PURDUE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
Faculty Senate Minutes
February 9, 2010

Representatives in Attendance: Karen Alfrey, Mark Bannatyne, Ed Berbari, Rongrong Chen, Stanley Chien (alternate), Elaine Cooney, Connie Justice, Sarah Koskie (alternate), Nancy Lamm (alternate), Roberta Lindsey, Emily McLaughlin, Razi Nalim (alternate), David Peters, Ken Rennels, Paul Salama, John Schild, Joy Starks, Bill White

Guests: Barb Christe, Marj Rush-Hovde, Andrew Hsu, Stephen Hundley, Dean Yurtseven

Presiding: Ken Rennels, Faculty Senate President

Meeting began at 11:02 a.m.

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

Ken Rennels asked everyone to look at the minutes from the December 2009 meeting. Copies of the minutes are not distributed at the meeting, but can be found at G:\COMMON\Senate documents in addition to being distributed to all faculty via the E&T Faculty email at least one week prior to each Faculty Senate meeting. A motion was made to accept the December 2009 minutes; all approved.

Additional Note: around 12:15 p.m. some faculty began leaving the meeting; Ken advised Joy Starks will be the proxy for Tom Ho; Barb Christe will be the proxy for Doug Acheson.

Administrative Report

Dr. Yurtseven advised Faculty Senate of the following:

Academic Programs:

Dr. Yurtseven advised the enrollment is very good for spring 2010; credit hours (more crucial in terms of budget) increase of 8% and headcount increase of 3%.

Energy Engineering BS program proposal is still with the Board of Trustees, a few problems, hope to be resolved this Thursday or the next board meeting.

Grants and Contracts:

Yunlong Hu (BME): American Heart Association, non-competing award, 01/01/10-12/31/10, ICR: $7,000, Total: $77,000

John Schild (BME): NIH, Continuing Competing Award, 01/12/10-11/30/10, ICR: $99,880, Total: 342,880

Dongsoo Kim (ECE): IUPUI/IDF, New Service Award, 01/01/10-12/31/10, ICR: 0, Total: $5,000

Lauren Christopher (ECE): IUPUI/RSF, 01/01/10-12/31/10, ICR: 0, Total: $54,750

Scott Deal (MAT): IU/New Frontiers Grant, ICR: 0, Total: $19,971

Faculty News:

There have been a large number of innovation disclosures, which is continued good news for the school; we are number two on the IUPUI campus after Medical School in submitting innovation disclosures, patents, and applications.

Lauren Christopher (ECE) and Yan Sun (ECE) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Lauren Christopher (ECE) and Mangilal Agarwal (ECE) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Lauren Christopher (ECE) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Afshin Izadian (ENT) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Hiroki Yokota (BME) and Ping Zhang (BME) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Yingzi Eliza Du (ECE) and Zhi Zhou (ECE) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Dong Xie (BME) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Stanley Chien (ECE), Chen Lin (Medicine), Fatih Akisik (Medicine), and Hongyun Zhu (ECE) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Jian Xie (ME) and Fan Xu (ME) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Yingzi Eliza Du (ECE) and Kai Yang (ECE) submitted Innovation Disclosure to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization

Joy Starks (CILT) co-authored textbook with Gary Shelly "Adobe Photoshop C84-Comprehensive Concepts and Techniques." Kevin Marshall (DCT) was the artist and photographer for the book. Joy will use her book this summer at Tech Camp and this fall in class.

Science and Engineering Research Complex (SERC)

This building will be discussed at the Board of Trustees meeting next week. This will be a $25M building, will go out for design bid in March, and construction bid for December 2010, or Jan 2011, and ground breaking will begin sometime in spring 2011. The building should be ready 12-18 months after start of construction.

Budget works out that the building is $25M; our school is putting in $5M that is coming from ANGEL funds (done by university on our behalf). The School of Science is putting in $3M down payment; we are making arrangements to lend part of the monies to the School of Science.

The remaining $17M will be bonds; the university will get a mortgage loan for 5.75% interest for 20-25 years. They will then calculate the monthly mortgage payments, and expenses for running the building, and each school will share in the cost base for this space; 37% of the space is for School of E&T and 63% for School of Science, almost agreed to the sharing formula. $5M given as down payment will go toward the payment over 25 years, which will be a credit for use; $3M from School of Science will also be a credit. The remaining balance will have to be paid from Indirect Cost Recovery. This building is a research building and about 60% of the cost has to be covered from the research indirect cost recovery funds. This is on the fast track due to this reason.

Phase 2 of the building will be entirely state funded $20-$25M; next fall there will be negotiations and a request to put in capital project. This year the school was advised that Phase 2 will be IUPUI's first priority; however, the location will not be between SL and ET, and the Master Plan has it at the south end of LD Building. The building plans have been approved by IU Trustees and President early on without this building in place, and they will not go back to revisit the new plan. It will be many months before it is brought to the board of trustees and president and the building is on a fast track. This is one reason the school gave up on location issues. The building will be built in two phases that are already in place or approved, which will be approximately 190,000 GSF when both phases are complete. They are recommending the building will be connected to part of the LD building through all of the floors except the basement, then it will make a right turn west on New York Street.

Events:

On December 11, ME celebrated the dedication of SL 044 as the Carrier Fluid and Thermal Sciences Laboratory.

Hasan Akay (ME) and Akin Ecer (ME) retired effective December 31, 2009 after thirty years of teaching, research and service efforts. Their retirement party took place on December 4, 2009.

Pam May (ENT), a long time staff member, retired effective January 4, 2010. Pam's retirement party (along with her sister Pat May) took place on December 17, 2009. Alison Stevenson is now the Assistant to the Chair, and began on February 8th.

Spring 2010 Faculty and Staff convocation took place on January 7, 2010; this was another snow day, not a large attendance. Chancellor Bantz and Dave Coats from the IUPUI Polis Center were the speakers.

Our school sponsored and organized the 2010 First Robotics competition on January 9, 2010. There were 18 high schools in attendance. Peter Orono is the lead advisor and organizer.

Collaboration with UITS:

Connie Justice will discuss in more detail later. The school signed two agreements, one is to work out the undergraduate student technology fee structure, which will go back to UITS. We gave up 6 labs and they will monitor and schedule these labs for the next 3 years. The second agreement was to provide the school with additional managerial expertise to CNC by bringing Jim Kippenbrock full-time over from UITS as the Interim Director of CNC; Jim Kippenbrock began working with CNC mid January. Bill Lin returned to full-time faculty role after five years of leadership for CNC. Jim Kippenbrock's position is interim until July 1, after that will look at position, and if agreed by UITS will be a permanent position. The agreement will be for a 3 year trial basis; half salary will come from UITS and half by our school. We hope Jim Kippenbrock can use his influence and position with UITS to connect us to UITS, and better use their resources since we pay about $600,000 tax to UITS each year.

<u>Questions for Dr. Yurtseven</u>

John Schild questioned what the cost is to build out a particular lab setting. Schild was questioning the numbers he was seeing regarding the lab costs. Dr. Yurtseven advised the costs so far are for building construction and everything for the wet lab that is needed. The approximate costs given to Dr. Yurtseven as of yesterday are $255.00 per GSF for research and teaching labs, $300.00 per GSF for vivarium (animal research facility), and $180 dollars for offices with no labs. These numbers are approximate at this time. This is the time to move quickly to get the contract bid; prices are good at this time. The cost for the equipment in the labs is not included at this time. The building position will be south of LD, along Blackford going towards New York Street; it will be an "L" shape building. Schild questioned the requirement of a new loading dock. Dr. Yurtseven advised this has not been worked out yet. They will try to see about accommodation and transporting of animals in the right way. Over the next few weeks during the Board of Trustees meeting they want to make sure there is $25M from different sources, and give the approval for the bid process to begin for the design phase. Dr. Yurtseven hopes everyone will be involved in the design phase during March and October/November. The school is looking at other lab layouts; they have looked at Bloomington and will be visiting West Lafayette this Friday. Notre Dame has also invited the school to look at their science/engineering labs. Once it is approved by the board, then both schools can work with the designers.

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

Associate Dean's Report

Stephen Hundley presented the following report:

Stephen Hundley thanked everyone for being available and taking advantage of the opportunities to meet the new dean candidates. Hundley knows everyone is busy and appreciates everyone participating in the process as much as your schedule permits.

Our student credit hours are up 8.45% over last spring; this compares to 2.38% for the campus. There is a reason why the campus numbers are down comparatively…the IU Kelley School of Business MBA program was transferred to the Bloomington campus, which is a loss of about 900 students. We have had to make this back up.

Kelly Keelen has sent out student information to each of the department chairs to help them understand student profiles a little better.

GREAT Environments committee will be conducting a series of focus groups in late February/early March to fill in the gap of unanswered questions. Hundley will share more information as it emerges from their analysis.

ABET preparation continues for BME, ME and ECE. We have also had some follow up response reports concerning CIT and CGT to close the loop.

Hundley also reminded everyone about our academic misconduct process. There have been a number of these working their way through the system. We have a process in place, and we need to avail ourselves of this process. We need to document the process and fill out the forms; if it is not filled out there is no documentation and no record in place. We have been working with Tralicia Lewis, in the Office of Students Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct, whose office is housed under the Office of Student Life, and spoken with legal counsel and as long as we follow our process we are good. The Undergraduate Education Committee has been trained and oriented to the procedure. We will have some cases that will

be emerging, cases appealed to the school level. This has not happened in several years; we wanted to make sure the committee is oriented, including our student representatives. We will try to resolve at the faculty level first, with the faculty and student; if resolution is not accommodated there it goes to the chair; if resolution is not accommodated there is goes to the Dean's office, and the last appeal the student has is to our school level committee. Hundley's office wanted to make sure that in advance that the Undergraduate Education Committee were properly trained and oriented. There will be some appeals this year. Talking with Tralicia this is not a bad thing, and we have a due process in place. This is a good time to activate this procedure and use the resources that we have. To take away some of the lessons learned from some of the issues that are working their way through the system we are partnering with Tralicia and her office, and the Center for Teaching and Learning. They will be developing a workshop that will probably be launched in fall 2010. The workshop will present some practical ways that faculty and departments and our school as a whole can safeguard our environments and minimize academic misconduct issues and to remind us of what the processes are. Hundley will forward a copy of the Student Academic Misconduct forms to everyone also.

Ed Berbari asked regarding the Academic Misconduct Policy, is it required when a faculty member and student first discover this, should the faculty member put a report forward that it occurred. Hundley advised yes, fill out the form, it is then a process issue to Dean's office, then Stephen Hundley signs the form and sends on to campus level. Tralicia's office, Office of Students Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct, keeps a copy of the form. If you resolve the issue with the student, but do not document, and the problem is recurring, documentation will not be in student's file of past issues.

Miscellaneous

There are two campus events coming up…both are campus level faculty development level events. Stephen Hundley will forward information via email to faculty.

Multicultural Teaching and Learning Institute

Edwin C. Moore Symposium on Teaching Excellence

There are three Lunch and Learns at the school level; one on service learning, one on student engagement, and one on preparing for Promotion and Tenure.

Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs

Graduate Programs

Andrew Hsu advised the school has received $207,000 for block grants from the campus; the Senate Graduate Education Committee met and decided to distribute the block grant according to requests from the departments. Department chairs will receive a letter regarding the distribution.

The school also received $30,000 for teaching assistantship, not part of the block grant, but from the same campus funding source; the Senate Graduate Education Committee decided to divide the grant four ways between ECE, ME, MAT and TECH.

The Senate Graduate Education Committee decided that next year before submission of proposal will have committee meet to come up with a formula; previously Hsu had developed a formula with the chairs on how to distribute based on indirect cost income and also graduate enrollment; so the Graduate Affairs committee will revisit this issue before the submission of the proposals next fall.

School research as of January 31st has reached $7M, less than $100K shy of last year's total. The School of Social Science got a large bump last month; we are no longer number two on campus. But we are still head to head with School of Science, for number three position. If the School of Social Science does not get any other major grants our numbers will probably exceed them.

Andrew Hsu advised IU has decided to establish a Graduate Council, and decided to give one representative slot to the two Purdue Schools. Hsu is working with Ken Rennels to see how we coordinate with the School of Science to elect one person from there.

Another issue that has been discussed in the past is that the Bursar office is charging a convenience fee on credit card payments and Bursar Ingrid Toschlog presented the rationale for the convenience fee to the Graduate Affairs Committee.

There is a task force on campus to study graduate experience at IUPUI, an appointment by Uday's office. They will be visiting your offices and checking with graduate students to study the experiences and how to improve upon them.

Research

There is a Trailblazer or Research Frontier Award, and the nominations are due by February 17th. There will only be 3 awards on campus. This is a prestigious award; the award targets associate professors within 3 years of their appointment in rank. The award is aimed at giving encouragement to faculty members who are still at the associate rank, and there is also a $1,000 award. If departments are planning on submitting nominations please get started soon. Hsu has sent out email messages. Please remind your department chairs about this award.

Campus is organizing a research day this year and it will be April 9th. Hsu advised they will be asking for faculty hosts and presenters. Steven Beering, former Purdue President, will give a speech during lunch.

One last issue is for submission of proposals to federal agencies on limited proposal opportunities; the campus has devised a new procedure, there will be timelines, etc. The Vice Chancellor for Research office wants to remind faculty members that it is the faculty members responsibility once they see a request for proposal where it says "limited submission opportunity" which means there may be one per campus allowed, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to contact the Vice Chancellor for Research office to make sure you get into the internal competition, otherwise you cannot represent IUPUI. John Schild asked if there was a paper trail for this process. Hsu advised there is a paper trail: the faculty member is required to submit a 1-2 page white paper, and then there is a formal review process.

Budgetary Affairs Committee – No Report

Computing Resources Committee (CRC)

Connie Justice advised after a very long negotiation process and communication process regarding the Undergraduate Student Technology Fees between our school and UITS, all have come to an agreement (See Attachment 2). Dr. Yurtseven signed the agreement on January 22, 2010 and Garland Elmore signed the agreement on January 15, 2010. The agreement was distributed during the Faculty Senate meeting.

The agreement was signed and we had a vote of endorsement during Faculty Senate last month. Those issues were put into the final agreement. Justice noted this will conclude the Student Technology Fee project for the year.

John Schild asked for clarification on Item #12, noting:

> "The space allocations (ownership) will be subject to a review after a period of two (2) years or 2012. It will be determined during this periodic review whether to continue the space assignments to UITS or to return the space assignment to the school. If the space assignment is reverted to the school, this will occur at the end of year three (3) or 2013."

Per our conversations as it stands we still own the space, and that will be reviewed after three (3) years. That is currently the understanding. According to our conversations in Faculty Senate this was the best compromise at this time.

Ken Rennels advised it has been advised to invite our Interim CNC director, Jim Kippenbrock, to a Faculty Senate meeting. Rennels advised maybe we will invite Jim Kippenbrock to the April meeting since he will be more familiar with our school and needs by then.

Mark Bannatyne questioned since Bill Lin was released as Director of CNC, why is the position interim now. Dr. Yurtseven advised with the administrative change in July, if the new Dean approves the position it will be permanent.

Joy Starks questioned scheduling of labs after July, who do we work with? Justice will find out.

Connie thanked everyone for their support.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Sarah Koskie displayed the Constitution and Bylaws for Faculty Senate. Koskie noted the Graduate Education Committee advised they were having great difficulty communicating with the Graduate chairs in the departments because those were not the people who were on the Graduate Education Committee (See Attachment 3).

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is proposing an amendment that would make the composition of the committee be the chairs of the Graduate program, and by request of the MAT, maximum one per department (MAT has two programs, wants to have only one representative from MAT).

This small change will require a change in the bylaws in four (4) separate places. The section headings involved are:

      IV. School of Engineering and Technology Senate
            E. Standing Committees of the Senate
                  2. Nominations Committee.
                        d. Duties and Responsibilities.
                  7. Graduate Education Committee.
                        a. Membership
                        b. Terms

The changes are:(1) Section IV.E.2.d.ii: Delete "representatives from Departments without graduate programs to the Graduate Education Committee and"

(2) Section IV.E.2.d.iv: Delete "This committee shall solicit from Departments with graduate programs the names of members elected to the Graduate Education Committee."

(3) Section IV.E.7.a (Membership): Replace "one Faculty member elected by each Department, one Faculty member elected from the combined Programs not contained within academic Departments," with

"the Chairs of the Graduate Programs (maximum one per academic department)". Add a new sentence following this one that states that "If a Graduate Program Chair is unwilling or unable to serve, the affected program shall designate a replacement."

(4) Section IV.E.7.b (Terms): Replace "Members shall serve two-year terms. Approximately half of the members shall be elected each year." With "If a Graduate Program Chair chooses not to serve, a designee shall be elected each year by that program." (see attachment 3)

The changes can be summarized as follows:

Two duties of Nominations committee would be affected. Mentions the committee will nominate representatives from departments without graduate programs for the Graduate Education Committee; since there is no particular need for a department with no graduate program to have representation, this will be changed. Second change is , inconsistency in bylaws…will make changes. Actual description of Graduate Education Committee will change the membership and provide for department selection of a designee (with a one-year term) if the Grad Program Chair cannot or will not serve.

Razi Nalim questioned if this changed the number of participants on the committee. Koskie advised it would decrease the number slightly, but there would be representation for each Graduate Program.

Ken Rennels advised this requires a first reading since this is a change in the bylaws. This is what the Constitution and Bylaws is proposing at this time; if there are any disagreements regarding these changes feedback needs to go to Sarah Koskie and her committee. This will be an action item to vote on these changes during the March Faculty Senate meeting. Rennels advised Faculty Senate members to discuss with their departments.

Rennels noted this committee is quite important. Andrew Hsu earlier advised this committee allocates block grant money, and this year the amount was $414,000.

John Schild questioned if the allocation of funds will go back to Faculty Senate for approval. Rennels does not believe Faculty Senate will approve funds; Hsu's office provides the request for the block grant and it goes in with certain percentages, and a breakdown of who is getting funds. The committee will have some influence with working on the formula for the funds with Hsu. Rennels noted we received everything we requested this year. In the case of the teaching assistant ship grant, asked for $70,000, only received $30,000; asked for committee to re-distribute these funds.

Graduate Education Committee – No Report

Grievance Board – No Report

Faculty Affairs Committee

Instructor and Course Evaluations
See Attachment 4 for Instructor and Course Evaluations – Revised Version

Marj Rush-Hovde advised that instructor and course evaluation revisions have been discussed previously in Faculty Senate. The Faculty Affairs Committee had received a request to look them over since they had not been updated in a long time. The committee made suggestions, and proposed the changes to Faculty Senate. A representative from the Center for Teaching and Learning also met with the committee to make sure the questions would provide useful answers. One item the Center for Teaching and Learning advised is to be careful and ask only one item in each question. The committee revised the questions for

classroom, online delivery and they created new questions for laboratory courses. Hovde advised she is presenting the documents to Faculty Senate and for vote.

Razi Nalim inquired about laboratory course questions. Hovde advised each section, classroom and laboratory, for example, would receive an evaluation.

Hovde displayed the current questions and proposed questions. These are all on a strongly agree/strongly disagree scale. Noted there are often different teachers for the laboratory and lecture sections; therefore, each section would be evaluated. Students will also be able to write comments. Student evaluations are only one measure of student effectiveness; one means for getting feedback. This would be combined with peer reviews, teaching portfolios, external reviews, etc. These are all some of the items discussed while deciding on wording of questions.

Discussion regarding evaluations:

#6 – the instructor fulfilled the course objectives
The instructor cannot fulfill the course objectives, that is something the instructor and students do; *change to "instructor helped me fulfill course objectives"* (classroom version)

#10 – overall, this instructor was effective at teaching in this course
The last question – one widely used purpose is to put in your Promotion and Tenure documents; # 9 and #10 will be especially important for these documents
Should the question be: overall I rate the instructor as….
Ken Rennels proposes the new wording is better for Promotion and Tenure.
Change to "overall, this instructor was effective at teaching this course" (classroom version)

#6 – the instructor fulfilled the course objectives
Change to "the instructor helped me fulfill the course objectives" (classroom version)

#5 – the instructor fulfilled the course objectives
Change to "the instructor helped me fulfill the course objectives" (online version)

Course description question – students have not read or always know the course objectives; student may not know if course matched description…

#9 – all qualitative – how can we effectively expect students measure #9 and #10; did not feel students are qualified to assess instructor.

#9 has more to do with curriculum issues over instructor issues

Hovde noted #10 – focuses on "did I learn something?"

Change word "objectives" to "course outcomes"…use word "outcomes" for courses, students may not understand "objectives" as much; some instructors use wording "course goals."

Marj suggested "goals" rather than "objectives", maybe a broader term.

Amendment to make wording changes as Marj indicated on the screen

A motion was made and Faculty Senate approved the wording changes as indicated on the screen and during discussion for the in class, online, and laboratory evaluation questions.

Votes are noted:

Yes – 14
Abstaining - 1

Hovde advised the Faculty Affairs Committee will try to put these updated evaluations in place by the end of the spring semester. In the past evaluations were not done in the summer, Hovde would strongly encourage evaluations be done in the summer. Rennels advised to go through the Associate Dean's office regarding summer evaluations.

A motion was made and Faculty Senate approved the revised instructor course evaluations as submitted.

Votes are noted:

Yes - 12
No - 1
Abstaining – 2

Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching
See Attachment 5 for Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching, Revised Version

Hovde advised the second item to vote on is an item that was tabled at a previous meeting, the Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching. Some faculty are not familiar with the original guidelines and they asked for the original guidelines. The original guidelines and the revised draft were sent with the agenda.

Hovde noted a couple changes:

Clarified wording, changed wording policy to guidelines; reorganized some of the ideas; also made provisions for review of online courses. One major addition is where they encouraged departments to develop guidelines that would be followed within their department and gives details of what might be included in those guidelines. These are some of the major changes made from the original document from the fall 2002 document.

A motion was made and Faculty Senate approved to accept the revisions to the Peer Review of Teaching guidelines as proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Votes are noted:

Yes – 14
Abstaining - 1

Hovde noted she would send the revised guidelines to the Associate Dean's office and also to the chairs.

Guidelines for Clinical Ranks
See Attachment 6 for Guidelines for Clinical Ranks Document

Faculty Affairs began revising the Clinical description awhile back, and is now revisiting the document. If you go to the E&T website, the faculty and staff section, there is a description for lecturers and clinical faculty. The last one was revised in 1998. The committee tried to make it more in line with the campus

understanding, but also to define for the School of E&T, clinical rank does not mean quite what it means in the medical setting, nursing, dentistry and medicine. Some of this material is similar, the committee defined clinical faculty in the document (third paragraph) as noted:

> "In the School of Engineering and Technology, clinical faculty members may be responsible for civic engagement that supports their teaching and service. The type, level, and scope of all of their service will be determined on a departmental basis at the time of an initial appointment. The primary duties of faculty members holding clinical rank in the School of Engineering and Technology are teaching and providing professional services such as service to students, the department, the school, the university, the community, and professional associations. Appropriate teaching load and service requirements will be determined by the faculty member's department chair with approval from the Dean in conformance with the school's workload policy."

The first numbered point comes from the influence of the 1998 document; the wording on the updated document is similar, however, the committee had some issues with limiting the percentage of clinical faculty, and not allowing flexibility. The intention behind the number was on voting privileges, to be sure that tenured line people would have an appropriate representation in voting.

One way to word this is "in school or departmental votes, the votes of tenure-line faculty members should be calculated proportionally to non-tenure line faculty members so that the majority is given to tenure-line faculty members."

Another way to word it is to create a separate document to address the issue of how do you have a voting situation represented for tenure line and non-tenure line faculty. The committee did not come to agreement, but it hopes to do so in the future.

Another change is the term of appointment…

Term of Appointment. The initial appointment for clinical appointments shall be one or two years during a probationary period of not more than seven years. After promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, the typical length of contract will be five years.

Have long term contracts, but not tenure.

Document discusses when clinical faculty will be reviewed, also mentions "after a successful 5th year review without promotion, 2- to 3-year contracts will be the norm. After promotion to associate clinical professor and/or full clinical professor, 5-year contracts will be the norm."

If you wish to stay at the assistant clinical professor level it is not an up or out sort of thing.

For promotion procedures use the guidelines that are currently being revised, look at service and teaching for evaluation:

> "Criteria for evaluating performance in teaching are identical to those for tenure-line faculty. Criteria for evaluating performance in service are also identical but with one exception; at the time of promotion consideration, a peer review of service will be completed by members of the Center for Service Learning or other appropriate individuals."

Hovde noted the final point from the document:

"In accordance with the IU Handbook, the clinical rank faculty member shall not be evaluated in the area of research. Clinical faculty members may contribute to the research efforts of a unit through their clinical work, but they are not expected to conduct discipline-specific individual research. In a promotion case, any research should be shown to contribute to the faculty member's teaching and/or service responsibilities."

It is noted in the last paragraph in parentheses in the guidelines that we have a couple people appointed to clinical lines and there were no guidelines, may need to be a case-by-case guidelines. In the future when new people are appointed they can use these guidelines.

Hovde noted this is for discussion at this time; she will bring comments to the committee, make revisions as needed and bring back to Faculty Senate for a vote.

Mark Bannatyne questioned in terms in length of contracts, questioned length similar to campus; Hovde advised this time period is campus wide.

Ken Rennels believes the committee needs to address maximum number and voting privileges, instead of an "or", both issues need to be address. Also, Rennels noted that since IUPUI Faculty Council is now recognizing non-tenure track clinical rank faculty with seats on the Faculty Council we need to be consistent with the fact now that they have a vote at the faculty governance level.

It was discussed that teaching for clinical and lecture position needs to be more clear. Hovde noted the main difference is that the majority of the clinical faculty member service should be external to campus, in the community, a professional association. The clinical person the service needs to be more integration of service with teaching, community work, or work with the center on campus that serves both students and people off campus. The other difference is the clinical person can go up on Excellence in service with good performance in teaching; a lecturer cannot, they need to go up on Excellence on teaching with good service. A clinical position can also go up on with Excellence in teaching and include service. There are more ranks in a clinical position.

Stanley Chien believes the definition is somewhat unclear for Clinical ranks. Hovde noted the committee is thinking about making a chart of all of the clinical lines because of the confusion.

Ed Berbari noted that since BME has one clinical faculty the one way he defines the position, is that a person who teaches students in the context of working with clients; Hovde advised that is one way to define the position. Berbari noted for their program the clinical faculty person teaches the senior design course primarily, these projects can come from industry, across campus, outside the department and outside the school. This is how BME has defined the clinical rank position, working with students and clients.

One of the reasons the committee wanted to revise the document is that in the past few years there have been a few more people appointed to clinical rank positions, and there was a lot of confusion. For the protection of these individuals the committee hopes they are treated appropriately and fairly when they go up for promotions. The Faculty Affairs Committee wanted to make sure the Clinical rank faculty know what is expected of them when they are appointed to the position.

Hovde noted that Rennels commented that he thought they should have sections both on maximum number and voting privileges. There was some question about the voting privilege question. Hovde gave an example that if there is a department with 15 clinical and 10 tenure-line people who all have equal voting privileges, the clinical people could outvote the tenure-line people. Hovde noted you may need to

give clinical line 40% of the vote and tenure line would have 60% of the vote. Voting needs to be identified, but not sure of current wording. Nancy Lamm questioned if lecturers will be included in voting issues, if they are included in the totals. Hovde is thinking about developing a separate document regarding the voting privilege issues.

Hovde advised she would bring the document back to her committee and advise them that there is no consensus at this time. Hovde and Rennels reminded Faculty Senate to bring the guidelines back to your departments and provide feedback to Hovde and the Faculty Affairs Committee. The guidelines will be brought back in March.

Faculty Affairs Committee is still working on the Tenure and Promotion document; will meet with the Unit Board on February 19th, and then revise it and bring it to Faculty Senate for discussion in March.

Nominations – No Report

Resource Policy Committee – No Report

Student Affairs Committee – No Report

Undergraduate Education Committee

Karen Alfrey presented two action items and an information item
See Attachment 7 for the Undergraduate Education Committee report

The first item is a change in the residence requirement for BMET associate degree.

Barb Christe noted the Associate Degree in BMET is one of the few associate degrees still offered in the school. There has been a great deal of difficulty with the small amount of credits required with transfer students from Ivy Tech; students want to take most of credits at Ivy Tech and come to IUPUI for one semester to complete degree. Employers have noticed the quality in students who take majority of courses at Ivy Tech is not the same, and this has impacted the degree. Students are also trying to get internships without a GPA, but our school does not allow this. BMET is requesting the following sentence to be added to the residency requirement for transfer students in the program from 15 to 20 credit hours. Will add the following sentence:

"Students who seek an associate degree in Biomedical Engineering Technology must complete 20 credit hours of courses from the School of Engineering and Technology."

Larger hurdle is internships, placed in internships for the last semester, but they begin internships in the last semester.

Ken Rennels asked if this could be an issue with West Lafayette, he believes the current policy is based on the Purdue West Lafayette policy for transfer credits for associate degrees. Christe believes this should not be a conflict.

Architectural Technology is the only other department offering an AS degree.

Alfrey advised the committee tabled this issue specifically so department representatives could check with their respective departments if they would like to make any similar changes. There were no other departments requesting any changes.

Ed Berbari asked if the department has thought about asking for the maximum number of credits transferred into the degree; Christe advised she was trying to stay with the current wording in the exiting policy, which addressed credit hours required from our school.

Faculty Senate unanimously approved the change in the BMET residency requirement

The second item is a pre-requisite change to five (5) courses in Interior Design; INTR 324, INTR 325, INTR 452, INTR 453, INTR 495. Each of these courses is remaining exactly the same with the exception of some changes to pre-requisites to reflect a change in the math requirement and a re-sequencing of some of the courses. The Undergraduate Education Committee voted unanimously to recommend these changes. The Math requirement was Math 153 and Math 154, and CIDA (Council for Interior Design Accreditation) requires only one math class, so INTR has requested this change.

Faculty Senate unanimously approved the INTR 324, INTR 325, INTR 452, INTR 453, INTR 495 pre-requisite changes

The final item is a request from the New Student Academic Advising Center, requesting a new withdrawal policy. Alfrey suggested the committee is seeking endorsement of the policy. UCOL already limits the number of withdrawals per semester for students with less than 26 credit hours to one withdrawal per semester. NSAAC would like to adopt this policy starting this fall. There is strong evidence that large numbers of withdrawals from courses are heavily correlated with not completing degrees or not completing the degree in a timely manner.

Ken Rennels verified that this applies only to students who are in the New Student Advising Center, not to students who are directly in the department? Barb Christe noted that UCOL policy is that students can withdraw from all of their courses, however UCOL does limit the number of withdrawals students can have. However, the provision for withdrawing from all courses is not published as part of the policy on the UCOL website and was not mentioned by the UCOL advisors in meetings with NSAAC to discuss this policy, so Nancy Lamm was unaware of that part of the UCOL policy. The goal of the NSAAC is to adopt the UCOL policy and administer it as UCOL has been doing.

Rennels asked with Faculty Senate permission, he asked that Undergraduate Education Committee asked them to revise the policy so that we coincide with the UCOL policy and then bring back next month for Faculty Senate endorsement. Faculty Senate may need to approve since it will be an academic policy.

IUPUI Faculty Council

Ed Berbari advised there have been two IUPUI Faculty Council meetings since the last Faculty Senate meeting.

Change in the vesting policy for fringe benefits for retirement package; will change for all new employees after September 1st. You will need to be here 5 years before you are fully vested in the retirement package.

During the last meeting the Chancellor pointed out that budget hearings were taking place; our school will present our budget on February 20th.

The Campus Campaign will go public sometime in October.

There is a new website that has all of the campus building projects summarized, on the Chancellors page.

The Chancellor's review is now finishing; there will be one more meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council with voting members present only and a few of the USC executive committee members and president on March 2nd.

There is a new review process for Academic Administrators that was passed during the last meeting.

The first reading of a new extension of tenure track policy; has to do primarily for the medical school. The policy will go to 9 years for tenure clock, will make the medical school more competitive in our recruiting. Other schools can adopt the policy, as a school (not department), if they can prove the benefit to their school. This will now be the norm for the School of Medicine, and will affect all new hires in the medical school.

There is an election currently going on for at large representatives.

For details on the above information and all other IUPUI Faculty Council meeting notes, please look at their website: www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil.

Purdue Intercampus Faculty – No Report

Purdue Technology Senate – No Report

Purdue Faculty Senate – No Report

IUPUI Council of Associate Deans for Research - No Report

Assessment Committee – No Report

New Business – No Report

Update on Dean Search and Screen

Stephen has been keeping everyone notified of the incoming candidates.

Meeting ended at 12:30 p.m. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 9, 2010, 11:00 a.m. in SL 165.

Attachment 1: Administrative Report from Dr. Yurtseven

Dean's Report for February 9, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

Academic Programs

- The enrollment numbers for spring 2010 are very encouraging. The headcount increased by 3% and the student credit hours increased by 8%.
- Energy Engineering-BS program proposal is still at Purdue University Board of Trustees. It will go to Indiana Commission for Higher Education after the Board approval.

Grants and Contracts

- Yunlong Hu (BME): American Heart Association, Non-competing award, "Analysis of Coronary Flow in Acute Stenosis", 01/01/10-12/31/10, ICR: $7,000, Total: $77,000.
- John Schild (BME): NIH, Continuing competing award, "Gender Differences in Aortic Baroreceptor Function and Neural Integration", 01/12/10-11/30/10, ICR: $99,880, Total: $342,880.
- Dongsoo Kim (ECE): IUPUI/IDF, New service Award, "Initiative of Academic and Research Collaboration with Korean Universities", 01/01/10-12/31/10, ICR: 0, Total: $5,000.
- Lauren Christopher (ECE): IUPUI/RSF, "NanoTechnology System: 3 Dimensional Image", 01/01/10-12/31/10, ICR:0, Total: $54,750.
- Scott deal (MAT): IU/New Frontiers Grant, ICR: 0, Total: $19,971.

Faculty News

- Lauren Christopher (ECE) and Yan Sun (ECE) submitted innovation disclosure "New Method for Real Time 3D Implementation" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.
- Lauren Christopher (ECE) and Mangilal Agarwal (ECE) submitted innovation disclosure "New Method of 3D Video Imaging" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.
- Lauren Christopher (ECE) submitted innovation disclosure "New Method Real Time 3D Image Processing" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.
- Afshin Izadian (ENT) submitted innovation disclosure "New Design for Wind Turbine Generator" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.
- Hiroki Yokota (BME) and Ping Zhang (BME) submitted innovation disclosure "New Salubrinal Formulation" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.
- Yingzi Eliza Du (ECE) and Zhi Zhou (ECE) submitted innovation disclosure "Multiwavelength Multimodal Biometric Recognition" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.
- Dong Xie (BME) submitted innovation disclosure "A Novel QUAT-composed Polyelectrolyte for a Variety of Applications" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.
- Stanley Chien (ECE), Chen Lin (Medicine), Fatih Akisik (Medicine), and Hongyun Zhu (ECE) submitted innovation disclosure "Magnetic resonance Imaging Protocol Web Portal" and Software disclosure "Software for MRI Protocol Web Portal" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.
- Jian Xie (ME) and Fan Xu (ME) submitted innovation disclosure "New Electrochemical Method of Carbon Dioxide Processing" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.
- Yingzi Eliza Du (ECE) and Kai Yang (ECE) submitted innovation disclosure "New Approach for Cancelable Biometrics" to the IU Office of Technology Commercialization.

- Joy Starks (CILT) co-authored another textbook with Gary Shelly "Adobe Photoshop C84-Comprehensive Concepts and Techniques" as part of Shelly Cashman Series. Kevin Marshall (DCT) was the artist and photographer for the book.

Science and Engineering Research Complex

- Science and Engineering Research Complex (SERC) project will go to IU Board of Trustees agenda of the February 17, 2010 meeting. The first phase ($25M) will be 60% research as dictated by the State and it will not use any State funds and student tuition fee income. The second phase ($20M) will come from the State, if approved, from the 2011-13 budget. The cover the cost of first phase IU President contributes $5M on behalf of E&T, $3M will come from Science, and the campus will come up with $17M. This will be borrowed with a debt payment of 20 or 25 years. We anticipate that $1M per year will come from the campus and the remaining debt will be paid from the Indirect Cost Recovery funds of the two schools in proportion to the space each occupies. The timeline for the building is start of design in March 2010, contract bid in December 2010, groundbreaking in spring 2011, and completion in 2012.

Events

- On December 11, the Department of Mechanical Engineering celebrated the dedication of SL 044 as the Carrier Fluid and Thermal Sciences Laboratory and we recognized Carrier Corporation for their generous laboratory equipment donation.
- Two of our long time faculty members, Hasan Akay (ME) and Akin Ecer (ME) retired effective December 31, 2009 after thirty years of distinguished teaching, research, and service efforts. Their retirement party took place on December 4, 2009.
- Another person who contributed to our school in many ways, Pam May, retired along with her sister Pat May from the TCEM. Faculty, alumni, staff, and students celebrated Pam's retirement on December 17, 2009.
- Our Spring 2010 Faculty and Staff Convocation took place on January 7, 2010. Chancellor Bantz and Dave Coats from the IUPUI Polis Center were the speakers. The theme was service learning and civic engagement.
- Our School again sponsored and organized the 2010 First Robotics competition kick off on January 9, 2010. Student teams, teachers, parents, and industry sponsors from 16 Indiana high schools and two Kentucky high schools participated in the event. Peter Orono is the lead advisor and organizer.

Collaboration with UITS

- School signed two agreements with UITS in an effort to increase the collaboration between our School and UITS. The first agreement addressed the need of the undergraduate student technology fee structure. The second agreement provided additional managerial expertise to our Computer Network Center (CNC) by bringing Jim Kippenbrock as the Interim Director of CNC. Bill Lin returned to full-time faculty role after five years of able leadership that he provided for CNC.

Attachment 2: Memorandum of Understanding between School of E&T and UITS

Memorandum of Understanding

Undergraduate Student Technology Fee Transition

School of Engineering &Technology and University Information Technology Services

January 15, 2010

The discussions between the School of Engineering &Technology and University Information Technology Services regarding the Undergraduate Student Technology Fee Transition have yielded the following points of shared understanding:

1   Beginning July 1, 2009 and in a three year transition, UITS will allocate the Undergraduate Student Technology Fee distribution to the School of Engineering and Technology to fund 100% of FTE position 00029252, 90 hours a week of hourly support at the Help Window and 20 hours a week of hourly support for Academic Computing.

2   Beginning July 1,2010 UITS will return 60% of the funds for the same FTE and hourly positions.

3   Beginning July 1, 2011 UITS will return 30% of the funds for the same FTE and hourly positions.

4   After June 30, 2012, UITS will retain all funds associated with the FTE and hourly positions. The reduced percentage each fiscal year over this period to allow the school to identify alternative funding sources for this support if necessary.

5   Six Computer classrooms and labs listed below will transfer to UITS and be administered by UITS beginning July 1, 2010. The registrar will schedule classes for fall 2010 with Engineering & Technology maintaining priority scheduling rights. The specific rooms are ET002, ET006, ET014, ET015, ET019 and EB08.

6   Beginning July 1, 2010, UITS will retain all funding associated with the equipment lifecycle replacement associated with these six facilities.

7   UITS will provide consulting support for the facilities administered by UITS.

8   UITS will provide printing support for facilities administered by UITS.

9   Access to the facilities in the basement of ET will be opened to allow all lUPUI students unfettered access to the facilities during classroom and lab open hours. Afterhours access mechanisms will be maintained by CNC.

10   Any variance from the total projected STF funding will be covered or retained by UITS.

11   Space allocation assignments and any associated university fees for these six (6) facilities will transfer to UITS on July 1, 2010.

12   The space allocations (ownership) will be subject to a review after a period of two (2) years or 2012. It will be determined during this periodic review whether to continue the space assignments to UITS or to return the space assignment to the school. If the space assignment is reverted to the school, this will occur at the end of year three (3) or 2013.

13   UITS reserves the right to relocate any capital items acquired Undergraduate Student Technology Fee from these facilities in the event of a transfer of ownership to a facility that serves a general IUPUI Student population.

14   School and Departmental sponsored events, including school recruitment and marketing events, will follow the same scheduling guidelines used by the Office of the Registrar.

The School of Engineering and Technology can work with the Registrar to pursue exceptions to the scheduling procedures on a case-by-case basis.

15. Software requests for all UITS managed facilities will follow the standard existing guidelines published at http://kb.iu.edu/data/bepj.html

IUPUI
STF TRANSITION PLAN
SCHOOL PROPOSAL
SCHOOL NAME

	FY 10	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13
Transitioning to UITS				
ET002		$ 7,117	$ 14,234	$ 7,117
ETOO6		$ 8,500	$ 17,000	$ 8,500
ET0l4		$ 31,450	$ 10,484	$ 10,484
ET0l5		$ 28,900	$ 9,634	$ 9,634
ET0l9		$ 26,350	$ 8,784	$ 8,784
ET308		$ 7,000		
Basement Printers (4)		$ 11,800	$ 2,952	$ 2,952
Common Area Printers (2)		$ 5,900	$ 1,476	$ 1,476
Print Release Stations (6)		$ 3,000		
				$146,303
Staffing and other		$ 65,233	$130,686	
Total STF	$195,250	$195,250	$195,250	$195,250

Engineering & Technology

H. Oner Yurtseven, Ph.D., *Dean* """ *Date*

Garland C. Elmore, Ph.D., Deputy CIO &

Accepted by:

M̸/ner Murkuy   Jun 22, 2010

2. Nominations Committee.

   a. Membership. The Nominations Committee shall consist of one Faculty member elected by the Faculty of each Department and one Faculty member elected from the combined Programs not contained within academic Departments.

   b. The chair of the committee shall be elected annually by the Senate from the members of the committee.

   c. Terms. Members shall serve two-year terms. Approximately half of the members shall be elected each year.

   d. Duties and Responsibilities.

      i. This committee shall aid the Dean in selecting Faculty to serve on Administrative Committees.

      ii. This committee shall nominate faculty members for positions elected by the Faculty of the School of Engineering and Technology: President of the Faculty Senate, School representatives to the IUPUI Faculty Council, faculty members of the Student Affairs Committee, the members of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, and members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee. This committee shall also nominate ~~representatives from Departments without graduate programs to the Graduate Education Committee and~~ other representatives the Faculty is called upon from time to time to select.

      iii. This committee shall establish election procedures and certify the results to the Senate and the Faculty.

      iv. This committee shall solicit from each Department the names of members elected to the Unit Promotion and Tenure Board, the Grievance Board, the Nominations Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Resources Policy Committee, and the Undergraduate Education Committee. ~~This committee shall solicit from Departments with graduate programs the names of members elected to the Graduate Education Committee.~~

      v. This committee shall nominate faculty members to serve as chairs of standing committees for election by the Senate, as provided in Section IV, E of these Bylaws.

c. Duties and Responsibilities. This committee shall review and advise the Dean through the Senate on matters such as planning and optimal utilization of the physical facilities of the University, including buildings, scientific and other equipment, library, and educational aids. In addition, this committee shall conduct regular reviews of faculty development awards, school development awards, and staff awards and make recommendations regarding policies and procedures for these awards.

6. Undergraduate Education Committee.

   a. Membership. The Undergraduate Education Committee shall consist of one Faculty member elected by each Department, one Faculty member elected from the combined Programs not contained with academic Departments, and an administrative representative appointed by the Dean who shall serve *ex officio* without vote.

      The chair of the committee shall be elected annually by the Senate from the members of the committee.

   b. Terms. Members shall serve two-year terms. Approximately half of the members shall be elected each year.

   c. Duties and Responsibilities. This committee shall review and advise the Senate on matters such as improvement of instruction, grades and grading, scholastic probation, dismissal for academic reasons and reinstatement, standards for admission, academic placement, the academic calendar, policies for scheduling classes, honors programs, general educational policy, general research policies, military training programs, and inter-Departmental and inter-institutional research and educational programs. The committee shall also review and recommend action on all new undergraduate course offerings; review and recommend action on all new undergraduate programs or degrees prior to proper administrative action; review and recommend action on the deletion of any undergraduate course, program, or degree; and coordinate all undergraduate curricula in the School of Engineering and Technology, reserving for Departments the right to act on curricular matters and alterations of programs and degrees.

7. Graduate Education Committee.

   a. Membership. The Graduate Education Committee shall consist of ~~one Faculty member elected by each Department, one Faculty member elected from the combined Programs not contained within academic Departments,~~ and an administrative representative appointed by the Dean who shall serve *ex officio* without vote.

The chair of the committee shall be elected annually by the Senate from the members of the committee.

b. Terms. ~~Members shall serve two-year terms. Approximately half of the members shall be elected each year.~~

c. Duties. This committee shall provide for the orderly functioning of the graduate programs offered by this Faculty and serve as liaison between this Faculty, the IUPUI Graduate Affairs Committee, and the Purdue University Graduate Council. The committee shall review and recommend to the Senate and the appropriate Council actions necessary to extend, develop, or change the pattern of graduate education. The committee shall coordinate all graduate curricula in the School of Engineering and Technology, reserving for Departments the right to act on curricular matters and alteration of programs and degrees.

8. Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

a. Membership. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee shall consist of five Faculty members elected by the Faculty – two from Engineering Departments, two from Technology Departments, and one from the combined Programs not contained within academic Departments.

The chair of the committee shall be elected annually by the Senate from the members of the committee.

b. Terms. Members shall serve two-year terms. Approximately half of the members shall be elected each year.

c. Duties and Responsibilities. This committee shall review the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty from time to time, shall draft amendments to propose to the Senate for approval, shall consult with Faculty members who wish to propose amendments, and shall provide interpretation of the Constitution and Bylaws when needed. The committee shall monitor changes in IUPUI, IU, and Purdue University faculty governance documents and advise the Senate regarding such changes.

9. Budgetary Affairs Committee.

Attachment 4: Instructor and Course Evaluation Questions – Revised Version

Purdue School of Engineering & Technology
Instructor & Course Evaluation Questions
Classroom Delivery Version
Draft January 2010

Questions will be evaluated on a four-point, Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree scale.
Each item will offer an opportunity to include comments.

Current Question	Proposed Question
1. The instructor explained the subject clearly.	1. The instructor explained the subject clearly.
2. The instructor's responses to questions helped me learn.	2. The instructor's responses to questions helped me learn.
3. The instructor provided regular feedback that helped me evaluate my course progress (e.g. quizzes, graded homework/projects, etc.)	3. The instructor provided timely feedback.
4. The instructor provided a motivating environment for learning.	4. The instructor provided a motivating environment for learning.
	5. The instructor provided clear instructions on how to participate in learning activities.
5. The instructor covered as much course material as I felt was appropriate to meet the course objectives.	
	6. The instructor helped me fulfill the course goals.
6. Course content matched the department course description.	
7. Instructional material (e.g. handouts, visual, online resource) were helpful in learning.	7. Instructional materials (for example, handouts and online resources) helped me learn the subject.
8. Assignments were helpful to me in meeting course objectives.	8. Course assignments helped me learn the subject.
9. Lab computer equipment needed for completing the computer assignments performed adequately.	*Omit*
10. The operation of lab equipment (non-computer) enabled me to complete the lab assignments.	*Omit*
11. Overall, I would rate this course as	9. Overall, I learned a great deal from this class.
12. Overall, I would rate the instructor as	10. Overall, this instructor was effective at teaching this course.

Purdue School of Engineering & Technology
Instructor & Course Evaluation by Student
Online Delivery Version
Draft January 2010

Questions will be evaluated on a four-point, Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree scale.
Each item will offer an opportunity to include comments.

Current Question	Proposed Question
	1. Online instructional materials helped me learn the subject.
1. The instructor explained the subject clearly.	*Omit*
2. The instructor's responses to questions helped me learn.	2. The instructor communicated in an effective manner.
3. The instructor provided regular feedback that helped me evaluate my course progress (e.g. quizzes, graded homework/projects, etc.)	3. The instructor provided regular timely feedback that helped me evaluate my course progress.
4. The instructor provided a motivating environment for learning.	*Omit*
	4. This class provided a motivating environment for learning.
5. The instructor covered as much course material as I felt was appropriate to meet the course objectives.	5. The instructor helped me fulfill the course goals.
6. Course content matched the department course description.	
7. Instructional material (e.g. handouts, visual, online resource) were helpful in learning.	6. Course assignments were helpful to my learning the subject.
	7. The instructor used online tools effectively for this course.
	8. This class was appropriately designed.
8. Assignments were helpful to me in meeting course objectives.	
9. Overall, I would rate this course as	9. Overall, I learned a great deal from this class.
10. Overall, I would rate the instructor as	10. Overall, this instructor was effective at teaching this course.
11. The functionality offered by OnCourse was appropriate for this course.	
12. The accessibility/reliability of OnCourse was appropriate for this course.	*Omit*

13. The content of this course was comparable to a classroom-based course.	*Omit*
14. Overall this course was equal to or better than a classroom-based course.	
15. The flexibility offered by a distance education class was the primary reason I took this course over the web.	*Omit*

Purdue School of Engineering & Technology
Instructor & Course Evaluation by Student
Laboratory Sections Version
Draft January 2010

Questions will be evaluated on a four-point, Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree scale.
Each item will offer an opportunity to include comments.

Proposed Questions
1. Laboratory work reinforced material in class/course objectives.
2. Appropriate tools were available to do the laboratory exercises.
3. Laboratory equipment functioned adequately.
4. The laboratory instructor provided clear instructions on how to participate in laboratory activities.
5. The laboratory instructor provided sufficient help to assist students during the laboratory periods.
6. The laboratory instructor provided clear safety guidelines.
7. The laboratory instructor provided timely feedback.
8. The amount of laboratory work required was appropriate.
9. Overall, I learned a great deal from the laboratory work.
10. Overall, this laboratory instructor was effective at teaching this course.

Purdue School of Engineering &Technology IUPUI

Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching

Revised Draft – Spring 2010

A. Introduction

This document establishes guidelines for peer reviews of teaching for the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology, IUPUI. Peer-review guidelines are established for two principal reasons:

- formative peer reviews support faculty members in becoming more effective in instruction, both in classroom or online delivery and in preparation for such delivery;
- summative peer reviews establish, in part, evidence of teaching performance so that the primary, unit, campus, and university committees can evaluate that performance in the promotion and tenure process.

These peer review guidelines must be considered as a flexible course of action to be carried out by individual departments. Results should be submitted to the school and other levels as required. An individual case may require alternate procedures as deemed necessary jointly by the faculty member and the department.

B. Rationale

• Peer review plays a critical role in promotion, tenure, and professional development.

Peer review is endemic in our academic careers. Faculty members often informally seek feedback from peers on their course topics, their teaching methods, and their outcomes. These requests are voluntary and not subject to evaluation for promotion, tenure, or financial compensation purposes.

The need for a more formal peer review process arises when a candidate applies for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure. At those times, the candidate's teaching performance needs to be evaluated at the department, school, campus, and/or university levels.

According to the IUPUI P&T Guidelines, "Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers must be included" in such considerations (Reference: *IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Dossiers Guidelines,* current edition). It is in the interests of a candidate to receive peer reviews in order to document teaching performance. The department chair is responsible to facilitate this process and provide adequate orientation and guidance for faculty members.

C. Guidelines

• Peer review should be available to those who ask for it. It is encouraged for first- to third-year faculty members and candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure.

Peer review is helpful to all who teach, especially for new faculty members. Peer review is most productive when the faculty member requests it early in a teaching career. For this reason, it is recommended but not required that a formative peer review process take place within the first year of the faculty member's teaching career. Both on-line and classroom performance and course materials must be fully reviewed, and the faculty member should receive feedback based on the peer reviewer's opinion. By starting the process in the first year, the faculty member has an opportunity to evaluate his/her performance, decide if the evaluation justifies further development, and if so, request a second-year evaluation. These first- and second-year evaluations are confidential and the property of the faculty member unless the faculty member wishes to share them with the department for his/her annual review or other similar purposes.

The third-year peer review is summative so that the department can evaluate teaching performance in order to determine a recommendation for reappointment. Likewise, the peer review in support of promotion and/or tenure is summative. Final reports from summative reviews will be shared with the faculty member as well as the department and the school.

• **The School encourages development of departmental peer review guidelines.**

Departments should develop guidelines for reviewing teaching performance in both classroom-based and online courses. These guidelines should include:

A definition of peer review

A statement of the purposes for peer reviews

A description of how the guidelines fit with school, campus, and university guidelines

Information on methods and procedures including:

Number of times/semester peer review is required

Number of people involved in the peer review

Uses of outside observers (such as those from the Center for Teaching and Learning)

Establishment of clear criteria for evaluation

How reports of reviews will be used and shared with the faculty member, the department, the school, the campus, and the university.

In these guidelines, departments should also clarify that reviewers should typically hold a higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, although there may be occasions when the reviewer will hold the same rank.

• **The School supports and encourages peer review of faculty members for the purposes of self-development and for promotion and tenure.**

While taking into account departmentally developed guidelines, an individual faculty member and his/her chair shall mutually determine the procedure for the peer reviews. For improving teaching, external offices such as the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and the Faculty Colloquium for Excellence in Teaching (FACET) may be used. The IUPUI P&T Guidelines can serve as a resource for the faculty member and chair for initiating and continuing peer reviews.

• **Peer-reviews shall be initiated by the faculty member with a written description supplied to the department for comment.**

The department needs to be aware of the kinds and forms of ongoing peer review that may support promotion and tenure. Each formal peer review that could potentially be submitted in this process should be disclosed and recognized by the department.

C. Summary

This document provides School of Engineering and Technology guidelines for peer review for the purpose of promoting teaching enhancement and assisting in the promotion and tenure process. This document shall become effective upon the date adopted by the School Senate.

Submitted to the School Senate by the Faculty Affairs Committee: Stanley Chien, Daphene Cyr, Stephen Hundley, Marvin Needler, Chair, Ramana Pidaparti, Robert Tharp, David Williamson, April 9, 2002.

Revised by the Faculty Affairs Committee Yaobin Chen, Hazim El-Mounayri, Patrick Gee, Cliff Goodwin, Marj Rush Hovde (Chair), Brian Kinsey, G. David Peters, and Hiroki Yokota. 2010.

Purdue School of Engineering &Technology IUPUI

Guidelines for Clinical Ranks

09-25-98

Draft Revision 1/22/2010

This document establishes the guidelines for clinical ranks for the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology, IUPUI. This document is supplemental to the administrative policies of Indiana University as documented in the Indiana University Academic Handbook. In particular, this document establishes School guidelines where called for by the Academic Handbook, and it establishes School guidelines where additional measures are promulgated by the School. Also, upon adoption of the guidelines stated in this document by the School senate, this document will be adopted as an addendum to the *E&T Promotion & Tenure Guidelines* for guidelines for promotion of clinical rank appointments.

The policy stated in the Indiana University Academic Handbook regarding clinical ranks is provided in Attachment A (and for future reference should be updated to the current version). In addition to IU policy, the School of E&T establishes these additional guidelines for academic instructional appointments of full-time clinical rank faculty.

In the School of Engineering and Technology, clinical faculty members may be responsible for civic engagement that supports their teaching and service. The type, level, and scope of all of their service will be determined on a departmental basis at the time of an initial appointment. The primary duties of faculty members holding clinical rank in the School of Engineering and Technology are teaching and providing professional services such as service to students, the department, the school, the university, the community, and professional associations. Appropriate teaching load and service requirements will be determined by the faculty member's department chair with approval from the Dean in conformance with the school's workload policy.

1. **Maximum Number**. The maximum number of full-time salaried clinical rank faculty in the school shall represent no more than 20 % of the total of the full-time faculty of the school and not exceed 40 % in any given department.

Or

> **Voting Privileges.** In school or departmental votes, the votes of tenure-line faculty members should be calculated proportionally to non-tenure line faculty members so that the majority is given to tenure-line faculty members.

Or

> Create a separate document to address this issue.

2. **Term of Appointment**. The initial appointment for clinical appointments shall be one or two years during a probationary period of not more than seven years. After promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, the typical length of contract will be five years.

3. **Termination Notice Due**. The termination notice shall be announced to the appointee at least three months prior to the end of the present appointment.

4. **Ongoing Reviews**. During the probationary period, the chair of the department and the departmental primary committee shall review the appointee annually. The appointee shall supply the faculty annual summary report for this purpose.

   After the 3rd and 5th year of the initial appointment, the departmental primary committee and the school's unit committee shall review the appointee. The unit committee's recommendations will be sent to the campus Dean of Faculty for review.

   After promotion to associate clinical professor, the departmental primary committee shall review the appointee every five years. Clinical faculty members at the rank of full clinical professor are not subject to these five-year reviews.

   After a successful 5th year review without promotion, 2- to 3-year contracts will be the norm. After promotion to associate clinical professor and/or full clinical professor, 5-year contracts will be the norm.

5. **Promotion**. Consistent with the Appointment and Advancement section of the IU Handbook, the promotion procedure is in accordance with the *E&T Promotion & Tenure Guidelines* for tenure-track positions. Promotion will go through the normal tenure-line faculty procedures used in the school. While the probationary period may extend to seven years, individuals in special circumstances may wish to apply for promotion earlier than usual.

6. **Criteria for evaluation**. Continued appointment and promotion in rank is based on excellent performance in either teaching or service with satisfactory performance in the other. Criteria for

evaluating performance in teaching are identical to those for tenure-line faculty. Criteria for evaluating performance in service are also identical but with one exception; at the time of promotion consideration, a peer review of service will be completed by members of the Center for Service Learning or other appropriate individuals.

In accordance with the IU Handbook, the clinical rank faculty member shall not be evaluated in the area of research. Clinical faculty members may contribute to the research efforts of a unit through their clinical work, but they are not expected to conduct discipline-specific individual research. In a promotion case, any research should be shown to contribute to the faculty member's teaching and/or service responsibilities.

(Upon adoption of these guidelines by the E&T Faculty Senate, people currently in Clinical positions will follow these guidelines when they seek promotions. However, if the nature of their work varies from what is stated here, they should confer with their chair and the dean about their cases for promotion.)

Appendix A: 2008 IU Handbook Material on Clinical Faculty, p. 81-83

Use of Clinical Appointments

Clinical appointments are appropriate for those who work primarily in the clinical setting. Clinical faculty may be involved in research that derives from their primary assignment in clinical teaching and professional service; however, continued appointment and advancement in rank must be based on performance in teaching and service.

> *[EXPLANATION AND COMMENT: Clinical appointees teach and practice full-time in the clinical professional setting. It follows that clinical appointments will be limited to academic units (and departments within academic units) in the professional-client service disciplines. Clinical faculty may contribute to the research efforts of a unit through their clinical work, but they are not expected to do individual research. Faculty who, in addition to teaching and service, have portions of their time allocated to doing research for which they are a principal or co principal investigator, who have research laboratories, or who are otherwise expected to do individual research should be in tenured/ tenure probationary positions. While individual faculty members hired in tenure-probationary appointments may switch to the clinical appointments during the first five years of their probationary period, such a switch must involve giving up the research component of their faculty work, except for their clinical role in collaborative research trials. Clinical appointments are not intended as a means of retaining tenure-probationary faculty members who will not be able to demonstrate the performance levels in teaching, research, and service required for the granting of tenure.]*

Rights and Privileges

Clinical faculty are expected to follow and be protected by University policies, including those pertaining to faculty hiring and faculty annual reviews. The faculty salary policies of the University, campus, school, and department shall apply to clinical faculty. Clinical faculty have the right to petition the campus faculty board of review. Clinical faculty are not eligible for University sabbatical leave, but schools may provide sabbatical-like leaves for their clinical faculty to provide opportunities for professional learning and collaboration with colleagues. Participation in University and campus faculty governance is governed by the Constitution of the Faculty of Indiana University and the faculty constitutions on each campus. The role of clinical faculty in governance within the unit shall be determined by vote of the tenured and tenure-probationary faculty of the unit, provided that where non-tenure track appointees have voting privileges, their voting participation must be structured in a way that reserves at least 60% of voting weight to tenure track faculty. The academic integrity of the school and its programs ultimately is the responsibility of tenured and tenure-probationary faculty. The rights of clinical faculty and the regulations concerning their roles within each school shall be written and available to the school

faculty. A copy of all rights and regulations shall be filed with the campus academic officer and with the campus faculty governance body.

> *[EXPLANATION AND COMMENT: The University Faculty Constitution defines the voting faculty as "all faculty members on tenure or accumulating credit toward tenure." The Constitution further states that "the voting members of individual campuses may extend voting privileges to others on matters of individual campus significance." The rationale for the distributions of rights and privileges is to leave the responsibility for the preservation of the most basic academic interests of the institution in the hands of those with the greatest protection of their academic freedom for the purposes of teaching, research, and service including the service of faculty governance; i.e. those with tenure. Non-tenure track appointees otherwise should have as many faculty privileges as is consistent with their qualifications and responsibilities.]*

Clinical faculty are not eligible for academic administrative appointments at and above the department chair level.

> *[EXPLANATION AND COMMENT: The integrity of the academic programs will be best served by requiring that those individuals holding administrative appointments with direct authority for academic programs have the full range of academic qualifications associated with the tenure track, as well as the fuller protection of academic freedom that tenure provides.]*

Appointment and Advancement

The faculty of each unit using clinical appointments shall decide whether those appointments will be with the titles of Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor and Assistant Clinical Professor, or Clinical Senior Lecturer and Clinical Lecturer. Initial clinical appointments should be at the level appropriate to the experience and accomplishments of the individual. The process for appointment with probationary status or appointment with a long-term contract shall go through the ordinary procedures for faculty appointments. Promotion in rank of Assistant and Associate Clinical Professors should go through the normal faculty procedures appropriate to the unit of the university, including peer review by the primary unit, and campus promotion (and tenure) committees. The faculty of each unit using Assistant and Associate Clinical Professor appointments shall adopt criteria for promotion that are appropriate to the duties that may be assigned to clinical appointees. Those criteria must be written, available to unit faculty, and filed with the campus academic officer. Clinical Lecturers shall be promoted to Clinical Senior Lecturers upon their being appointed to long-term contracts following a probationary period.

Protection of Academic Freedom

Clinical appointees are not eligible for tenure; however, in order to protect their academic freedom, individuals appointed as clinical faculty shall be given long-term contracts after a probationary period of

not more than seven years. The exact mechanism for this shall be determined by the dean and the faculty governance body within each school using clinical appointments and be approved by the chancellor, but the mechanism should be a long-term contract of not less than five years or be some equivalent, such as a rolling three-year contract. The criteria for granting long-term contracts after a probationary period shall be analogous to the criteria for granting tenure, except that clinical faculty shall earn the right to a long-term contract on the basis of their excellence only in those responsibilities that may be assigned to them. Each school will establish procedures and specific criteria for review of individuals concerning the renewal of long-term contracts or their equivalent.

Clinical faculty appointments during the probationary period shall be subject to the same policies and procedures with respect to appointment, reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal as apply to tenure-probationary faculty during the probationary period. After the probationary period, dismissal of a clinical faculty member holding a longer-term contract which has not expired may occur because of closure or permanent downsizing of the program in which the faculty member teaches and serves; otherwise, dismissal of such clinical faculty shall occur only for reasons of professional incompetence, serious misconduct, or financial exigency. Non-reappointment of clinical faculty to a new contract term may occur for the foregoing reasons or may occur as well for reason of changing staffing needs of the clinical program. Non-reappointment decisions regarding clinical faculty holding a long-term contract after the probationary period must be made with faculty consultation through processes established by the school's faculty governance institutions. The jurisdiction of campus faculty grievance institutions includes cases of dismissal and non-reappointment of clinical faculty.

> *[EXPLANATION AND COMMENT: Probationary periods for part-time faculty may be longer than seven years, where regulations adopted by the faculty of the academic unit so provide. University practice requires that probationary periods be served on a continuing basis unless a leave of absence has been applied for and been granted. The University is not obliged to relocate within the institution clinical faculty whose positions are eliminated because of closure, permanent downsizing, or changing staffing needs of their clinical programs. Where an instructional line is converted from non-tenure to tenure track, a clinical faculty member occupying the line may apply for the tenure-track position, but is not guaranteed appointment.]*

(University Faculty Council, February 13, 2001; Board of Trustees, May 4, 2001)

Attachment 7: E&T Undergraduate Education Committee Report

E&T Undergraduate Education Committee

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE – 9 February 2010

BMET Residency Requirement

The BMET program would like to increase the residency requirement for transfer students in its program from 15 to 20 credit hours. From the bulletin page 7 (proposed addition in red):

"There is a residency requirement to receive a degree: transfer students must complete a program of study that includes at least 32 credit hours for a bachelor's degree and at least 15 credit hours for an associate degree in the School of Engineering and Technology. For the associate degree, at least 6 out of the 15 credits are expected to be in the major. For the bachelor's degree, at least 12 out of the 32 credits are expected to be in the major at the junior level or higher. Students who seek an associate degree in Biomedical Engineering Technology must complete 20 credit hours of courses from the School of Engineering and Technology."

Rationale: Students who transfer from other institutions need to complete a higher portion of credits on our campus to ensure adequate BMET instruction. Employers noted that graduates from IUPUI with only 15 credits lacked essential skills which were present in most IUPUI graduates. This change ensures consistent quality among BMET graduates.

This item was discussed at our November meeting but tabled so that other Technology departments could discuss whether they wished to make similar changes to their residency requirements. However, no other departments brought forward similar changes to this month's meeting. The committee voted unanimously to recommend the proposed change for approval by the Faculty Senate.

INTR 324, 325, 452, 453, 495 prerequisite changes

Interior Design seeks to make some course prerequisite changes to five courses, reflecting a change in math requirements and a change in course sequence in the plan of study.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend the proposed prerequisite changes for approval by the Faculty Senate.

New NSAAC Withdrawal Policy

A strong predictor of failure to graduate from an undergraduate program is a pervasive pattern of withdrawing from courses partway into the semester. The New Student Academic Advising Center plans to implement a policy for students with less than 26 earned credit hours which would allow them only 1 course withdrawal per semester (with exceptions granted for extenuating circumstances as approved by an academic advisor). UCOL currently has this policy, and NSAAC plans to implement it next fall.

The Undergraduate Education Committee feels this policy decision is in the purview of the freshman programs; however, we do support this policy, and recommend it for *endorsement* by Faculty Senate.