

FORT WAYNE SENATE AGENDA  
MONDAY  
DECEMBER 8, 2008  
12:00 P.M., KT G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 10, 2008
3. Acceptance of the agenda – B. Abbott
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
  - a. Purdue University – N. Younis
  - b. Indiana University – M. Nusbaumer
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – S. Davis
6. Committee reports requiring action
  - a. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 08-7) – M. Nusbaumer
  - b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 08-5) – B. Abbott
7.
  - a. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 08-8)
  - b. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 08-9)
  - c. Question Time (Senate Reference No. 08-10)
8. New business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
10. The general good and welfare of the University  
Chancellor’s Remarks: Strategic Plan
11. Adjournment\*

\*The meeting will adjourn or recess by 1:15 p.m.

Approving  
B. Abbott  
S. Davis  
J. Grant  
M. Nusbaumer  
K. Pollock  
N. Younis

Absent  
A. Ushenko

---

Attachments:

- “Slate for the Election of the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review” (SR No. 08-7)
- “Approval of replacement member of the Executive Committee” (SD 08-5)
- “Question Time: regarding administrative teaching load” (SR No. 08-8)
- “Question Time – regarding faculty increment monies” (SR No. 08-9)
- “Question Time – regarding promotion and tenure standards” (SR No. 08-10)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Indiana University Senators

FROM: Michael Nusbaumer, Chair  
Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs

DATE: 24 November 2008

SUBJ: Slate for 2009-2010 Faculty Board of Review Election

Here is the slate of Indiana University tenured faculty members who have indicated their willingness to serve on the IPFW Faculty Board of Review. Members of this body will be elected by Senators with Indiana University affiliation at the Senate meeting on December 8.

jp

**Slate**

Melanie Bookout  
Margit Codispoti  
Mark Crouch  
Stanley Davis  
Christine Erickson  
M. Gail Hickey  
Ahmad Karim  
Michael Nusbaumer  
Audrey Ushenko  
William Utesch

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Bruce Abbott, Chair  
Executive Committee

DATE: 24 November 2008

SUBJ: Approval of replacement member of the Executive Committee

DISPOSITION: To the Presiding Officer for implementation

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.2.) that "... Senate Committees ... shall have the power to fill Committee vacancies for the remainder of an academic year, subject to Senate approval at its next regular meeting"; and

WHEREAS, There is a vacancy on the Executive Committee; and

WHEREAS, The Executive Committee has appointed Janet Papiernik as the replacement member for the remainder of the 2008-09 academic year;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Senate approve this appointment.

Approving

B. Abbott  
S. Davis  
J. Grant  
M. Nusbaumer  
K. Pollock  
N. Younis

Not Approving

Absent

A. Ushenko

## Question Time

In reference to Senate Document SD 96-4 which states the following:

"That it be the policy of Indiana University-Purdue University that all administrative personnel who hold academic rank be expected, as a condition of their appointment, to be responsible for the teaching of one class per year in the department in which they have academic affiliation."

Could you provide the Senate with a report delineating the number of administrators above departmental chairs who have academic "rank" and the course number, title, number of students, and semester each has taught in the past three years?

Executive Committee of the Fort Wayne Senate

## Question Time

Per Senate Document SD 06-09, which requires the Faculty Affairs Committee to send questions concerning faculty salary increment distribution to the administration:

1. What were the total increment monies allotted, how were they dispersed and by whom?
2. Of the increment monies distributed by the Deans and VCAA, how many faculty received increments for equity and special merit and what was the total dollar amount distributed in each category?
3. How many faculty were recommended to the VCAA by the Deans in each category? How many faculty received funds from the VCAA who were not recommended by the Deans in each category?
4. From which administrative level(s) does recommendation for equity, compression, and/or super merit come?
5. How are promotion increments determined?
6. Why has the focus of equity increases been at the full professor level? How have equity increases been distributed among the faculty ranks (including Continuing Lecturers)?
7. Why must the department be sure to give some extra merit to those that are recommended for merit increases at the college or university level? How can we encourage those working adequately or even to their full ability when we must award them less than the suggested increment?

## Question Time

### Question 1.

On June 6, 2008 the Office of Academic Affairs issued the following:

OAA is now disseminating these materials via hard copy and on the web ([www.ipfw.edu/vcaa/promotion/default.shtml](http://www.ipfw.edu/vcaa/promotion/default.shtml)) in order to provide a single set of recommended and required standards to be used by all academic departments in managing the external review process for their promotion and tenure candidates presenting cases beginning Fall 2009.

The rationale implied here is that all the promotion/tenure (PT) guidelines must adhere to a common standard regarding confidentiality of external review letters. The OAA standard now being required is the use of only non-confidential letters. This policy has undesired consequences. Our mentoring committees endeavor to help PT candidates to supply weighty and perspicacious documents to support their cases. This OAA policy would in fact lead to less meaningful assessments from external reviewers who are experts but unwilling to submit their unvarnished views. This is at variance with the IPFW Strategic Plan's goals to document progress and provide for accountability.

The first question deals with why this confidentiality is now required since the Indiana Code in question (IC 5-14-3, <http://www.in.gov/legislative/ic/code/title5/ar14/ch3.html>) was written in 1983 and both Indiana University and Purdue University have policies (see <http://www.indiana.edu/~uhhs/training/bloomington/lc/academic.html> and [http://www.purdue.edu/policies/pages/human\\_resources/c\\_2.html](http://www.purdue.edu/policies/pages/human_resources/c_2.html)) in place which are not so extreme as to eliminate confidential reviews. **What other higher educational institutions in Indiana have been required due to legal arguments to remove confidential reviews from their PT process and does this policy, required by OAA, also need approval from faculty governance bodies as well as West Lafayette?**

### Question 2.

This memo also states:

We have come to this position because university attorneys advised us that confidentiality was not legally defensible under the Indiana Access to Public Records Act.

Our understanding is that IC 5-14-3 makes certain exceptions, such as in the case of employment decisions whereby some measure of confidentiality is permitted. *We believe a robust policy that permits some measure of confidentiality and yet permits a candidate to challenge negative letters would represent a healthy compromise.*

A number of IPFW faculty members in the natural and physical sciences agree that this is a detrimental policy that will only undermine our ability to attract and help reward the best and most creative faculty. We believe that such a policy would undermine the credibility of higher educational institutions.

Confidential reviews have been upheld in federal courts in Pfizer pharmaceutical vs. Science Magazine (<http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/summary/319/5870/1601a>) and Pfizer pharmaceutical vs. The New England Journal of Medicine (<http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/358/21/2276>). A similar standard seems reasonable and in the best public interest for all faculty evaluations. The principle in play is the right of all stakeholders, not just one institution, to have access to the information that is above reproach. There is the acknowledgement that confidentiality of reviews is not perfect but it is far less problematic than the alternative. Group polarization is a well-known phenomenon (see [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=199668](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=199668)) when only a subset of information is available to decision-making bodies.

Furthermore, the policy in force at IUB (*vide supra*) since the early 1980s validates the way some departments at IPFW handle expert confidentiality by making external review letters available but with identifying information removed. The problem appears to be the incongruity between departments at IPFW. **Would it be possible to implement a process to obtain a single set of standards so that we can best serve all candidates that undertake the PT process at IPFW?**

Ron Friedman, Chemistry

Don Linn, Chemistry

Vince Maloney, Chemistry

Daryoush Tahmassebi, Chemistry

Bill Cooper, Biology