

**UNIVERSITY SENATE AGENDA**  
**EBERLY AUDITORIUM**

December 4, 2018

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

**Approval of Order**

- A. Approval of minutes from the November 6, 2018 meeting.
- A. Approval of current agenda items and order

**Reports and Announcements**

**Appendix**

**Page(s)**

- A. President Driscoll
- B. Provost Moerland
- C. Chairperson Piper
- D. Vice Chairperson Hale

**Standing Committee Reports**

**Chairperson**

- |   |                     |   |       |
|---|---------------------|---|-------|
| A. Rules Committee                                    | Korns               |   |       |
| B. University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee | Sechrist/Greenawalt | A | 2-4   |
| C. University-Wide Graduate Committee                 | Moore/Frenzel       | B | 5-8   |
| D. Noncredit Committee                                | O’Neil              | C | 9-10  |
| E. Library and Education Services Committee           | McLaughlin          |   |       |
| F. Research Committee                                 | Delbrugge           | D | 11-19 |
| G. Student Affairs Committee                          | Stocker             |   |       |
| H. University Development and Finance Committee       | Mount               |   |       |
| I. Academic Affairs Committee                         | Dugan/Wachter       | E | 20-25 |
| J. Awards Committee                                   | Paul                |   |       |

**Senate Representative Reports**

**Representative**

- |   |          |
|---|----------|
| A. University Planning Council                  | Stocker  |
| B. Presidential Athletic Advisory Council       | Castle   |
| C. Academic Computing Policy Advisory Committee | Chadwick |
| D. University Budget Advisory Committee         | Soni     |

**New Business**

**Adjournment**

**Appendix A**  
**University-Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**  
**Co-Chairs Sechrist and Greenawalt**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

The following courses were approved by the UWUCC to be offered as distance education courses:

- **SAFE 311 Fire Protection**
- **SAFE 331 Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene**
- **SAFE 346 Fundamentals of Ergonomics**
- **HIST 240 Zombies: A Cultural History of Death, Disease, and Technology**
- **SCI 113 Physics in Science Fiction**

**FOR ACTION:**

**1. Department of Chemistry—Credit Hour Correction**

**Current Catalog Listing:**

**CHEM 112 General Chemistry II** **3c-01-4cr**

**Correct Catalog Listing:**

**CHEM 112 General Chemistry II** **3c-31-4cr**

**Rationale:** In 2012 when this course was last revised the credit hours were incorrectly reported to Senate and have been in the catalog incorrect since. The proposal had the correct hours of 3c-31-4cr.

**2. Department of Safety Sciences—New Courses, Course Title Change**

**a. New Courses:**

- i. SAFE 331 Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene** **3c-01-3cr**  
**Prerequisite:** Restricted to MS Safety Sciences students only; or by instructor permission only  
Provides an understanding of selected chemical, physical and biological stressors in the workplace that may present occupational health hazards for workers. Focuses on anticipating, identifying, evaluating, and controlling chemical, physical and biological stressors in the workplace. Emphasizes adverse health effects from excessive exposures, workplace standards, sampling and analytical methods, and control options.
- ii. SAFE 346 Fundamentals of Ergonomics** **3c-01-3cr**  
**Prerequisite:** Restricted to MS Safety Sciences students' only; or by instructor permission  
Explores the fundamental principles of human performance and its effect upon the safety and reliability of systems. Examines risk factors in workplace design associated

with force, repetition, and posture using anthropometrics, biomechanics of motion, work physiology and human performance. Teaches ergonomic methods that analyze these risk factors.

**Rationale:** Approximately 75% of admitted students to the MS in Safety Sciences program require the completion of deficiency coursework due to having a non-safety BS degree or experience. Traditionally, students complete their deficiencies for Industrial Fire, Ergonomics and Industrial Hygiene online through Trinidad State Junior College (TSJC). The courses at TSJC require the students to have a mentor that is a safety professional. Most students use the IUP Safety Sciences faculty to guide them through and review their projects. This has added a significant amount of work to the department. In addition, student feedback regarding the courses at TSJC has been average in terms of knowledge gained. The faculty in the Safety Sciences department support offering these same courses online at IUP. These courses would be restricted to MS Safety Sciences students only and non-Safety undergraduate majors. MS students would still have the option of taking this coursework at TSJC if so desired.

**b. Course Title Change:**

**Current Title:** SAFE 347 Ergonomics

**Proposed Title:** SAFE 347 Applied Ergonomics

**Rationale:** Recently, the Safety Sciences department submitted a proposal for a new course titled SAFE 346 Fundamentals of Ergonomics. This course is for MS majors only or with instructor permission. We want to change the undergraduate course SAFE 347 Ergonomics to Applied Ergonomics to enable clear and different titles between this course and the new proposed course - eliminating confusion during scheduling.

**3. Department of History—New Course**

**HIST 240 Zombies: A Cultural History of Death, Disease, and Technology** 3c-01-3cr  
Explores the concept of the Zombie throughout history and across cultures, and the way the figure of the zombie has served as a metaphor for deeper personal and communal fears, such as death, nuclear war, global pandemics, and out of control technology.

**Rationale:** While history courses typically involve the study of a defined period or particular location, they can also focus on the study of an idea or concept over time and around the world, allowing students to understand better the similarities and differences between different cultures. While Zombies seem an unusual choice, they represent death, danger, chaos, and the breakdown of civilization and all societies throughout history have demonstrated concerns and fears regarding these issues. By focusing on zombies and what they represent, students will be able to focus both on the similarities and differences between modern society and people living in the past.

**4. Department of Physics—New Course**

**SCI 113 Physics in Science Fiction****3c-01-3cr**

Explores the use and abuse of physics in science fiction. Discusses staples of science fiction including time travel, faster-than-light speed travel, quantum mechanics and artificial gravity. Examines the agreement between phenomena presented in fiction and our current model of the universe. Reviews popular, current science fiction franchises as well as classical science fiction.

**Rationale:** When reading or watching science fiction, one might guess that “someday” this all will be possible. Is this true? Based upon the laws of physics, we will explore what is very possible, somewhat possible and impossible in various works of science fiction. This analysis will empower the learner so she will have the ability to analyze the natural world.

**5. Department of Communication Disorders, Special Education, and Disability Services—  
Course Revision, Catalog Description and Course Title Changes****Current Catalog Description:****EDHL 308 Language for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing and English Language Learners****3c-01-3cr****Prerequisites: EDHL 114, admission to Step 1 of the 3-Step Process**

Reviews normal language development for birth through 12 years and compares it to the language development of children with various types and degrees of hearing loss. Emphasizes specific strategies focused on the assessment and development of English language skills in English language learners (ELL) and deaf and hard-of-hearing children (D/HH).

**Proposed Catalog Description:****EDHL 308 Supporting Language and Communication for Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing,  
English Language Learners, and Individuals with Language Disorders****3c-01-3cr**

Reviews normal language development birth – 12 years and compares it to the language development of children with various types and degrees of hearing loss, English as a second language, and children with language disorders. Emphasizes specific strategies focused on the assessment and development of English language skills in English Language Learners, Deaf/Hard of Hearing children, and children with language disorders.

**Rationale:** In order to reduce the number of individualized instructions for the Special Education majors, minimal revisions were made to EDHL 308 in order to include them in the course. This will be the course which is required for them instead of SPLP 254 which is no longer offered.

**6. Liberal Studies and UWUCC approved the following:**

- HIST 240 Zombies: A Cultural History of Death, Disease, and Technology was approved as a Liberal Studies Elective in the information literacy and technical literacy categories.
- SCI 113 Physics in Science Fiction was approved as a Natural Science, Non Lab course.

**Appendix B**  
**University Wide Graduate Committee**  
**Chairs: Moore and Frenzel**

**FOR ACTION:**

**1. DEPARTMENT: ADULT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION**  
**COURSE REVISION**

**Course:** ACE 622: Program and Project Planning and Evaluation

**Rationale:** The title and catalog description changes are due to the reorganization of coursework in the Instructional Design and Technology (IDT) track. The title change emphasizes the relationship between program and project planning and evaluation. This course will combine the program planning information from ACE 622 with the program evaluation content from ACE 744 into one course that covers the entire process of program and project design which includes evaluation into the planning process. This combination will provide students with a holistic perspective of the iterative process of program design and development.

<b>Current Course Title:</b> Program and Project Planning	<b>Proposed Course Title:</b> Program and Project Planning and Evaluation
<b>Current Catalog Description:</b> Provides a hands-on approach to planning education and training programs and instructional design projects. ACE 622 is a knowledge and skill-building course designed for present and future instructional designers, trainers, and adult and community education professionals. This how-to course examines concepts and practices relevant to the development of education and training programs and instructional design projects in a variety of settings.	<b>Proposed Catalog Description:</b> Provides a hands-on approach to planning and evaluating education, training programs, and instructional design projects. This course will include an analysis of projects in the context of designing, conducting, revising, and disseminating effective education and training programs. Effective strategies for planning and implementing both formative and summative evaluation will also be addressed.

**PROGRAM REVISION**

**Rationale:** This proposal is for a minor program revision to the Instructional Design and Technology track in the M.A. in Adult and Community Education. The proposed change is the deletion of ACE 744 Program Evaluation from the Option B, Non-Thesis track. We are requesting this change because the program evaluation content from ACE 744 is being added to the ACE 622 Program and Project Planning and Evaluation course to allow students to experience the iterative process of program planning and development which includes the program evaluation process. ACE 744 will be replaced by three credits of internship or three credits of elective in the Option B, Non-Thesis track. The program's non-thesis, Option B,

currently has only three credits of internship or elective available in the track. Making this minor revision will increase the internship or elective credit options from three credits to six credits in Option B. This change provides additional opportunities for students to gain professional experience and/or specialized instruction in the field of instructional design.

CURRENT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS
<p>I. CORE COURSES (27 CR.)            ACE 600 Introduction to Instructional Design 3 cr.            ACE 610 Learning Management Systems 3 cr.            ACE 617 Distance Education Technology 3 cr.            ACE 621 The Adult Learner 3 cr.            ACE 622 Program and Project Planning 3 cr.            ACE 623 Organizational Leadership in Adult and Community Education 3 cr.            ACE 630 Distance Education Pedagogy 3 cr.            ACE 700 Advanced Instructional Design 3 cr.            BTED 675 Web Design: Theory and Applications 3 cr.</p> <p>II. RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS (3 CR.)            GSR 615 Elements of Research 3 cr.</p> <p>III. EITHER            A. THESIS OPTION (6 CR.)            ACE 795 Thesis 6 cr.            or            B. NON-THESIS OPTION (6 CR.)*            ACE 744 Program and Project Evaluation 3 cr.            ACE 698 Internship 3 cr.            or            Elective (as approved by advisor) 3 cr.            *A portfolio is required for non-thesis option students.</p> <p>Total 36 cr.</p>	<p>I. CORE COURSES (27 CR.)            ACE 600 Introduction to Instructional Design 3 cr.            ACE 610 Learning Management Systems 3 cr.            ACE 617 Distance Education Technology 3 cr.            ACE 621 The Adult Learner 3 cr.            ACE 622 Program and Project Planning 3 cr.            ACE 623 Organizational Leadership in Adult and Community Education 3 cr.            ACE 630 Distance Education Pedagogy 3 cr.            ACE 700 Advanced Instructional Design 3 cr.            BTED 675 Web Design: Theory and Applications 3 cr.</p> <p>II. RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS (3 CR.)            GSR 615 Elements of Research 3 cr.</p> <p>III. EITHER            A. THESIS OPTION (6 CR.)            ACE 795 Thesis 6 cr.            or            B. NON-THESIS OPTION (6 CR.)*            ACE 698 Internship 6 cr.            or            Elective (as approved by advisor) 6 cr.            *A portfolio is required for non-thesis option students.</p> <p>Total 36 cr.</p>

**2. DEPARTMENT: COMMUNICATION DISORDERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION AND DISABILITIES SERVICES**  
**COURSE REVISION**

**Course:** EDEX 569: Education of Persons with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders, Learning Disabilities, or Brain Injury

**Rationale:** We are seeking to eliminating the prerequisite for this course as graduate students taking this course, for their major, have already completed the prerequisite courses during their undergraduate program at other universities. This is verified during the acceptance process by the program coordinator. The prerequisite is no longer needed for this course

<p><b>Current Prerequisite(s):</b> Certification or EDEX 650 or EDEX 111 or EDEX 300. This course is designed to meet teacher certification requirements</p>	<p><b>Proposed Prerequisite(s):</b> No prerequisites</p>
--	--

**3. DEPARTMENT: CHEMISTRY**  
**COURSE REVISION**

**Course:** CHEM 630 Organic Chemistry

**Rationale:** The course is being revised to update the content for the Professional Science Master's degree in Applied Industrial Chemistry. Much of the core content from the course will be kept (i.e. physical organic chemistry and study of mechanisms). However, this revision places an emphasis on the inclusion of application of how chemical structure effects the mechanistic route and outcome of advanced reactions seen in the chemical industry, specifically with the commodity and specialty sectors.

<p><b>Current Course Title:</b> Organic Chemistry</p>	<p><b>Proposed Course Title:</b> Essentials of Structure and Reactivity for Industrial Organic Applications</p>
<p><b>Current Catalog Description:</b> Principles of physical chemistry will be applied to the study of organic reaction mechanisms. Lecture—three hours.</p>	<p><b>Proposed Catalog Description:</b> Examines structure and reactivity relationships of organic substrates in key reactions used in the chemical industry. Emphasizes molecular structure, chemical bonding, mechanism characterization, stereochemistry and how structure and reactivity are exploited in reactions that are used in the commodity and specialty sectors of chemical industry.</p>

## **FOR INFORMATION**

**The following courses were approved for distance education:**

- APMU 622/672/722/772/740: Private Conducting
- APMU 740: Graduate Music Recital
- CHEM 630: Essentials of Structure and Reactivity for Industrial Organic Applications
- COMM 812: Media Ethics
- COMM 815: Teaching Communications Media
- EDSP 994: Introduction to the Dissertation



**Appendix C  
Non-Credit Committee  
Chair O’Neil**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

**December 4, 2018  
WedNetPA Training Program**

On November 13, 2018 the Non-Credit Committee interviewed Kristen O’Hara, from the Offices of Extended Studies, Continuing Education regarding WEDNet Programming.

**Committee Members Present:** Tess O’Neil, Chair, Sudipta Majumdar, Vice-Chair, Ken Bohl, Mindy McIsaac, Marcy Rearick, and Mike Husenits

**About the Programs**

**WEDNet Program**

WEDNet is a Pennsylvania economic development program with the mission of helping employers provide quality job training to their employees. The goal of the WEDNet program is to make “Pennsylvania companies more competitive and productive”.

The IUP WEDNet office is administered through the IUP Office of Extended Studies and is of 26 state-wide WEDNet offices that coordinate and facilitate the granting process between the state and eligible employers in the following ways:

- Identifying eligible Pennsylvania employers
- Verifying employee qualifications
- Assisting employers in identifying potential applicable training programs
- Assisting employers in completing the grant application
- Monitoring and managing the progress of granted employers
- Facilitating the reimbursement of applicable training expenses

The types of training available fall into two broad categories:

- Essential Training Skills
- Advanced Technological Training

What distinguishes these two categories is the content of the course and the eligible reimbursement. Essential Training Skills courses are eligible for a reimbursement of \$450 per employee and Advanced Technological Training courses are eligible for a reimbursement of \$850 per employee. The 5-year maximum for a single employer is \$50,000.

Although courses must be approved by the WEDNet office, courses covered are largely based on employer needs and we were provided with several hundred examples of covered courses spanning both the Essential Training Skills and Advanced Technological

**IUP WEDNet Operations**

The IUP WEDNet office has limited resources and is responsible for both the marketing of the WEDNet services and the administration of the granting process. Of these two responsibilities, administration is the most time consuming, allowing little time for marketing, promotion and lead generation.

## **Recommendations**

The WEDNet program can be a valuable resource to Pennsylvania base SMEs and large corporations alike. As with many small offices, the administrative burdens require a prioritizing of time. In this case the first priority is the processing of new grant applications and the administering of existing contracts. Unfortunately, this leaves little time to prospecting and gathering leads for future clients. In addition to having to prioritize time to existing work, there is also a limited marketing budget.

One possibility might be to leverage IUP's relationships with business, industry and trade organizations. Regional job fairs, such as those hosted by IUP and WestPACS might provide low or no-cost opportunities for representation at events with high numbers of regional employers.

A second possibility could involve a collaboration between WEDNet and the Eberly Mini-MBA program. The Min-MBA taught by the Eberly College of Business. is typically a custom designed business program targeting management-track employees. Based on examples of Essential Skills Training topics it seems that employers who enroll employees in a Mini-MBA could be eligible for a \$450 per employee grant.

**Appendix C**  
**Research Committee**  
**Chair Delbrugge**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

**Committee business**

- The committee discussed the new proposed “Policy for the Oversight of Research Involving Human Subjects,” which was unanimously approved to move from the committee to the Senate **FOR ACTION** (policy provided below). This policy is accompanied by a letter **FOR INFORMATION** (provided below) from IUP’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) chair, Dr. Jen Roberts.
- The committee also discussed a small (4 word) edit to the university “Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct,” which harmonizes the policy with the new “Policy for the Oversight of Research Involving Human Subjects.” The revised “Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct” was unanimously approved to move from the committee to the Senate **FOR ACTION** and the first two pages of the policy (with four word changes in the “Definition” section noted) are provided below. The original policy in its entirety is available [HERE](https://www.iup.edu/research/policies/) (https://www.iup.edu/research/policies/)

**2. A letter from Dr. Jen Roberts, Chair, IUP’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects**

Dear Colleagues,

On January 20, 2019, new federal regulations regarding the protection of human subjects (also known as ‘the common rule’) will go into effect. These regulations come from the US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP), in coordination with fifteen other Federal Departments and Agencies. **These revisions to the Common Rule chiefly effect the way Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) categorize and review research; the direct impact on most researchers is fairly negligible.** The new regulations impact not only IUP, but universities across the country. As such, the overwhelming majority of universities are updating their existing policies and practices as they pertain to the protection of human subjects. Interested readers are encouraged to review the new federal policy in its entirety [here \(https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/19/2017-01058/federal-policy-for-the-protection-of-human-subjects\)](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/19/2017-01058/federal-policy-for-the-protection-of-human-subjects).

In preparation, IUP’s IRB has taken several steps to ensure a smooth transition from the old to the new regulations. These steps include updating current policies and practices, completing training, and bringing our electronic protocol submission, review, and monitoring system, IRB Manager, into compliance. **We anticipate that IUP researchers will notice very few changes in terms of how to submit and receive approval for their research protocols and/or requests for changes to their research protocols.** Researchers will continue to contact the IRB with

questions about whether or not IRB oversight is required for their research and, for those where oversight is required, researchers will continue to use IRBManager for research protocol submission and to receive approval for protocols or requests for changes.

Most of the regulatory changes are meant to streamline the review process and to provide time saving changes for IRBs and researchers. For example, the new federal regulations allow more types of research to be reviewed at the exempt and expedited levels. The turn-around time on exempt and expedited protocols at IUP is significantly faster than the national average, and this will continue to be the case. In addition, *in most cases*, continuing review of exempt and expedited protocols will no longer be required. With the new regulations, our office will send researchers a yearly request for an update on the status of their approved exempt and expedited projects. Using IRBManager, researchers will simply indicate whether or not the project is continuing or should be closed, and also confirm whether or not any changes to the existing protocol are required.

Of note, the new federal regulations clarify the definition of ‘research’ and specifically exclude certain scholarly activities from this definition. **However, the determination as to whether a project constitutes human subjects research and/or qualifies for exempt or expedited review lies with the local IRB office, not the researcher. Researchers are encouraged to contact our office with questions regarding their projects.**

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or the IRB staff (IRB-research@iup.edu).

Sincerely,  
Jen Roberts, Ph.D., Chair, IRB

**FOR ACTION:**

**1. Policy for the Oversight of Research Involving Human Subjects**

POLICY STATEMENT

---

Subject: Policy for the Oversight of Research Involving Human Subjects

---

Date: October 31, 2018

Distribution: All

Reference Number:

Effective Date: January 20, 2019

---

Addition \_\_\_\_\_

Originating Office:

President’s Approval

- PURPOSE:** To establish a policy for the oversight of human subjects research conducted by IUP faculty, managers, administrators, staff, students, and other researchers formally affiliated with the university.
- SCOPE:** This policy shall apply to all current and former IUP faculty, managers, administrators, staff, students and formally affiliated researchers who engage, plan to engage, or engaged prior to their separation from IUP, in human subjects research. Because participation of humans in research raises fundamental ethical and civil rights questions, no distinctions in the monitoring of projects will be drawn between funded and unfunded projects, sponsored and unsponsored projects, or among projects carried out by students, faculty, managers, administrators, staff, and other formally affiliated researchers, on-campus or off-campus.
- OBJECTIVE:** This policy seeks to help ensure the protection of human research subjects and the integrity of research and scholarship at IUP. This policy defines human subjects research and describes the responsibilities of both the researcher(s) and the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB), which provides oversight for human subjects research in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 45 CFR Part 46.
- POLICY:** It is the policy of Indiana University of Pennsylvania to foster an academic environment that advances ethical conduct in all human subjects research. The IRB is the university group that provides oversight of all human subjects research conducted by IUP faculty, managers, administrators, staff, students, and other researchers formally affiliated with the university, regardless of whether or not the research is funded/sponsored. In compliance with 45 CFR Part 46, this oversight includes: (i) determinations of whether or not IRB review is required for a given research project; (ii) review of new human subjects research protocols, changes made to existing human subjects research protocols, and the continuing review of human subjects research protocols; (iii) monitoring of approved human subjects research protocols, including receipt of adverse event reporting; and (iv) reporting non-compliance with this policy to the university Research Integrity Officer for review, consistent with IUP's Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct.

**DEFINITIONS:**

A “human subject” is a “living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research: (i) Obtains information or biospecimens through intervention or interaction with the individual, and uses, studies, or analyzes the information or biospecimens; or (ii) Obtains, uses, studies, analyzes, or generates identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens.” (45 CFR Part 46.102(e)(1)).

“Research” is a “systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Activities that meet this definition constitute research for purposes of this policy, whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program that is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities.” (45 CFR Part 46.102(l)).

The “Institutional Review Board” (IRB) is a body established in accord with and for the purposes expressed in 45 CFR Part 46. IRB membership is prescribed in 45 CFR Part 46.107; functions and operations are prescribed in 45 CFR Part 46.108; review is prescribed in 45 CFR 46.109-114; record-keeping is prescribed in 45 CFR Part 46.115; and registration with the US Department of Health and Human Services is prescribed in 45 CFR Part 46.501-505. The purpose of the IRB is to protect participants in research as well as to protect researchers and research integrity at IUP.

**RESPONSIBILITIES:**

Research projects involving the use of human subjects must be reviewed by the IRB. If it is unclear whether the proposed research falls under the purview of the IRB, the researcher must seek assistance from the Associate Dean for Research or the IRB chair.

The IRB determines if oversight is required for proposed research and establishes procedures for the timely evaluation of human subjects research protocols for exempt, expedited, and full board reviews. The IRB reviews and monitors protocols following guidance from 45 CFR Part 46 for all funded and unfunded research. The IRB maintains documentation related to the review and monitoring of protocols and decisions made regarding protocols. All documents are maintained for the statutorily prescribed period (at least three years from the completion of the research; 45 CFR 46.115(b)). The IRB shall notify the University’s Research Integrity Officer (RIO) of any failures to comply with this policy.

It is the responsibility of any researcher associated with IUP to protect the rights and welfare of their research participants. For projects over

which the IRB has purview, researchers are required to submit a research protocol for review and this protocol must be submitted and approved prior to commencement of any recruitment of subjects or data collection. Researchers are also responsible for submitting any requests for changes to existing human subjects protocols and/or requests for continuing review of existing protocols and must receive approval from the IRB for these activities prior to their commencement. It is the responsibility of the researcher to complete their human subjects research in the exact manner as dictated in their IRB-approved research protocol and to retain all data and consent documents for at least three years beyond the completion of the research. It is also the responsibility of researchers to report issues and adverse events to the IRB within 48 hours. Student researchers are further required to comply with IUP's Policy for the Preparation and Training of Students Working with Human and/or Animal Subjects.

## **PROCEDURES**

Human subjects research protocols must be submitted to the IRB via the designated electronic platform well in advance of the proposed date for commencement of research activities. All protocols received are logged, routed for a determination of the required level of review (exempt, expedited, or full board), and reviewed accordingly. All communication to researchers about their human subjects research protocols is sent electronically via IUP email. Human subjects research may not commence until IRB approval is granted.

Some departments have established a departmental review board (DRB) to review human subjects research protocols prior to their submission to the IRB. This review is in addition to, not in lieu of, review and approval by the IRB.

An expedited or exempt review procedure is possible for those human subjects research protocols that involve no more than minimal risk to subjects and also fall under one of the research categories eligible for expedited review or fall under the categories exempted from continuing review by federal regulations. Final determination as to whether a specific project is eligible for such review can only be made by the IRB.

If a researcher wishes to make any changes to an approved human subjects protocol, the researcher must submit a request for change via the IRB's electronic platform. The IRB will review the request and communicate a decision to the investigator. The researcher may not enact the change until approval is granted.

Approved research protocols may be selected for periodic post-approval monitoring to ensure researchers are following the exact procedures approved by the IRB.

The IRB will send researchers an annual electronic reminder about forthcoming protocol approval expiration dates (where applicable) and instructions for renewal or project close-out.

More detailed information for human subjects researchers, including model protocols, protocol submission tutorials, educational and training materials, IRB full board meeting dates, and committee membership, can be found on the university’s IRB web site.

DISTRIBUTION All faculty and managers annually by the School Graduate Studies and Research.

**2. Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct**

**POLICY STATEMENT**

Subject: Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct

Date: April 26, 2010                      Distribution: All Employees                      Reference Number:  
Revision Date: April 19, 2011

Addition                       Originating Office:                      President’s Approval  
Deletion   
New Item                       School of Graduate Studies and Research

- 1. PURPOSE: To establish a policy and procedure, consistent with all regulations in 42 CFR 93, June 16, 2005, to respond to any allegations or apparent instances of fraud or misconduct in the carrying out of research by IUP faculty, managers, administrators, staff, and students.



2. SCOPE: The policy will cover all IUP faculty, managers, administrators, staff, and students who conduct research.
3. OBJECTIVE: The policy for responding to allegations of research misconduct governs research conducted by IUP faculty, managers, administrators, staff, and students, defines misconduct in research, and establishes procedures for conducting an inquiry and, if necessary, an investigation into any allegation of possible misconduct. The policy also protects the integrity of the University's research mission. The procedures here constitute the entire fact-finding phases of all situations involving alleged research misconduct as defined by 42 CFR 93, June 16, 2005.
4. POLICY: It is the policy of Indiana University of Pennsylvania to foster an academic environment that encourages ethical conduct in all scholarship. Moreover, IUP will deal forthrightly with possible misconduct associated with research. The University will conduct an inquiry and, if warranted by that inquiry, an investigation of any allegations of misconduct by IUP faculty, managers, administrators, staff, and students carrying out research projects. In the event that misconduct is determined by a preponderance of evidence, the President may take appropriate disciplinary action. Any actions that are proposed to be taken shall be consistent with the relevant Collective Bargaining Agreement (faculty, administrators, or staff) and the PASSHE Board of Governors' Policy 1983-01-A Merit Principles (managers). For students, findings of misconduct will be processed according to the Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs. It is also the policy of the University to maintain and widely promulgate its procedures for dealing with research misconduct.
5. DEFINITION: "Misconduct" or "Research Misconduct" means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results (see 42 CFR 93, June 16, 2005). Under ~~this~~ **IUP** policy, Research Misconduct also includes failure to comply with Federal regulations **and IUP policies** for protection of researchers, human subjects, the public, or the welfare of laboratory animals. It does not include honest error, honest

differences in interpretations or judgments about data, or disputes about authorship (see 42 CFR 93, June 16, 2005).

6. RESPONSIBILITIES: It is the responsibility of the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) (Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Research) to receive initial allegations from a complainant. A complaint must normally be filed within six years of the alleged incident to be considered under this policy. Absent unusual circumstances, within 20 days of receiving a complaint, the RIO should identify apparent instances of misconduct, determine whether an inquiry is warranted, and if so, initiate an inquiry into possible misconduct. In cases of honest error such as miscalculation or inadvertent omission of a citation, the RIO should dismiss the allegation. However, if the RIO believes that the evidence has the potential to show that (1) research misconduct, as defined in this policy, occurred; (2) the research misconduct is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and (3) the respondent committed the research misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly, the RIO should initiate the inquiry.

...

(Full text available at <https://www.iup.edu/research/policies/>)

### **FOR INFORMATION:**

#### **Review of Travel and Research Small Grant Proposals:**

There were 12 USRC Small Grant proposals for review and the decision was made to fund 9 proposals totaling \$10,115.

- Christine Baker was awarded \$806 for travel to present “Conflict and Exchange on the Frontier” at the Middle East Studies Association conference to be held November 16-18, 2018 in San Antonio, TX.
- Jill Brady was awarded \$742 for travel to present “Interpreters as Team Members” at the American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association Conference to be held November 15-17, 2018 in Boston, MA.
- DeAnna Laverick was awarded \$1,000 for travel to present “Applying Theory to Practice: The Impact of a Leadership Theories Course on D.Ed. Students’ Leadership and Professional

Practice” at the Hawaii International Conference on Education to be held January 4-8, 2019 in Honolulu, HI.

- John Mueller was awarded \$1,000 for travel to present “Multicultural Competence: Advancing Social Justice and Inclusion” at the American College Personnel Association conference to be held March 3-6, 2019 in Boston, MA.
- Kelli Paquette was awarded \$1,000 for travel to present “Leading Doctoral Students to Terminal Degree Success” at the Hawaii International Conference on Education to be held January 5-8, 2019 in Honolulu, HI.
- Lisa Price was awarded \$760 for travel to present “Increasing Cultural Competence and Awareness of Racial Privilege in Undergraduate Students” at the American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association Conference to be held November 15-18, 2018 in Boston, MA.
- Timothy Runge was awarded \$1,000 for travel to present “Selecting Appropriate Interventions and Support at Advanced Tiers” at the NASP Conference to be held February 26-March 2, 2019 in Atlanta, GA.
- Megan Knoch was awarded \$2,000 for her proposal “The Role of Peripheral Metabolic Activity in Determining Circadian Rhythms.”
- Luz Marin and Majed Zreiqat were awarded \$1,807 for their project “Effect of Music Relaxation and Mindfulness Meditation Rest Breaks in Reducing Fatigue during Repetitive Manual Tasks.”

**Appendix E  
Academic Affairs Committee  
Co-chairs Dugan and Wachter**

**FOR ACTION:**

**1. Emeritus Faculty Nominations**

The Academic Committee recommends that the following faculty be granted Emeritus Faculty status:

<b>Candidate</b>	<b>Department</b>
Dr. W. Timothy Austin	Criminology & Criminal Justice
Dr. Carol Caraway	Philosophy
Dr. Stanley Chepaitis	Music Department
Ms. Carol Connell	Libraries
Dr. Lon Ferguson	Safety Sciences
Dr. Dighton “Mac” Fiddner	Political Science
Dr. Arden Hamer	Developmental Studies
Ms. Joann Janosko	Libraries
Dr. Amy Labant	Nursing and Allied Health Professions
Dr. David Loomis	Journalism and Public Relations
Dr. Phillip Neusius	Anthropology
Dr. Sarah Neusius	Anthropology
Dr. Ray Pavloski	Psychology
Dr. David Pistole	Biology
Dr. Jay Start	Communications Media
Dr. Dey Whit Watts	Geography and Regional Planning

**2. Procedure and Criteria for Awarding Dean Emeritus Status**

**Toward a Concept of "Emeritus"**

Each year the university confers the title "Emeritus" on exemplary Deans/Associate Deans/Assistant Deans who have been recommended through a Chairs and Dean’s Council or Associate Deans group-based process.

Emeritus status is an honor conferred by the university to show respect for a distinguished career. It says, "even though you are no longer an official part of this organization, you have shown such merit that we claim you as a continuing part of our professional group; we gather glory from your reflected glory."

In addition to the public award and inclusion in a published listing of emeriti, the university may provide benefits such as library privileges and office space when available. The university community is encouraged to use the skills and the talents of emeriti on a voluntary basis when appropriate.

### **Definitions**

For purposes of this document, the following definitions shall be applied:

"Dean" – Academic Leadership who are not defined as faculty in the CBA

"Associate Dean" – Academic Leadership who are not defined as faculty in the CBA

"Assistant Dean" – Academic Leadership who are not defined as faculty in the CBA

***For the purposes of this document the term "Dean" shall apply to all three: Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean.***

NB: A dean who meets the criteria for the *IUP Faculty Emeritus* status may elect to be considered under that category and following those procedures. However, no person may be considered under both. No person may be rejected under one and then apply under the other.

### **Procedure**

Nominations for Dean emeritus status must be initiated within two years following retirement. The title "posthumous Dean emeritus" may also be awarded. Nominations must be initiated within two years following death. (NOTE: Last employment must have been with IUP.)

Nominations for Dean emeritus status may be made by a current or recent (within the last three years prior to the nomination) IUP chair from the Dean's college or unit who is familiar with the nominee's professional contributions. After a full-vote by the college's Chairs Council/group, following the rules for voting established by the group, nominations with vote total (and additional commentary, if desired), will be forwarded to the Dean's Council. [Note: all Chairs votes should be by secret ballot.] The members of the Dean's Council will discuss the candidates' applications and make a recommendation. After the nominees' college chairs vote and Council of Dean's recommendation, materials will be forwarded to the Provost's Office. The Provost's Office shall send the completed transmittal form, along with nomination letters and supporting documentation, as well as the Chairs Council vote and Dean's Council recommendation, and any commentary, to the Academic Committee. The Academic Committee shall review these documents, make recommendations, and forward the recommended Dean Emeritus nominations (requiring majority vote by Academic Committee) to the Senate for consideration and approval. Upon Senate approval, the nominations will be reviewed by the President's office. If approved by the President, the nominations are then forwarded to the Council of Trustees for final approval.

### **Criteria**

Each nominee for emeritus status must have been a full-time Dean at IUP for at least five full calendar years and must have demonstrated exemplary performance. In addition, the nominee must have made a significant contribution to their college and the University in the areas evaluated by the Management Performance Evaluation and Development (MPED) Form or other current evaluation method. The nominating package MUST address the candidate's exemplary performance in the higher-level categories of Academic Administration; Service and Integrity; and Professional Engagement.

Management Performance Evaluation and Development (MPED) Form, or other current evaluation method, includes these factors:

1. Academic Administration (such as inspiring and encouraging faculty growth, business processes, technology, customer service and results; planning and program/project management; policy and decision making, and resource management)

2. Service and Integrity (such as vision; leadership; creation of a positive environment; service to the College, and service to the University)
3. Professional Engagement (such as human resources and labor relation management, communication/collaboration/interpersonal skills, and interacting with external environment).

The nomination for Dean’s Emeritus status MUST include:

- 1) A current curriculum vitae.
- 2) A nomination letter from a member of the college’s Chairs Council that includes a substantive narrative addressing how the nominee qualifies for emeritus status. The nomination letter should refer to specific evidence of the nominee’s exemplary qualifications. Although the application need not include the materials themselves, evidence as outlined in the nomination criteria, 1) Academic Administration, 2) Service and Integrity (including vision, leadership, college and university service, and creation of a positive working environment) and 3) Professional Engagement, should be cited in sufficient detail.
- 3) A letter of support from a fellow dean, or associate/assistant dean, depending upon the management category of the nominee.
- 4) A copy of the last three completed Management Performance Evaluation and Development Forms or relevant evaluation method (Office of the Chancellor). *(Note: Consent of the nominee is needed for performance reviews if not initially received from the nominee.)*

The nomination MAY also include other materials, such as:

- 1) Letters of commendations or other special recognition.
- 2) Additional Management Performance Evaluation and Development Forms (or current evaluation method) from prior evaluations.

The Academic Committee reserves the right to request clarification from the college’s/unit’s Chairs and Council of Deans and to request additional information from the nominator and/or nominee.

Nominations for emeritus, or posthumous emeritus status, with supporting evidence for the above criteria, should be in the office of the Chair of the college’s Chairs Council by noon on [INSERT DATE], who after review and vote, will forward the nominations to the Council of Deans by [INSERT DATE]. After review and vote by the Council of Deans, the nomination with all prior votes will be sent to the Provost’s Office by [INSERT DATE]. After review and comment, the Provost will send recommendations and previous votes from the Chairs and Council of Deans to the chair/co-chair of Academic Committee by [INSERT DATE]. The Academic Committee will review the nomination packages, previous votes and recommendations, and will vote on the nominations. The Academic Committee shall forward the nominations receiving a majority vote of support from the Academic Committee to the Senate for voting at the November meeting. Following the Senate vote, the nomination(s) shall be evaluated by the University President and, if approved, the Council of Trustees.

**DUE DATES:**

- |  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1. Chair, College Chairs Council         | DATE (by noon)                |
| 2. Convener, Council of Deans            | DATE (by noon)                |
| 3. Provost                               | DATE (by noon)                |
| 4. Academic Committee (fwd. to Senate)   | DATE (by noon)                |
| 5. Senate                                | November meeting              |
| 6. University President                  | After November Senate meeting |
| 7. Council of Trustees (fwd. by Provost) | After November Senate meeting |

**Indiana University of Pennsylvania  
Nomination for Dean Emeritus Status**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nominee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nominator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rank/Dept

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Retirement

\_\_\_\_\_  
Years of IUP Service

**Nomination Criteria** (Check all that apply.)

Meets all the following:

\_\_\_\_\_ Completed 5 full calendar years of service to IUP as a Dean

\_\_\_\_\_ Demonstrated exemplary administrative performance as a Dean in the following areas:

1. Academic Administration (such as inspiring and encouraging faculty growth, business processes, technology, customer service and results, planning and program/project management, policy and decision making, resource management)
2. Service and Integrity (such as vision, leadership, cultivating a positive environment, service to the college, service to the university)
3. Professional Engagement (such as human resources and labor relation management, communication/collaboration/interpersonal skills, interacting with the external environment)

Attachments:

\_\_\_\_\_ A current curriculum vitae

\_\_\_\_\_ A nomination letter addressing how the nominee qualifies for emeritus status

\_\_\_\_\_ A copy of the last three *Management Performance Evaluation and Development Forms* or other current evaluation criterion

\_\_\_\_\_ Other Materials (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**Approval Process**

College Chair's Council: Eligible Voters \_\_\_\_\_ Actual Voters \_\_\_\_\_

Vote Results: For \_\_\_\_\_ Against \_\_\_\_\_ Abstain \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Above results verified by (Chair of Chair's Council) Date \_\_\_\_\_

*When a majority approval is not secured, attach a list to this form of area(s) in which nominee has not excelled.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deans Council Recommendation (if Dean nominee) or Yes No Date \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Deans Group Rec. (if Assoc/Asst Dean nominee)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost Recommendation Yes No Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Senate Academic Committee Recommendation Yes No Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Approved by University Senate Yes No Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Approved by University President Yes No Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Approved by Council of Trustees Yes No Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Rationale:** The current IUP Emeritus definition and process provides the emeritus honor for CBA defined faculty. It effectively excludes from emeritus consideration deans who were not initially hired as CBA defined faculty. It also excludes from consideration deans who were hired as a CBA defined faculty members who transitioned to the role of dean prior to serving for 10 years in the faculty role. Over the years, faculty in the colleges of deans who were retiring, and who were in the two exclusion categories, have asked about nominating their dean for emeritus. Prior committees had not allowed these submissions as they did not fit the defined category. The current committee received such a request spring 2018 and voted to try and create a process for deans. While our initial intent was to have the Dean's Council administer any policy, it was recommended that the Academic Committee create and administer a process fairly like that of the faculty emeritus, thus affording independent review, and equal integrity to the process. The committee ultimately agreed and created a parallel process. The policy as developed was reviewed and commented on by the Dean's Council, with few changes, which have been incorporated. The Academic Committee, therefore, seeks approval of this new policy which will afford a measure of honorary recognition to exemplary academic administrators who, throughout their tenure before retirement, have significantly contributed to the betterment of their college and IUP.

### **3. Change of Major Policy**

#### **CURRENT POLICY**

##### **Change of Major**

To qualify for a change of major, a student must be in academic good standing (2.00 cumulative GPA). This requirement does not apply to students in their first semester at IUP without a GPA. All students must meet any other requirements specific to the new major. All teacher certification programs have requirements beyond a 2.00 GPA. Please refer to the individual college sections in this catalog for change of major policies pertaining to specific colleges and majors.

A student must apply for a change of major on MyIUP - under Academics/ Academic Record, Change of Primary Major. Before seeking a change of major, the student should consult with the departmental chairpersons of both the "old" and "new" majors.

When a student changes college, the dean (or dean's designee) of the college of the new major will evaluate the student's credits before approving the change. A copy of the evaluation will be made available to the student and his/her new advisor if a change of major is affected.

In cases involving students who are veterans, the dean (or dean's designee) of the new major shall give the veteran a statement of prospective approval and the effective date of the proposed changes. This statement shall also indicate the amount of extended time the change of major will entail, if any.

The veteran shall take this statement to the veterans' counselor at least one month before the effective date of the change. No change of major shall be made by veterans until VA approval has been assured.



## **REVISED POLICY**

### **Change of Major**

To qualify for a change of major, a student must be in academic good standing (2.00 cumulative GPA). This requirement does not apply to students in their first semester at IUP without a GPA. All students must meet any other requirements specific to the new major and college. All teacher certification programs have requirements beyond a 2.00 GPA. Please refer to the individual college's section pertaining to change of major policies.

#### **Student with One Major**

A student who has one primary major must apply for a change of major online through MyIUP - under Academics/ Academic Record, Change of Primary Major. Before seeking a change of major, the student should consult with the departmental chairperson (or chairperson's designee) of the new major.

#### **Student with Secondary or Tertiary Major**

A student wanting to add or change a secondary or tertiary major must obtain and complete the appropriate paper application from the department of the new major. Note: the online application is for a student who has one primary major only.

#### **Additional Information**

When a student changes colleges, the dean (or dean's designee) of the college of the new major will evaluate the student's credits before approving the change. A copy of the evaluation will be made available to the student and their new advisor if a change of major occurs.

In cases involving students who are veterans, the dean (or dean's designee) of the new major shall give the veteran a statement of prospective approval and the effective date of the proposed changes. This statement shall also indicate the amount of extended time the change of major will entail, if any. The veteran shall take this statement to the Military and Veterans Resource Center at least one month before the effective date of the change. No change of major shall be made by veterans until VA approval has been assured.

**RATIONALE:** Reviewed as a part of a five-year review cycle, language was minimally updated for better clarity; recognition of secondary and tertiary majors was added; and titles were corrected. Reformatting was added to highlight the difference in directions between changing a first, as opposed to a secondary or tertiary major.