

Faculty Organization Minutes
February 19, 2016
1:00-3:00
Hawthorn Hall 107

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of January 15, 2016 – approved without amendment
3. President's Report
 - a. Congratulations to Marie Eisenstein, Joe Ferrandino, Kris Huysken, Kevin McElmurry, and Cindy Symanski for their election to the Board of Review
 - b. Terri Crouch and Karen Keffer will be coming from IUB on March 1st to provide advice for dossier preparation for IU Distinguished Teaching Awards.
 - c. March 25th Faculty Organization meeting time has been changed to 12:30pm to 2:30 so faculty can have the opportunity to attend the one book - one campus - one community event. Operation Homecoming Event.
 - d. Regional Faculty Caucus meeting Tuesday – Briggs and Gallmeier will report next month.
 - e. Board of Trustees Report
 - i. Thanks to everyone who sent topics to communicate to the BOT
 - ii. Other campuses may have been slightly offended that IU Northwest was given more highlights than other campuses. 😊
4. Chancellor's Report
 - a. Importance of University Teaching Awards
 - i. IU Northwest has a very good record of winning in recent years.
 - ii. Congratulations to Diane Larson, this year's winner.
 - iii. One Book Events, March 25 – please attend and encourage your students to attend.
 1. Thank you to members of the One Book Committee
 - iv. Budget Committee has begun meeting regarding 16-17
 1. Hearings took place last week. Effective changes were made to streamline this process.
 2. Current year is on track to exceeding revenue projections for 15-16.
 - v. Online Education – IU Northwest has 135 online classes offered.
 1. In the first year of online course connect, we lost money. Last year we broke even. This year we are plus about \$125,000.
 2. David Malik's work last year was important in making this shift.
 3. Additional revenue should be our goal going forward.
 - vi. Faculty Question – It's good that we are now benefiting from additional online revenue. Is this a zero sum game? Are other campuses losing because we are winning?
 1. Yes. There is competition right now in the IU online course connect environment.
 - vii. Follow up - Is this healthy competition?
 1. No. Healthy competition is competing against other universities or states. I feel strongly that this is competition where there should be collaboration.
 - viii. Faculty Question – Are there quality controls on online courses?
 1. Only those that an individual department puts in place.
 - ix. Faculty Question – Is there pressure on departments to offer courses online?

1. Not from me. No professor should be forced to teach online. $\frac{3}{4}$ of tenure track professors have taught online. There is high interest in courses online from our students, especially general education.
 - x. Faculty Question – Can faculty expect a salary increase?
 1. That is our first priority.
5. Vice Chancellors' Reports
 - a. Mark McPhail – Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 - i. IUOCC – We were their first visit. IU wants to be a national leader in online education.
 1. IUOCC is working on the budget model to be sure that it works for IU as a whole.
 - ii. ASSCU – “Reimagining the first year” – Several from our campus attended
 1. Hoyert – Presentations from schools that resemble our own were very interesting. Intentional efforts to improve the rates of student success without changing the demographics of their students.
 2. O’Dell – We are involved in a three year process of improving graduation rates through these innovative means.
 3. McPhail – It’s on us. The problems at IU Northwest are not just about students, they are about all of us.
 - iii. AQIP – March 17 is next WEAVE forum.
 - iv. Carnegie Classification – also upcoming.
6. Procedures for Responding to Academic Misconduct – Marie Eisenstein, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee and Beth Tyler, Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean of Students
 - a. See Attachment 1
 - b. Faculty Comment – F* should be included as part of the punishment.
 - i. There needs to be more clarification of the policies surrounding F*.
 - c. If you have a strong opinion about this issue, please communicate with Marie Eisenstein at maeisens@iun.edu
7. Proposal of the Constitutional Review Committee - Susan Zinner – Chair, Constitution Committee
 - a. See Attachment 2
 - b. This amendment will be read a 2nd time next month and barring objections will proceed to a vote.
8. Process for Lodging Concerns and Complaints about Instructors - Tanice Foltz, Chair, Student Affairs Committee
 - a. See Attachment 3
 - b. Faculty Concern – It should not be mandatory that a student first go directly to the faculty member in question. There must be some way that a student can express a concern without having to address the faculty member on their own. (Lengthy discussion on this issue)
 - c. PASSED with a majority voting yes. There were a number of votes against.
9. Jeri Gabbert – Graduation Events
 - a. Update on Events surrounding 2016 Commencement
10. Upcoming Diversity Programs -James Wallace, Office of Diversity and Multicultural Affairs
 - a. Diversity Programming Series Invitation
 - i. Please submit ideas for campus events that would complement classroom content and promote diversity.
 - ii. <https://www.iun.edu/diversity/forms/programming-series-proposal.htm>

- iii. Total budget available for these events is \$32,000 per year, 8-12 proposals are funded per year.
 - b. Lift Every Voice
 - i. Feb 24 5-7pm, Bergland
 - c. METAS
 - i. Targeted programming for local Latino students regarding academic success
 - ii. Volunteers needed!
 - d. Diversity Fellows Program
 - i. \$1000 for projects
 - ii. <http://www.iun.edu/diversity/docs/CFP%20Fall%202016.pdf>
 - e. Diversity Advocacy Council – 3rd Thursday of every month
- 11. Tech Tips – Life Cycle Computer Replacement for Faculty – Mark Uncapher, Director of Microcomputer Support
 - a. All laptops and desktops will be replaced over the next month or so.
 - b. Y2K stopped all computers on campus. Lifecycle computer replacement was put in place after that debacle. Guaranteed funding for lifecycle was instituted at that time.
 - c. PCs:
 - i. NO DVD drives on new computers!
 - ii. Lenovo has been chosen again. They have the only military spec approved laptops and desktops. Overall cost of ownership is therefore lower. Energy star rated. Up to 65% post-consumer materials.
 - iii. We are reimbursed for Lenovo repairs. We are able to give Lenovo certification to our young student workers.
 - iv. New machines will have better battery life.
 - v. Drives will be mapped to Box and will be accessible from lecterns
 - vi. SSD internal drives
 - d. Mac
 - i. No lag in OS rollouts. Casper device management. Shared
 - e. All faculty computers will be encrypted.
 - f. Laptop docs will be replaced free of charge.
 - g. Support for all issues is available!
- 12. Motion to extend meeting for 10 minutes – approved.
- 13. Old Business
- 14. New Business
- 15. Adjournment at 2:42pm.

Attachment 1:

**Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct Hearing Procedures for
Responding to Incidents of Academic Misconduct IU Northwest**

DRAFT

Academic Affairs Oversight

Responsibility for academic misconduct is primarily in the sphere of Academic Affairs, although the Dean of Students is to be notified of all cases of academic misconduct and is empowered to institute additional sanctions if the matter rises to the level of an offense against the campus community or the student is a repeat offender.

Students who have been charged with academic misconduct are afforded multiple points of access to be heard and present their side of the matter. Different levels of review and procedural fairness have been established to protect the student. Most incidents of academic misconduct are course-related and are handled by faculty and academic administrators. Sometimes a violation may be tangential to a course, for example the infraction of “interference” could be initiated by a student remote to the course(s). Similarly, if a student acquired a copy of a final exam and decided to sell it, the violation would be “facilitating academic dishonesty.” In each of these examples of out-of-class academic misconduct, a faculty member or faculty administrator will initiate disciplinary proceedings.

Action by a Faculty Member

The term “faculty” or “faculty member” as used throughout this document refers to all those who teach and/or do research at the university including (but not limited to) tenure-track faculty, librarians, holders of research or clinical ranks, visiting and part-time faculty, and other instructional personnel. A faculty member who suspects a student has committed academic misconduct in connection with that faculty member’s course should inform the student of the suspicion in writing, which may include email, and invite the student to a private face-to-face meeting to discuss the matter and hear the student’s response. In the case of online courses, the instructor is encouraged to conduct the meeting via Skype, if possible. If, despite the faculty member’s good faith effort to schedule such a discussion, the student declines to meet or does not respond, the faculty member will complete the investigation without benefit of the student’s input.

If the faculty member concludes the act of misconduct did occur, the faculty member may impose one or more sanctions, which include the following.

1. Repeating the assignment(s) in which misconduct occurred
2. Completing additional assignment(s)
3. A lower or failing grade for any assignment(s) in which misconduct occurred
4. A lower or failing grade for the course.
5. Required withdrawal from the course, with a grade of either “F” or “W” at the faculty member’s

discretion, regardless of when during the semester the student withdraws from the course.

☐ See [Part II, Section G](#) of the “Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct” for a comprehensive list of what constitutes academic misconduct.

Serious acts of academic misconduct result in a grade of “F” for the course. Whenever a failing grade is imposed at the end of the semester and the student has requested a review, an Incomplete (“I”) will be temporarily entered on the record until final disposition. Grades of “F” as an academic sanction cannot be removed from the permanent record (such as through repeat and applying extended “X”). The official transcript contains no entry of the reason for an academic sanction of “F”.

The Dean of Students will be notified of this action in writing using the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form, which can be transmitted via email. The Dean of Students will inform the student in writing of their right to have the decision reviewed by a higher authority. The levels of review in cases of academic misconduct are, in this order: 1) Department Chair or Program Director, 2) Dean, and 3) Academic Affairs Committee. If, after an Academic Affairs Committee review, either the student or the faculty member believes that a procedural error occurred that was serious enough to prevent a full and fair consideration of a misconduct finding or academic sanction, then they may file a written appeal with the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. The student or faculty member has seven working days^{*} from the date they receive the decision of a unit hearing board to file the appeal.

Review

There is an expectation that cases of academic misconduct be resolved expeditiously. If a student asks for a second level review or even a third level this process should take place in the span of two working weeks,^{*} barring any extenuating circumstances. If desired, it is the student’s responsibility to initiate the next level review seven days from the date they sign the Academic Misconduct Reporting form and arrange for an appointment with the designated administrator. Because information sharing is a key element in seeking resolution, the faculty member and the student may be asked to provide information in advance of the review. The administrator reviewing the case may decide that both student and faculty member should be present in conference; each party should be informed of such in advance in writing, which includes email.

If a student ultimately seeks a review by the Academic Affairs Committee, then a reasonable amount of time must be allowed for preparation. In general, the Committee should strive to convene no later than 30 working days[☐] from the first-level conference. Individual Committee members who are parties to the case being considered are expected to recuse themselves from the process. The student will be notified of the hearing and provided an opportunity to prepare. If witnesses are involved, each side must disclose in advance who will be present. At the hearing, witnesses can be questioned by the student,

instructor, or Committee member. The student has the right to be assisted by an advocate, who may be an attorney. Advocates are not permitted to represent students; they may not comment nor engage in questions.

There are few formal procedures for conducting the hearing. It is up to the chair to assure that all necessary information is presented and that the proceedings are balanced and fair. The Committee chair also determines when sufficient information has been presented. The Committee can take up to 10 working days to make a decision and it is final, unless either the instructor or student believes that a procedural error has been made sometime during the process. The decision of the Committee must be

Working days and weeks include anytime when classes or exams are in session.

based solely upon the information presented at the hearing, i.e., oral presentations and any written documents submitted. The final disposition requires a majority vote. The Committee can find for the student or uphold the faculty member's initial decision. The authority of the Committee is such that it can 1) dismiss all charges, 2) change, reduce or add student sanctions, and 3) assess the faculty member's action and or sanction to be without basis or arbitrary and recommend a faculty sanction. Any sanction in the latter will be in accord with faculty discipline guidelines.

No sanctions shall become effective until after opportunities for review have been exhausted.

Coursework performed while misconduct proceedings are underway, however, shall be considered conditional. Conditional work may be affected or eliminated based on a final finding of misconduct or sanction imposed. This may result in loss of course credit, a delay in the awarding of a degree, or revocation of a degree that was awarded prior to a final decision in the misconduct proceedings.

Any time limit set out in these procedures may be extended by the relevant authority only for good reason shown.

Action by the Dean of Students

If, after reviewing the disciplinary report from the faculty, the Dean of Students believes the violation is serious enough to warrant further review, he/she can decide to charge the student with personal misconduct, in which case [Procedures for Responding to Incidents of Personal Misconduct](#) will apply.

Attachment 2:

Proposal of the Constitutional Review Committee

Date: February 12, 2016

Section 5.5 College/School and At-Large Representation

Terms of college/school and at-large representatives shall be for two years. No representative may serve more than two consecutive terms in one capacity. This does not prevent a college/school or at-large representative from serving a third consecutive term in another capacity.

The College of Arts and Sciences (COAS) shall elect three (3) members. The College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) shall elect (2) members. The Library, School of Business and Economics, and the School of Education shall elect one member each. Two representatives shall be elected by the faculty at large.

Voting units with more than one member should establish processes for scheduling voting and sending new members to the Committee that ensure continuity.

Attachment 3:

Process for Lodging Concerns and Complaints about Instructors

DRAFT for ALL ACADEMIC UNITS 10-26-2015

FINAL DRAFT FROM STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE January 2016

The following sequence of steps should be pursued by any student when voicing a concern or complaint about a course instructor. At the end of each semester, students are provided an opportunity to evaluate their classes and teachers. This primary recourse is available to all students. Students should use this opportunity to express their opinions. If the nature of the concern or complaint is sufficiently complex and significant, students may express their concerns in a stepwise progression. That is, all students must complete step one before completing step two and so on.

*NOTE: This document does not pertain to complaints of sexual harassment or discrimination of any kind; rather those complaints should be directed to the Office of Affirmative Action in Raintree 213. For policies and procedures, see <http://www.iun.edu/affirmative-action/>. It also does not pertain to grade appeals: for details, see the Grade Appeal Policy located on the Academic Affairs website at <http://www.iun.edu/academic-affairs/docs/academic-affairs-grade-change-policy.pdf>.

Step 1. All students should discuss their concerns with their course instructor first. This step may be in person or concerns may be expressed in writing.

Step 2. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the consultation with the course instructor, the next step is to submit the concern/complaint in writing to the Department Chair/Program Director. This must be in writing and should include documentation of concrete evidence that illustrates the source of the concern or complaint. The Chair/Director should gather information from both the student and the faculty member and reach a decision as to the merits of the complaint. A common outcome of this step is to place the letter in the instructor's permanent record.

Step 3. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the consultation with the Department Chair/Program Director, the next step is to submit the formal complaint to the unit's Ombudsperson, should one exist. If there is no Ombudsperson, the complaint goes directly to the Dean (or their delegate). This appeal must be in writing. It must include a written narrative of the case from the student, it must include documentation and it must be signed. The Ombudsperson or the Dean will gather information from the instructor and/or department chair and will reach a decision as to the merits of the complaint. A common outcome of this step is to place the letter in the instructor's permanent record.

Step 4. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the consultation with the Dean/Ombudsperson, the last step is an appeal to the Office of Academic Affairs. In the case of a unit that has an Ombudsperson, if the student is not satisfied with the outcome, the appeal should be sent to the Dean prior to Step 4 and the student should only proceed to Step 4 if the student is not satisfied with the outcome with the Dean. In both cases, this appeal must be a written narrative of the case from the student, must include documentation, and it must be signed. This narrative and documentation should be sent to the Office of Academic Affairs, Lindenwood Hall 329.