team was concerned that some of the advisors were teaching too much.

4) Engage in ongoing and purposeful professional development for faculty and staff advisors. Worley noted we desperately need this. If we have a new PA in a department, there is no formal training that they go through. We need to offer a program that keeps all of our advisors professionally trained.

5) Create an administrative structure that combines student and career services with academic advising. There is a need for academic advising and career advising to be either together or close in proximity to each other, so students can access both resources easily.

Since we had the team here at the end of September, Worley has held two 2-hour focus groups in October with the advisors, both staff and faculty advisors. Worley had three areas she wanted the focus groups to look at.

Worley wanted the groups to look at the definition of advising, a synopsis of what advisors do with regard to student advising. Both groups felt that we need to be advising the whole student, that we need to build relationships with these students, and that there should be a trust level that is built between student and
advisor. Advisors should be a source for referrals; they need to know of campus information and be able to share it with students. Advisors should help or coordinate withdrawals of courses, along with help on career decisions, and academic advising in general, such as registration and graduation planning. Additionally, advisors need to be available and advocate for students, and help students transition to campus. Worley noted that this is requiring a lot.

The next item the focus groups were to look at is what the ideal scenario for our school with regard to advising would be if we had an ideal situation. Everyone was quite interested in this topic, and one suggestion is that there should be a centralized model, career and academic advising being together. There was a suggestion that one advisor be introduced to a student at the beginning of his/her academic career and this advisor would carry through until the student graduated. But, this advisor needs to partner with the faculty immediately to get the students involved in the department after one semester. There should also be mandatory touch points with students once a semester. Worley noted that according to ABET, advising is mandatory for our students in programs that are accredited. It is not that we make advising available, but according to ABET, students should be provided with advising on a regular basis.

The faculty and staff advisors also discussed and felt electronic advising notes should be mandatory. If you don’t advise, you will not know what this means. Worley advised that some advisors write notes on paper, and put the notes in the student’s folder. The only person who has access to this information is the person who has the folder. If the recorder needs to check on something about a student, there is no record of advising in the electronic advising format. If everyone uses electronic advising notes, anyone who has access to SIS can see when a student last met with an advisor and what was discussed.

The chairs of departments will meet later today and put together a task force to take the information that the focus groups have already shared and build on that.

Eugenia Fernandez questioned the comment that faculty advisors teach too much. Worley clarified that in the New Student Academic Advising Center it was noted that some faculty in this office are teaching large loads as well as advising. Bob Durkin asked whether advisors discuss the quickest route to graduation; what kinds of tools does the advisor have to help them have the correct information? Worley noted it depends on how well trained the advisor is. The advisors in the New Student Academic Advising Center are very well trained; we have several electronic tools that have just been introduced in the past year. Worley advised the department advisors have more on their plate, because they are doing other administrative things besides advising. Worley is not sure if they have had the opportunity to keep up with the tools as easily as the advising center advisors. There are a lot of tools for advisors. Durkin noted that in Engineering Technology they have made some program changes, due to the 120 credit hour change. If there are static tools, they may not be up-to-date with the new requirements. Students in their department may take courses over many years, and they have changes occasionally in the curriculum. Worley noted that in the big picture our advisors are very good and they get to know the program quite well. Advisors don’t have to use electronic advising, but it does make their jobs a little easier if they know how to use the tools. Worley commented that ENT recently hired two new people and they impress her with their knowledge of our processes, etc. Worley noted that Bob Durkin made a good point that when programs do make changes, if the changes are not communicated with the Advising Center, they won’t know the latest curriculum changes. It is very important that when programs do make curriculum changes that they communicate them with the Advising Center. Worley advised some of the advisors in the Advising Center do attend curriculum meetings in their specific programs to keep up with the latest changes in departments.

Collaborative Learning Classrooms - Worley let everyone know that about a year ago she sent a survey around to several faculty about revisiting what classrooms should look like. IUPUI is starting to develop collaborative learning classrooms. Many faculty don’t want a collaborative learning environment
classroom because of the kind of course they teach and the way they teach. These classrooms are set up with a lot of technology, which encourages active learning. If you are interested in a classroom that allows collaboration and active learning, we have two that are in general inventory at the campus level. These rooms are Lecture Hall 104, which has a capacity of 54 students, and Education Social Work, ES 1117, with a capacity of 30 students. You have to request these rooms and meet certain criteria to be allowed the use of these classrooms. The Office of the Registrar coordinates these two rooms. If you want one of these rooms, make sure to advise the person who does your scheduling. One of the largest criteria to meet to use the room is that your class meets at least 67% of the class capacity, and you have to have a clear plan for active learning. Eugenia Fernandez also noted that CIT has a collaborative learning classroom, ET 329, which CIT will allow other departments to use if they are not using it. OLS also has a room which allows for collaboration.

**Lunch n’ Learn** – Thursday, November 20, Promotion and Tenure. If you are interested in being promoted from lecturer to senior lecturer, assistant professor to associate professor, or associate to full professor, you may want to come to this workshop. Elaine Cooney, Chair of ENT and Ed Berbari, Chair of BME, will be leading the workshop. Make sure you let Susie Bradley know by this Friday if you plan to attend.

**Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs**

**Research**

Razi Nalim was unable to attend Faculty Senate. Joy Starks read Dr. Nalim’s report. The Associate Dean’s Report can be found under Attachment 2 at the end of this report.

**Graduate Programs**

John Schild presented the following report.

The final draft of the MS Tech online proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Graduate Education Committee. Dr. Phil Pope, Associate Dean of Graduate Programs, in West Lafayette has also positively reviewed this draft which is now in review at the College of Technology with Drs. Moller (Head) and Whitten (Graduate Program Chair). Our School is making the effort to ensure all approve of the proposal and that there are no concerns before it is presented to the Dean’s Council hopefully this month, or next month. There will be a request for signatures from the department heads and then the document can proceed.

The self-study for the MS Tech review is ongoing and we are keeping in line with the timeline. There was one course which was pulled back, ME 65100, Advanced Finite Element Methods for Solids. This course is offered by ME. We received mostly a very positive review from the Graduate Education Committee, Area C in West Lafayette. There were some concerns about the number of finite element courses that were being offered on this campus at the graduate level. The committee discussed this with Mechanical Engineering and they are going to retire what had been their Advanced Mechanical Engineering course, ME 552, which was used for both advanced masters and Ph.D. students. They will retire this course and offer ME 561 which covers many of the same topics within advanced applications and more suitable for the Ph.D. program students.

The block grant application is new this year and has been submitted to the Graduation Education Committee. The committee will discuss the block grant on Monday, November 17. It is being circulated. If you are interested or will be involved in any of the data collection please look at the information. Schild noted that accountability will be the big thing this year. Many of our programs manage their MS and Ph.D. students in different ways in providing sources of funding, when covering tuition and fees. This
will come down to accountability and departments will have to specify the individual students, what they are taking, and what they have done over the past year if they receive any block grant money. Schild does not anticipate any huge changes with the block grant funding from years past. As you begin to plan your fellowship offers you can use the numbers from the past years, minus 10%. Schild noted in preliminary conversations with Dr. Janice Blum, Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Programs, she was more concerned with us using this new process as a way for her to identify where all the money is going and what the school is doing in each department.

Schild advised that new this year BME will be contributing to the block grant application, not as a member of our school application but this is a first foray into the block grant application process. BME receives a separate small amount of $50,000 base budget money from the campus. Dr. Berbari, Chair of BME will clarify with Dr. Blum the origins of these funds the intended purpose and will clarify how the department has been using this resource to support BME graduate programs.

**Student Affairs Committee** – No Report

**Budgetary Affairs Committee**

Stephen Hundley distributed the school budget. Sherri Alexander, Assistant Dean for Finance and Administration, attended also at the request of the Budgetary Affairs committee. Sherri Alexander attended in case there were questions and to make sure the information was accurate.

The purpose of the Budget Affairs Committee is advisory to the Dean’s office in terms of the budget priorities. They have dialogue regarding how the schools budget is implemented. The committee meets twice a year; they met on November 3rd for their fall meeting. During this meeting they discussed the school budget and discussed the budget philosophy and budget priorities. Hundley reminded everyone that IUPUI is an institution that operates under a budgeting model called Responsibility Center Management (RCM). This means that revenue to the academic unit is derived from several sources and flows directly to each academic unit.

Our base budget is comprised of three primary revenue sources:

- Tuition from students (credit hours generated)
- State appropriation, which many may have noticed is rapidly declining
- Facilities and administrative costs or ICR on grants and contracts

There is a fourth driver of revenue that does not impact our base budget, but is also worthwhile to mention, and that is gifts that individuals and corporations made to philanthropy. This is the work that Tami Tarpley and Courtney Wooton do in their capacity.

We oftentimes talk about base budget and our foundation account; the base budget is derived from those three primary sources mentioned earlier, and the foundation account revenue is from philanthropy and gifts that the school receives.

When we talk about RCM, revenue flows to the unit, we have to pay our direct expenses here and we pay an assessment or if you want to call it a tax for centrally shared services at the campus and university level. RCM places a lot of responsibility and accountability, but also a lot of innovation and entrepreneurial activity at the academic unit level. We have a lot of control and discretion here, but we also have a lot of responsibility that the Dean and fiscal officer bear on behalf of the entire unit. Sometimes if you wonder why certain policies or steps have to be taken it is because they have to sign off and certify the transaction and financial information for the academic unit on an annual basis.
Hundley then address what it takes to make the budget work. The school has base budgeted funds that come in through credit hours generated. We require approximately 65,000 credit hours to be generated on an annual basis to fund our base budget. We also require that the base budget over $1.2M of budgeted money come from ICR expenses from grants and contracts. These are what we rely on to meet our budget obligations. In discussions with Dr. Russomanno and Sherri regarding the budgeting priorities and philosophies of our unit, Hundley shared some of the discussion.

1) The Dean is very committed to having our base budget reflect our obligations, that if we have an ongoing, recurring, and strategic expense for the year we need to make sure that is accurately reflected in our base budget and that we are not funding that with cash, but actually reflecting this in our base budget. We need to make sure that we fully support and reflect in our base budget what it takes to run our operations, including graduate assistant support and adjunct talent as two examples.

2) It is also important that we are fiscally conservative in the budget that we create and in the budget we implement. One of the things we have to recognize and you see in the handout is that not unlike most budgets and organizations compensation and salaries, the direct cash compensation and fringe benefits are the largest expense in the budget.

We have been operating very conservatively and as a result we have a wide spread degree of stability. We have workforce stability that has been part of our budgeting and operating philosophy in our school. What that means is we don’t ramp up and hire a lot of people and when there is a budget downturn we don’t lay off a lot of people, which is a good reason to be conservative in the budget philosophy and priorities.

One of the benefits of RCM is that it is not like some models in state government or public institutions where at the end of the year there is the mad sprint to spend down your budget so you get that budget back next year. What we can do if we are operating our budget conservatively and generating revenue to the unit, if we do not spend all of our money in a given year that money rolls over and we are able to retain that revenue and that income for ongoing investments to help our academic unit. In discussions with the Budgetary Affairs Committee, they discussed items that were deemed a priority of reinvestment of resources that carry over on a particular year. Hundley noted that many faculty probably see some evidence of reinvestment in our unit in the ET buildings, on the first, second, and third floors, the informal learning spaces that are there. This is a reflection of investing in the unit. Research lab renovations are an investment back into the unit. Cost sharing, either required or voluntary, on proposals, would be an example of a reinvestment back to the unit.

Travel support to help faculty go to federal labs to cultivate relationships and to provide seed money that would hopefully result in ongoing partnerships and presumably some ongoing projects would be another example. Obviously, the start-up packages that people receive as part of their employment perspective would be part of that reinvestment to the unit.

Otherwise innovative approaches to helping us improve what we do in cost sharing including our entire operation including teaching and learning, research and engagement activities.

Hundley also discussed briefly the budget itself. Hundley referenced the first page of the handout noting the revenue streams, and sources of revenue that come to the school. Page two and three reflect all of the broad expenditures that the unit has at the academic level.

Lastly, Hundley noted that as a department chair in his own department he makes available and shares on an annual basis what the department budget is so faculty and staff can see how much money there really isn’t in the base budget. Hundley challenged and encouraged other department chair colleagues and those
who are in divisions where you have budgets, to share those budgets and have discussions so faculty and staff understand how the departments are running financially.

Discussion

Pat Fox noted that the travel budgets were cut tremendously some years ago. Hundley noted that the travel budget was cut some years ago under a mandate by the IU Board of Trustees. The travel budgets were cut basically in half, due to some political pressure. At one time the newspaper was reporting that throughout the IU system about $42M was spent each year on travel. That is not correct because about $34M was paid for by grants and contracts. So actually a modest amount of that total share was paid from the general fund. The money was cut in half, but the travel was reflected downward by 50%. Faculty have approximately $700.00 annually for travel, which is allocated at the department level. Fox asked if there were any plans to increase the travel allowance. Hundley noted that faculty need to generate resources through grants and contracts to pay for their travel. Travel budget was not discussed in the Budgetary Affairs committee, with regard to adding travel back to the base budget. Hundley noted that they can discuss travel in the next Budgetary Affairs committee meeting.

Dr. Russomanno noted that part of the discussion should start first in the department, because you need to work in the department to discuss how funding is being used. In some cases departments get back a portion of indirect cost recovery and other returns. This discussion should start in the department in terms of what is a reasonable allocation of travel funds for faculty. The department chair can then reflect that in the department priorities when the school reviews the departmental budget at the school level. This discussion should start in the department versus the school level saying they will increase the travel budget. Some departments actually cut their internal travel allocation to reallocate to graduate student funding or some other areas and they use their cash accumulated through a variety of mechanisms to fund individual travel requests. The budget does not tell you the whole story.

Computing Resources Committee (CRC) – No Report

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Graduate Education Committee

Brian King advised Graduate Education Committee met October 27, and also met online. The MS Technology Online Distance Education proposal was presented to the committee. The committee held a brief online discussion and it was approved. The proposal will be attached at the end of these minutes.

Grievance Board – No Report

Faculty Affairs Committee

Eugenia Fernandez advised her report was a follow up from last month. The committee looked at the wording previously suggested for the school P&T Guidelines related to reconsideration. The committee met and after some discussion presented their changes. In the section that discusses the department chair responsibility they are changing the wording from:

- In a tenure case, if there have been negative votes, discuss the candidate’s right for reconsideration.
- In a tenure case, explain the candidate’s right for reconsideration in the event of a negative tenure recommendation at any level.

November 2014 Faculty Senate Minutes, Page 7 of 22
This suggests that the department chair should always be telling the candidate about their rights for reconsideration, just in case. Even if it wasn’t negative at that point, if it is negative at the unit committee or dean point, they are also eligible for reconsideration. This way the candidate will know of their rights no matter what the particular vote was at that point. Further down in the last part of the table it notes “Immediately after notification of unit committee results review with Dean” it advises the candidate can request reconsideration. This follows both of these areas. At this point the faculty was not advised of reconsideration so that will now be changed so that the faculty should always be told about their right for reconsideration during the process.

The committee also made minor changes in the box to break the first two sentences into two lines and changed the order to more in line with the actual chronology and to add the word “unit” in the last box because it wasn’t clear which committee results review was supposed to happen at that point.

**Faculty Senate unanimously approved the updated wording change to the P&T Schedule.**

Fernandez asked who has the word version of the document so the changes can be made. Marj Hovde may have the document, so Fernandez will check with her.

*The report from the Faculty Affairs Committee with the excerpted table with changes can be found under Attachment 3 at the end of this report.*

**Nominations** – No Report

**Resource Policy Committee** – No Report

**Undergraduate Education Committee**

Karen Alfrey presented the following report. Alfrey noted that during the last meeting the committee proposed a new policy for Evidence Based Assessment of Prior Learning, which turned out that the wording was in conflict with an existing policy in CIT. At the committee meeting they discussed their goals and the idea is that we have had students coming into the school with various kinds of prior credit. Many students come in with military credit and want it to be appropriately assessed. The goal is to have a guideline in place to let students know the time frame. When is it appropriate to ask for credit? The time to ask for credit is not after you have taken the class and failed it. The goal was to give guidelines for when you can test out, and when you cannot test out. The committee looked over the document and used the CIT policy as their starting point.

The last clause, “Evidence based prior learning credit will not be awarded…” was to cover those students, maybe recent transfers who may not have realized that at the point they signed up for the course that they were eligible for prior credit. For regular semester classes, during the first seven days the W will not appear on the transcript, but for summer session it might; so that was noted in the policy. OLS requested this policy, and they have many non-standard type courses, in which the timeframe on the transcript would apply. The committee unanimously voted to recommend the policy.

Sarah Koskie noted that students may question if they can receive credit without testing out of a course according to the first paragraph; Karen Alfrey advised that each department can provide their particular policies and procedures regarding test out or credential out for course credit. Alfrey noted that BME does not have test outs for credit, and they have not done credit by credential very often. Alfrey noted that OLS does credit by credential via portfolio of information reviewed by faculty. The policy will be in the school bulletin.
Faculty Senate unanimously approved the Policy for Evidence-Based Assessment of Prior Learning as presented. See policy below.

(Proposed) Policy for Evidence-Based Assessment of Prior Learning

Students admitted to an undergraduate degree program in the School of Engineering and Technology who enter the program with experience relevant to a specific E&T course may be eligible for credit through evidence-based assessment of prior learning (e.g. credit by credential, military transcripts, test-out) provided the following criteria are met:

- The test-out exam for the course may only be attempted once.
- The test-out exam cannot be taken during a semester in which the student is enrolled in the course.
- Evidence-based prior learning credit for a course (credit by credential, military transcripts, test-out, etc.) will not be awarded if the course already appears on the student’s transcript (as a regular grade, W, or I) UNLESS a grade of W was awarded for withdrawals within seven calendar days after the first day of class.

IUPUI Faculty Council

Doug Acheson advised there was an IFC meeting on November 4, 2014.

The meeting was fairly short. Chancellor Bantz was not in attendance; Nasser Paydar presented for him.

There was no report from the IFC president.

There was a second read on Election At Large Representatives to the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee. Dr. Hundley was one of the candidates. Rick Ward (School of Liberal Arts) and Charles Goodlett (School of Science) were elected to the committee.

Khadija Khaja, Faculty Fellow, advised the Common Theme for 2013-2015 is “Find Your Voice, Hear My Voice: Creating Civil Conversation.” She also promoted the upcoming speaker, Phil Cousineau, who will speak about “Beyond Forgiveness, Reflections on Atonement,” here on November 19. This book was voted as the IUPUI common theme book for 2014-2015.

There were no standing committee reports for IFC.

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 – No Report

Purdue Intercampus Faculty Council

Purdue University Senate

Old Business

New Business
John Schild asked Faculty Senate members if they had read the Strategic Plan. Some noted they had looked at it. Schild advised faculty have been invited to comment on the plan. Schild is not sure if our school has any collective strategy, is the Senate discussing the plan among yourselves and departments? Schild would like to forward something from our school. November 22 is the final date to submit comments online in response to Dr. Applegate’s email. Sarah Koskie noted that individuals could make a statement, but it might be better to have a collective statement from Faculty Senate. Schild noted that their department has been discussing the plan. Joy Starks advised faculty could send their comments to her and she could send a statement to Dr. Applegate.

Pat Fox questioned IU offering an engineering program. Fox felt that IU could not offer an engineering program and Purdue could not offer medicine. Schild was not sure that was an actual policy. Dr. Russomanno does not believe there is any statute regarding these programs. Dr. Russomanno encouraged faculty to voice their opinions. Dr. Russomanno believes that the most positive approach is to look at how we can advance in terms of engineering, and what are our key needs. Schild noted that faculty have been invited to voice their thoughts and felt it would be good to respond to the Strategic Plan.

The meeting ended at 12:00 p.m. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, December 9, 2014, 11:00 a.m. in SL 165.
Attachment 1: Faculty Senate Report from Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Undergraduate Programs

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

November 11, 2014

Submitted by Wanda L. Worley

QUICK UPDATES

- **Common Core**: New course proposals due in my office by November 15.
- **ABET**: Several programs will be participating in a mock visit on March 23 and 24. Programs include Biomedical Engineering (BME), Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE), Mechanical Engineering (ME), Motorsports Engineering (MSTE), Energy Engineering (EEN), Computer and Information Technology (CIT), and Computer Graphics Technology (CGT). The “real” visit will happen fall 2016.

ADVISING PROGRAM REVIEW

- Review team visited our School on September 29 and September 30
  - Housed in SL 165
  - The team:
    1. John Hackworth (associate professor, Old Dominion University, department of engineering technology, Norfolk, VA, a representative from out of state)
    2. Kenneth Garcia (academic advisor, Undergraduate Programs, College of Engineering, University of Houston, Texas, a representative from out of state)
    3. Cynthia J. Munerol (a community representative, retired area manager for AT&T, DIAC member)
    4. Cathy Buyarski (executive assistant dean, University College, campus representative)
    5. Terri Talbert-Hatch (assistant dean for student services, a neutral School representative)
  - The team met with (1) Dean Russomanno, (2) department faculty advisors, (3) department staff advisors, (4) New Student Academic Advising Center, (5) students.
  - The visit was very successful.
  - Overall, the team clearly found advising to be strong and important to our faculty and staff.
  - Recommendations included (1) develop a culture and common perspective on advising across the School; (2) create and implement systems and processes that support coordinated and intrusive advising; (3) study advising and teaching loads; (4) engage in ongoing and purposeful professional development for faculty and staff advisors; (5) create
an administrative structure that combines student and career services with academic advising.

- On October 27 and 31, I held 2, 2-hour focus group meetings with advisors. We explored a definition of advising, the ideal scenario for advising in our School, and ways to address the recommendations made by the review team.
- A copy of the Review Team Report is attached.

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING CLASSROOMS

- IUPUI is developing collaborative learning classrooms. These classrooms “leverage advanced technologies (including a video wall display, in some cases) and a de-centered layout to meet collaborative instructional goals.” Placement in one of these classrooms will be coordinated by the Office of the Registrar.
- Placement in these classrooms must be requested.
- Classes must meet certain criteria. Two of the most important are (1) that there’s a clear plan to use the space and technology to support active learning and (2) that the class meets at least 67% of the room capacity. Departmental proximity is also important.
- Lecture Hall 104 with a capacity of 54 and Education/Social Work (ES 1117) with a capacity of 30 are currently available.

LUNCH ’N LEARN

- October: Danny King and I discussed the results of the Advising Program Review. We had excellent attendance and a lively discussion.

- November: Thursday, November 20, 2014, Noon-1:30 p.m., SL 165
  Topic: Promotion and Tenure Workshop for E&T Faculty
  Speakers: Elaine Cooney, Chair of ENT, and Ed Berbari, Chair of BME
  Description: Gearing up for promotion and/or tenure requires diligence in performing, documenting, and evaluating teaching, research, and service contributions. Learn about updates or changes to guidelines, as well as practical strategies to prioritize work, develop the dossier, and assemble the necessary artifacts for promotion and/or tenure.
  RSVP to Susan Bradley at susjbrad@iupui.edu by noon on Friday, November 14.
Purpose of the Review

On September 29th and 30th of 2014 an advising review team visited Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis campus for the purpose of evaluating the state of the advising process in the School of Engineering and Technology, reporting findings and making recommendations on ways to improve the program.

The evaluation team consisted of

- Cathy Buyarski, IUPUI
  - Associate Dean for Student Affairs, University College
- Kenneth Garcia, University of Houston
  - Academic Advisor, Undergraduate Programs, Cullen College of Engineering
- John Hackworth, Old Dominion University, Team Chair
  - Associate Professor, Program Director of Electrical Engineering Technology, Chief EET Student Advisor
- Cynthia Munerol
  - Retired Area Manager, AT&T
- Terri Talbert-Hatch, IUPUI
  - Assistant Dean for Student Services, School of Engineering and Technology

The review team was asked to review the advising processes at IUPUI, and specifically address the following questions.

1. *How well the current model(s) of academic advising serve the needs of our students? Do we have the capacity at current resource levels to meet the needs of our students? How might we better meet the needs of our students through academic advising?*

2. *How well do the transition processes work for students? (both the transition from University College advising to the NSAAC and the transition from the NSAAC to the academic departments). What works well for students? What could work better?*

3. *What roles do faculty advisors and professional staff advisors currently play in our School? How well is each group fulfilling those roles? Should distinctions be made between the two groups?*

4. *How well does the academic advising program in our School match the CAS Standards?*
Discussion

The external review process involved the view of a written self-study and a day of meetings with administrators, faculty and staff advisors from the New Student Academic Advising Center (NSAAC) and departments, and students. In preparation for the external review, an advising survey was administered to faculty and staff in the School. The results of the survey were very consistent with what was heard in the meetings with faculty and staff advisors and helped to shape the review committee’s recommendations.

Advising in the School is strong and the recommendations of this report are offered as a guide to taking the next step in student success. It should be noted that the review and findings did not include the Music and Arts Technology department. There was also little if any discussion related to the dual degree programs with Butler University, Marian University, and University of Indianapolis.

It is also important to note that while the review team had the opportunity to meet with many individuals who are involved with advising, Department Chairs were not included in the discussion unless they served as a primary advising contact.

Team Findings and Recommendations

Advising is clearly valued in the School as evidenced in conversations with faculty and staff as well as through the advising survey in which 100% of faculty and staff indicated they strongly agreed/agreed with the statement “I see academic advising as an important part of the learning process.” Both faculty and staff advisors are passionate and dedicated to student success. Students indicated that advisors are available, knowledgeable, and want to help them navigate their academic career. The fact that no direct complaints were made about advising is astounding and speaks clearly to the strong advising happening in both the NSAAC and academic departments.

Faculty and staff advisors in departments and the NSAAC are very engaged in their role and actively seek out professional development opportunities. Several advisors have leadership roles in the campus advising association; others attend campus, state, regional and national academic advising conferences and read higher education publications. Advisors indicated that when they have sought financial support for professional development the request has been supported, indicating administrative support for advisor development. As an example of advising excellence, advisors in Engineering and Technology have been nominated for and/or received campus advising awards.

Finally, there are indications that advisors in both the NSAAC and the departments are ready to come together to strengthen advising across the School. Departments have begun sending students welcome letters at the point in which a student moves from the NSAAC to their academic program. Both faculty and staff advisors indicated an interest and need for advisors from across the School to come together for regular meetings to 1) ensure that students have smooth transitions from the centralized advising office to the department, as well as 2) support advisors from across the School in having accurate information and participating in common training and professional development.
The review team offers the following recommendations as a way to enhance the current system, and in moving from advising that is at times provided in isolated silos to a coherent and effective School-wide program.

**Develop a culture and common perspective on advising across the School**

While there is widespread agreement on the importance of advising, perspectives on the role and responsibilities as well as approaches to advising are varied. Some people approach advising in a holistic manner that supports students success in all areas, others believe advising should only encompass academic planning. Similarly, some advisors are very intrusive in reaching out to students while others are more passive.

The School needs to come together to develop a common mission statement for advising, using the [NACADA Core Values of Academic Advising](https://www.nacada.org/) and the IUPUI learning and process outcomes for academic advising as guides. Further, the roles of all involved in advising need to be clarified, particularly in respect to the responsibilities of the NSAAC and departmental advisors. Through this role clarification, a system of advising will be created and respect for the roles of all in the process will be enhanced. Additionally, there is no consistency in advising in the academic departments. This review team is not recommending that advising in each of the academic units be the same, however, it is important to review the approaches to and structure for advising so that students have consistent and coordinated advising experiences throughout the School.

As part of the clarification of roles, particularly that of the NSAAC, the freshman engineering and technology curriculum needs to be revisited and clarified. Currently, completion of the freshman curriculum is used as the indication that a student is ready to move to departmental advising. It was reported that students are held in NSAAC because of one or two classes (typically math for technology students and speech for engineering students). However, many departments are asking that students be transferred before completion resulting in a system that is operating more on exceptions than adherence to the curriculum. The result is confusion for students and advisors as well as lack of clarity of roles within the School advising system.

**Create and implement systems and processes that support coordinated and intrusive advising**

Once a standard curriculum for freshman engineering and technology is agreed upon, a system of transferring students from NSAAC to the department can be created. Currently, transfer happens through the individual review of student files and, because of the tremendous workload associated with this process, transfer happens when the NSAAC advisor finds the time to complete the process. This results in students who are ready to graduate still being considered as part of “new student engineering.” Ideally, students should be certified to move to the department two to three times a year with the dates for review and transfer being scheduled and communicated to everyone in the School. In addition, departments must honor the NSAAC and let first year students use the team of advisers set aside specifically for them. If earlier recommendations concerning “freshmen” classes are implemented, there should be few reasons a student would stay in the NSAAC for longer than 2-3 semesters.
Technologies, including the creation of “mini degree audits” and the Student Success Collaborative dashboard, can assist in streamlining review of student readiness to transfer to the department. The review team supports the currently evolving practice of all students receiving a welcome letter from their department upon transfer out of the NSAAC. Department should notify the student that they have a new adviser and should set up an appointment.

It is important to stress the NSAAC refers to new students (not freshmen). This is a point of contention among students, mainly because transfer and returning students appear to be classified as freshmen. A different designation in systems could help with this issue. In addition, a decision needs to be made for returning students. If they received advising in their department once, when returning to the university, where do they go? A clarified freshman engineering and technology curriculum will ensure that there is transparency in advising services for returning students.

Because the School relies on a system of advisors, the importance of advising notes that are available to all advisors cannot be stressed enough. An expectation for consistent note taking in the campus advising notes system (AdRx) should be made clear to all advisors.

Across the School, there is little use of advising “holds” which require a student to meet with an academic advisor at specific points in time. Some departments place “permission to register” holds on certain courses with the idea that by stopping registration, students will be forced to seek advising. We believe that there is an important difference between requiring a student to seek advising and requiring permission to register for a course. An advising hold is unambiguous, while other types of holds could be interpreted by students to contact course instructors or department staff for registration overrides. We advocate for the use of required advising through the use of advising holds at points in time or at milestones that are related to the curriculum and student progress to a degree. While at first blush this would appear to increase advising contacts beyond current resources, the creative use of group advising, online advising, and other delivery methods can ensure that advising is delivered in a timely, effective and efficient manner.

Finally, forward movement in creating an enhanced system of advising in the School should be based on data. It appears that very little data is currently being collected on student traffic, advising satisfaction, or achievement of learning outcomes. The data that is being collected is not being used in decision-making. We advocate for the implementation of a tracking system that supports collection of data on factors such as student usage, type of advising contact, and individual advisor workload. The new AdRx system has many of these features; there is also other software being used throughout IUPUI that can be adapted for use in Engineering and Technology. Further, regular assessment of advising needs to be conducted. This assessment should include matters of student satisfaction as well as effectiveness in achieving stated learning outcomes. While the CAS Standards for academic advising were referred to in the guidance provided to this review team, it is clear they are not being used in program development and decision-making. These standards can provide a framework for decision-making and benchmarks for data collection as well as development in many of the processes and systems mentioned in this report.
Study advising and teaching loads

Nearly all of the advisors in NSAAC teach either first-year seminar (learning community) or Freshman Engineering courses. Each of the individuals teaching stated that they truly enjoy teaching and believe that they are better advisors due to their interaction with students in the classroom. However, three of the individuals in NSAAC teach 11 – 12 credit hours each of the Freshman Engineering courses. In addition to this course load, the number of students in each class has grown due to continual increases in the number of new students admitted to the School. All members of the committee felt that this work load was too much for individuals who are also responsible for advising 30 – 60 students each. It is recommended that along with the review of the first year curriculum, the teaching load of these individuals be reviewed. It should be determined if teaching of the first year engineering courses should be housed in NSAAC or within the Engineering departments.

Teaching first-year seminar (learning community) classes seems to be appropriate for individuals in NSAAC as well as staff advisors in departments.

Engage in on-going and purposeful professional development for faculty and staff advisors

As mentioned earlier in this report, the faculty and staff advisors in the School are providing excellent service to students. This outcome is true despite there being little intentional and coordinated training and professional development for advisors. Several types of professional development programs are needed in the School. First, a comprehensive training program for new advisors needs to be developed. Based on the roles of advisors (NSAAC, faculty or departmental staff), training needs should be clarified and focused. Specific training programs for each type of advisor should be institutionalized and scheduled regularly to ensure that all advisors are delivering outstanding advising to students. Campus training programs, such as those offered by University College and the new Director of Career and Advising Services, should be utilized so as to maximize training efforts and bring new advisors into the advising community at IUPUI.

Second, regular meetings of advisors from across the School should be held. The NSAAC needs to continue to meet as a group but this needs to be expanded to meeting once a year with all advisers in the ET School. NSAAC staff needs to meet with their department counterparts on a regular basis (2-3 times each year) to maintain open lines of communication. These meetings should serve as a forum during which to share information on curriculum and academic policies and procedures, and can also provide a vehicle through which on-going training (in both advising skills and advising software) and professional development activities can be carried out.

Finally, professional involvement in campus, state, regional and national advising and advising-related organizations should continue to be encouraged. It is important for advisors, particularly those who serve as the only advisor in an academic department, to be connected with those who do similar work. These connections serve not only to enhance advisor knowledge and effectiveness, but to allow for rejuvenation and recommitment to work that can be challenging.
Create an administrative structure that combines student and career services with academic advising

Given the national trend, as well as directive from Indiana University on the enhancement and coordination of both academic and career advising, we recommend that the Office of Student Services, Office of Career Services and Professional Development and the New Student Academic Advising Center be more closely aligned in a new unit with the suggested name of “Undergraduate Student Success Center.” This type of administrative alignment will support the life of the student from recruitment to advising to career planning and ensure that programs and services are coordinated in a way that appears seamless to students. In addition, by coordinating these functions, staff can work in collaborative ways that maximize the School’s resources.

Concluding Remarks

It should be reiterated that the team found the advising system within the School of Engineering and Technology to be very strong, and staffed with extremely dedicated people. During the team visit, it became immediately apparent that student advising commands a very high priority within the School.

The meetings with the faculty advisors and staff advisors were very helpful, open, and candid. All were ready to provide opinions, examples (both supporting and opposing), and suggestions for improvements. In particular the review team found the meeting with the students to be extremely refreshing and insightful. The students represented a wide range of demographics, and were informative, articulate, and responded directly to the team’s questions. All of them participated in the discussion, did not hesitate to provide opposing opinions, and provided a “user” viewpoint that was unavailable in the meetings with the faculty and staff advisors.

Finally, the team wishes to recognize and thank those who organized and scheduled the visit. It was very apparent to the review team that extensive effort was involved in planning and executing the review.
Attachment 2: Faculty Senate Report from Associate Dean for Research

November 2014

Research

1) 19 external awards were contracted for total $2.97 M as of October 31 this fiscal year to date with PI at the School. Year to date, proposals were submitted requesting $10.2M.

2) The 4th Annual IUPUI Innovation-to-Enterprise Forum & Showcase will take place at the campus center on Thursday, November 20, starting at 2pm. Website: research.iupui.edu/IEC/ITESF/
Attachment 3: Report of Faculty Affairs Committee

Report of Faculty Affairs Committee

November 5, 2014

Recommended by the E&T Faculty Affairs Committee: Eugenia Fernandez (Chair), Patrick Gee, Lingxi Li, Benjamin Smith.

Recommendation

The Faculty Senate requested the Faculty Affairs Committee re-visit the proposed change to the School’s P&T document to reduce the ambiguous wording relating to reconsideration in a tenure case. The committee reviewed the wording in Table A.1 and are proposing the changes shown in bold in the table excerpt below. The committee is also recommending the addition of the word “unit” in the “Immediately after notification of committee results review with Dean”, also shown in bold.

A.1 Promotion and Tenure Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due Date**</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Last Friday in September | Department Chair | ● Review candidate’s dossier & write recommendation,  
● Meet with the candidate to discuss the results of the Primary Committee’s deliberation and the chair’s recommendation.  
● In a tenure case, if there have been negative votes, discuss the candidate’s right for reconsideration.  
In a tenure case, explain the candidate’s right for reconsideration in the event of a negative tenure recommendation at any level.  
● Have the candidate sign for receipt of the documents.  
● Provide recommendation and completed dossier to Dean’s Office, who will forward to School’s Unit P&T Committee |
| Immediately after primary committee results review with Chair | Candidate | ● For tenure cases: If needed, request reconsideration and prepare written documentation to correct the record, this documentation will be included in the record; must be completed prior to completion of Unit Review. (See IU Academic Handbook for details) |
| Second Friday in October | Unit P&T Committee Chair | ● Schedule and lead Unit P&T Committee review meetings;  
● Draft committee recommendation for member review;  
● Finalize and submit Unit Committee recommendation with all materials to Dean |
| Last Friday in October | Dean | ● Notify candidate of the Unit Committee’s recommendation  
● Prepare candidate’s recommendation letter,  
● Notify candidate of recommendation, and  
● Forward dossier and all recommendations to Dean of Faculties |
| Immediately after notification of unit committee results review with Dean | Candidate | ● For tenure cases: If needed, request reconsideration and prepare written documentation to correct the record, this documentation will be included in the record; must be completed prior to completion of Campus Review. (See IU Academic Handbook for details) |
PURDUE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL
DISTANCE EDUCATION PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Campus: Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
School: Purdue School of Engineering and Technology
Degree Program: Master of Science in Technology
Date: October 31, 2014

PREAMBLE: The overarching intent of this proposal is to shorten the time to degree completion for graduate students in the existing Purdue Master of Science in Technology program (MSTECH) on the IUPUI campus. This will be accomplished by providing expanded options for distance education. The vast majority of our MSTECH graduate students are nontraditional, part-time adult learners living and working in the greater Indianapolis metropolitan area. A core strength of our MSTECH program is a faculty with significant industrial experience offering practical course content in a live lecture format, i.e. an on campus experience highly conducive to group learning and refining team-based, problem solving skills. Since Fall of 2006 many working adults in our graduate program have also benefited from occasional enrollment in online sections of graduate technology courses as a practical solution to managing the varied complexities and time constraints associated with balancing professional, academic and family commitments.

In conversations with our MSTECH graduates and Industrial Board of Advisors two critically important observations have become apparent. The first observation is that all constituents value the local availability of a highly accessible campus offering vibrant learning experiences that can only be had through personal immersion in an academic setting. An environment that provides, for example, office hours and advising, departmentally sponsored lectures by faculty, industry representatives and professional societies, small meeting rooms for recitation and group study sections, hands-on practical laboratory experiences, and so on. The second observation is that a more structured approach toward managing the online sections of graduate MSTECH course materials would greatly reduce the potential for difficulties in maintaining continuous semesters of enrollment. Maintaining a regular schedule of classes, i.e. "persistence" is leading facilitator of degree completion. Furthermore, frequent and positive educational experiences on campus is essential to establishing lasting and committed relationships between our faculty, our students, our industrial partners and alumni of our School in the local community and across the state of Indiana.

For such reasons this proposal for a distance education option to the existing Purdue MSTECH degree offered on the IUPUI campus IS NOT intended to be an entirely online program of study. The on-campus experience and flexible online course scheduling is valued highly by our faculty, graduate students, School and local community partners. There are, however, occasional instances where a working adult beings a program of graduate study on the IUPUI campus but must turn to online course offerings as a result of some change in professional obligations or family commitments. Our School is highly motivated to help our existing MSTECH graduate students complete their degree program as Purdue graduates, including those who must turn to a distance education option while having fulfilled less than one half of the course credits required for the degree. Such an option is not presently allowed under existing policies and guidelines for administration of the Purdue Master of Technology degree at IUPUI, a limitation that can be resolved through implementation of the distance education options outlined in this proposal. Furthermore, there are areas of specialization, i.e. concentrations approved for the MSTECH degree that reflect a depth of faculty expertise that is unique to our School and the IUPUI campus. Two such examples are Facilities Management and Motorsports Technology, i.e. narrowly focused training in areas with a demonstrated state, regional and national demand that are not being fulfilled elsewhere within the Purdue system or other educational institutions. Apart from online delivery of these highly specialized areas under this proposal it would be a rare occurrence for more than 50% of the required credits on an approved MSTECH Plan of Study to have been completed through online delivery of course materials. And yet, our School must be responsive to the needs of our working graduate students who, through no fault of advising or failure to file an approved plan of study, could find themselves in need of a more relaxed distribution of on-campus lectures and online course offerings than is presently available. Implementation of this proposal will better position our School help lead these working adult students toward degree completion as Purdue graduates rather than losing their existing course credit and a potential graduate degree to another institution.
Program of Distance Education for the Purdue Master of Technology degree at IUPUI

This proposal highlights two divergent Plans of Study that encapsulate the broadest examples of student participation in the proposed distance education option for the Purdue MSTECH program at IUPUI. One PoS is built around an approved concentration area for the MSTECH degree and the other is an example of a “generic” MSTECH distance education degree that could be typical of a PoS for a part-time graduate student dealing with an unplanned change in professional or family obligations early in their graduate career.

The first example PoS fulfills the requirements for an existing and approved concentration in Facilities Management. This is a technical discipline defined by the International Facility Management Association (IFMA) as "A profession that encompasses multiple disciplines to ensure functionality of the built environment by integrating people, place, process and technology.” As the professional society for the facilities management field, IFMA accredits degree programs. Based on research data developed by the IFMA, there exists a significant shortage of professionals in this field. The compendium of graduate course offerings supporting this concentration have been designed to both address this shortfall in professional training and to fulfill the criteria for IFMA accreditation. Although significant opportunities exist in the greater Indianapolis metropolitan area to recruit graduate students into our Facilities Management concentration, the practical reality is that there is a limited number of physical facilities in our region that are of a size and complexity that can justify hiring of personnel formally credentialed in the discipline of Facilities Management. However, there is significant demand across the state of Indiana and nationally for such IFMA accredited graduate training. Given available faculty expertise in the Department of Engineering Technology and related strategic objectives of our Purdue School of Engineering and Technology, this proposal is intended to better establish Facilities Management as a distance education option under the existing MSTECH degree program at IUPUI. The second PoS is for an IUPUI graduate student enrolled in the Purdue MSTECH program who, for any number of foreseeable reasons, may require a more relaxed distribution of courses with in-person, on-campus lectures and online, distance education lecture formats. For such adult learners it would be unusual but not exceptional for more than 50% of their degree course work to be completed by way of an online mechanism for distance education.

1. On-Campus Enrollment/Degree History: Purdue M.S. in Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??(68)</td>
<td>??(72)</td>
<td>??(67)</td>
<td>??(72)</td>
<td>??(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Degrees</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Mix of technologies available to deliver this program:

Technologies routinely available and maintained on the IUPUI campus in support of online (distance) instruction centers around Oncourse, which is the Indiana University online collaboration and learning environment. Oncourse supports teaching and learning, academic and research projects and portfolio development that, collectively, provides an exceptional virtual learning environment with easy to use tools for group learning/discussion, remote recitation and Q&A sessions, group problem solving and file sharing, group specific tools for email, data sharing and group editing of documents.
Capabilities and related technologies include:

- Announcement posting and distribution via a class (or section) specific email
- Assignment creation, distribution, collection and grading
- An online calendar that is integrated with the course assignment schedule
- Course and campus policies documentation
- Syllabus for posting and linking outlines for course
- Roster including student contact information
- Chat room for real-time communication
- Blog and Wiki entries for site participants
- IU Box accounts (cloud storage) for file sharing between instructor and student(s)
- iTunes U for podcasting
- Integrated library resources to facilitate access to supplemental course materials
- Message for email through site
- MH Campus allowing integration with McGraw Hill’s MH Campus
- Modules for authoring, organizing and publishing learning materials
- MyLabsPlus allowing integration with Pearson’s MyLabsPlus
- Resources link for posting documents and links to other websites
- Statistics showing site activity by user, event or resource
- Tests and Survey for online tests, quizzes and surveys
- Web Content for accessing external websites from within Oncourse site
- WileyPLUS allowing integration with WileyPLUS
- Gradebook for entering, storing and managing grades
- SIS Grade Roster for submission of final grades to the Registrar

Purdue School of Engineering and Technology faculty are also supported by the IUPUI Center for Teaching and Learning, which provides training and consultation and assistance in developing and delivering online course content. State of the art software tools for developing and managing online course content are available at no cost to IUPUI faculty through consortium agreements IU has for Microsoft, Adobe and similar software vendors.

3. Access to the Instruction:

a. Given the technologies described above, identify the instructional settings available to students (i.e.: home; workplace; libraries and other public, non-educational settings; K-12 schools; public campuses/centers)

Archived online coursework is available asynchronously giving students 24 hour access from any web portal. On campus lectures may also have separate registration sections for simultaneous online, e.g. streaming, distance delivery. Finally, on campus lecture may supplement or occasionally substitute an on-campus lecture with one delivered online.

b. Will the institution enroll students in the program from anywhere in the state?

- Yes
  (Only for approved Concentration Areas that are unique to the IUPUI campus AND which do not overlap with existing graduate online graduate degree programs in the Purdue College of Technology or elsewhere in the Purdue System. Presently, our School has only two such unique Concentration Areas, i.e. Facilities Management and Motorsports. See Preamble for further explanation.)

- No (If no, please explain)
4. **Coursework Delivery**

The existing MSTECH program has two approved degree options, each requiring a minimum of 33 credit hours of graduate technology course work including 9 credit hours of program core (TECH 50700: Measurement and Evaluation in Industry and Technology, TECH 50800: Quality and Productivity in Industry and Technology and TECH 64600: Analysis of Research in Industry and Technology). An alternative core may be permitted for graduate students enrolled in an approved Area of Specialization for the MSTECH degree. One such approved degree path requires a 3 credit hour Directed Project (TECH 59800) while the other, so-called “Professional Master’s” degree path requires only that the 24 credit hours of graduate technology course work beyond the technology core be thematically consistent with the academic interests of faculty in the home department.

a. *Provide an example Plan of Study (including terms, class schedule type, expected duration/time to completion, etc…)*

In order to complete all requirements for the Purdue MSTECH degree in 2 years newly admitted graduate students are strongly advised to maintain a pace of two, 3 credit hour approved graduate technology courses per semester and summer terms. This can be a challenge for working adults and those with family commitments. Our School can greatly facilitate this timeline toward degree completion by expanding options for distance delivery of traditional, on campus lecture formats. This proposal for adding a distance education option to our existing Purdue MSTECH degree is intended to accommodate Plans of Study that may necessitate more than 50% online content. Such Professional Master’s degree paths can select graduate technology courses from a list of 20 regular course offerings with permanent course numbers.

A Plan of Study for online delivery of the MSTECH degree from the IUPUI campus might include 11 of those graduate courses approved for online delivery from the IUPUI campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIT 52800</td>
<td>Information and Security Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT 55000</td>
<td>Organizational Impact of Information and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT 56500</td>
<td>Teaching Computer Programming and Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IET 58100</td>
<td>Workshop in Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS 57400</td>
<td>Managerial Training and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS 58000</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills for Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS 58100</td>
<td>Workshop in Organizational Leadership and Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS 58200</td>
<td>Leadership and Organizational Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS 58300</td>
<td>Coaching and Mentoring in Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 50400</td>
<td>Motorsports Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 50700</td>
<td>Measurement and Evaluation in Industry and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 50800</td>
<td>Quality and Productivity in Industry and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 52100</td>
<td>Practicum in Motorsports Design and Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 53100</td>
<td>Motorsports Topics Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 56200</td>
<td>Teaching Engineering Technology Content and Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 56300</td>
<td>History, Trends and Limitations of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 57300</td>
<td>Managing Risk of Organizational Accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 58100</td>
<td>Workshop in Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 58200</td>
<td>Motorsports Special Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH 64600</td>
<td>Analysis of Research in Industry and Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Plan of Study for online delivery of a concentration in Facilities Management must include: (*bold are permanent course numbers approved for online delivery from the IUPUI campus, (course numbers in parentheses) are pending review by Area Committee A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number*</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ART51500)</td>
<td>Introduction to Facilities Engineering Systems</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IET 51500)</td>
<td>Facilities Planning and Management</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECET 53500</strong></td>
<td>Energy Management for Buildings</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ECET 54500)</td>
<td>Management of Telecommunications Infrastructure</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TECH 5xx00)</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IET 53000)</td>
<td>Facilities Contract Management</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECH 50800</strong></td>
<td>Quality and Productivity in Industry and Technology</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IET 55000)</td>
<td>Financial Aspects of Facilities Management</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IET 53800)</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance and Operation</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECH 59800</strong></td>
<td>Directed Project</td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 credit hours approved technical elective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* all (permanent course numbers) are as identified on the Form 40G documentation presently under review at the Purdue Graduate School. See item 4.b below.

Plan of Study Notes:
- The courses will follow the standard IUPUI 16 week semester format; Fall Semesters run from about the third week of August through the second week in December and Spring Semesters run from about the second week of January through the first week of May with Summer I & II terms following a more compressed 6 week schedule.
- All of the courses have been developed using guidelines from the International Facility Management Association (IFMA).
- The program is based on taking two courses in the fall and spring semesters, and one course over the summer terms. This schedule makes possible degree completion within 2 calendar years.

b. Form 40G and Supporting Documentation has been submitted to the Graduate School for courses identified.

c. Anticipated online M.S. Technology concentration areas will utilize courses offered by the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology on the IUPUI campus or other coursework available within the Purdue system. No other campus units are actively involved or responsible for the delivery of any online course content.

5. Off-Campus Curriculum and Instruction:

a. Will the off-campus curriculum be identical to the on-campus curriculum?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No (If no, please explain)

b. If applicable, describe how students will complete laboratory, studio, or clinical work.
It is not anticipated that laboratory, studio or clinical work will be incorporated in the online degree program curriculum which likely be limited to a “course only” plan of study, typical for such “Professional” Master’s degree programs. There are no plans at this time to implement an online option for a Directed Project. However, specialized concentrations such as Facilities Management often require a capstone course as part of fulfilling criteria for program accreditation. In such cases, the project requirements are designed to encourage working adult students to complete the project at their place of employment or alternatively, at a non-profit organization in their geographic location.

c. Please explain how the program will provide for timely and appropriate interaction among students and faculty members.

Current online courses typically require a deliverable from the student for each module of material. Learning modules are generally organized in one week increments although summer sessions may operate at an accelerated pace. Example deliverables include problem sets, quizzes and/or case analyses. Student’s receive feedback on the deliverable through the ‘Assignments’ feature in Oncourse as well as through one-on-one advising sessions with the course instructor.

Faculty post contact information including campus email and telephone in addition to audio/visual support mechanisms available through IUConnect. Furthermore, the Oncourse system incorporates a messaging provision allowing students to contact instructors and each other. Depending on course content and lecture format, the instructor may utilize the ‘Chat Room’ provision in Oncourse for real-time interaction.

d. How the program will provide for timely and appropriate interaction among students?

The Oncourse system incorporates a messaging provision allowing students to contact each other individually or as a group. The class roster with contact information is accessible to all students use and students have access to the ‘Chat Room’ provision in Oncourse for real-time interaction without the instructor.

e. Will the program require students to come to campus for any period of time?

☒ No
☐ Yes If “Yes,” indicate for how long, with what frequency, and for what purpose.

It is not anticipated that student will be required to come to campus. Administratively, the admission process at IUPUI is online, course registration is online, textbook information is posted to Oncourse sites and the diploma can be sent via registered mail. The current concentration in Facilities Management which has been identified for online delivery requires no on-campus commitment.

6. Assessment of Student Learning:

Identify the significant competencies or learning outcomes expected of students completing this program and how the students will be assessed.

Assessment of student learning is an integral component of all programs on the IUPUI campus. Following standard practices for instructional materials developed in the School of Engineering and Technology, each course description and syllabus incorporates specific Learning Outcomes. Furthermore, each concentration area for the M.S. Technology degree program will have an additional, specific set of Learning Outcomes. All Learning Outcomes will be assessed using methodologies that have been developed and vetted by our School and campus and that are shared through the Assessment Committee for the School of Engineering and Technology. As an example, the following are examples of Objectives and Outcomes for the approved concentration in Facilities Management:
Program Objectives

1. A majority of graduates will be employed in a facilities management related field.
2. A majority of graduates will have advanced their careers as a result of completion of the facilities management curriculum.
3. A majority of graduates will have received certification from a professional society in a facilities management related area.

Program Outcomes

1. Graduates will understand the organizational, managerial, ethical and legal principles associated with facilities management, and have the ability to effectively communicate in written, graphical and oral forms.
2. Graduates will understand aspects of the work environment related to employee health, safety, comfort and quality of work life.
3. Graduates will understand techniques and procedures for analyzing, planning, designing, constructing, specifying, equipping, occupying, evaluating and managing energy needs of a facility.
4. Graduates will understand basic financial and real estate functions related to asset management, budget development, property acquisition, leasing practices, operational expenditures and long-term financial planning associated with facilities management.
5. Graduates will understand the maintenance and operation requirements for buildings, building systems, equipment, grounds and exterior elements.
6. Graduates will understand concepts related to Information Technology systems, communications infrastructure and application of appropriate application software to support a facility's operation.
7. Graduates will understand: how to evaluate and assess the quality of services; evaluate and assess facility effectiveness; benchmark; audit processes; and develop activities to support facility services.

Assessment of learning outcomes utilize examinations in all coursework in addition to research papers, analysis of case studies, quizzes, problem sets and/or other assessment tools as appropriate for the course content.

7. Availability of Academic Support and Student Services:

Describe how students have access to each of the following:

a. Admissions – Admission process in online for all IUPUI students. The School of Engineering and Technology Graduate Office maintains contact with potential student’s through-out the admission process. Contact information is provided to potential students for direct contact.

b. Financial Aid – Financial Aid application is online for all IUPUI students. Contact information is provided to potential students for direct contact.

c. Academic Advising – Upon admission, each graduate student is assigned to a faculty member in their area of study for academic advising. An initial plan of study is developed for each student, the advisor and student then are in contact via phone and email as needed. A formal graduation application is submitted in the semester prior to graduation along with the Purdue GS-6 Plan of Study form to verify all degree requirements are fulfilled.
d. **Course Materials** (including delivery mechanism) – All course materials are accessible asynchronously via the Oncourse student learning system or via a course specific website.

e. **Library Materials** (including delivery mechanism) – Library Materials are accessible through the IUPUI Main Library. Materials utilized for online coursework are digital and can be accessed by any current IUPUI student. Library resources can be linked directly to the Oncourse system.

f. **Placement and Counseling** – Students have access to the IUPUI School of Engineering and Technology's Student Services which include job posting by employers and placement assistance. Online students may utilize all campus services related to academic and personal counseling. Career counseling is provided by the student's academic advisor and/or other Engineering Technology graduate faculty.

g. **Technical support (e.g. on-line help desk)** – The School of Engineering Technology's Computer Network Center (CNC) and the University Information Technology Services (UITS) provide technical support including help desks accessible either online or by phone. Additionally, UITS has extensive online student support via their Knowledge Base postings. The UITS Knowledge Base includes multiple help resources related specifically to the Oncourse system.

8. **Student Fees:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indiana Residents</th>
<th>Non-Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Campus Instruction</strong></td>
<td>$ 318.20/credit hour</td>
<td>$ 957.70/credit hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance Education Instruction</strong></td>
<td>$ 318.20/credit hour</td>
<td>$ 957.70/credit hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)2012-13 Academic Year Fees
9. **Academic Degree Program**: Proposal Summary (Table 1)

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSAL SUMMARY

I. Institution/Location: *School of Engineering and Technology / Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis*

Program: *Master of Science in Technology*

*(projections are for the proposed online delivery of the Facilities Management concentration and do not include projections for enrollments in the existing on-campus delivery of the MSTECH degree, i.e. see page 2 of this proposal)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time (Headcount)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time (Headcount)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Headcount)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time (FTE)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time (FTE)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (FTE)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree Completions Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New State Funds Requested (Actual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New State Funds Requested (Increases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

II. **CHE Code:**

| Campus Code: |
| County Code: |
| Degree Level: Graduate / Master of Science |
| CIP Code: |


Degree Title: Master of Science in Technology

Campus: Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

School: Purdue School of Engineering and Technology

____________________________________________   ______________
Department Head        Date
Department of Engineering Technology, IUPUI

_____________________________________________    ______________
Associate Dean of Graduate Programs, IUPUI      Date

_____________________________________________    ______________
Academic Dean         Date
School of Engineering and Technology, IUPUI

_____________________________________________     ______________
Dean of the Graduate School, Purdue University                Date

_____________________________________________   _______________
Provost, Purdue University           Date