

Minutes of the
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Eighth Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne
December 12, 1988
Noon, Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 14, 1988
3. Acceptance of the agenda - J. Owen
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University - K. Stevenson
 - b. Indiana University - M. Downs
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Agenda Committee (Senate Document SD 88-12) - J. Owen
 - b. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (Senate Reference No. 88-8) - M. Downs
 - c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 88-13) - D. Oberstar
7. New business
8. The general good and welfare of the University
9. Adjournment

Senate Members Present:

M. Auburn, J. Bell, F. Borelli, J. Carnaghi, V. Craig, M. Downs, P. Flynn, W. Frederick, A. Friedel, H. Garcia, J. Hersberger, S. Hollander, A. Karna, F. Kirchhoff, J. Lantz, M. Laudeman, M. Lipman, A. Mahmoud, J. Manzer, E. Messal, J. Meyers, D. Monteith, D. Oberstar, J. Owen, M. Rosenfeld, S. Sarratore, D. Schmidt, S. Skekloff, J. Smulkstys, E. Snyder, K. Stevenson, J. Sunderman, D. Swinehart, J. Switzer, G. Ulmschneider, W. Unsell, K. Wakley, P. Zonakis

Senate Members Absent:

K Bordens, H. Broberg, E. Foley, L. Graham, J. Haw, D. Hockensmith, K Keller, B. Lingaraj, R. Miers, D. Onwood, J. Outland, A. Pugh, J. Rivers, D. Ross, R. Sedlmeyer, A. Shupe, K Squadrito, G. Szymanski, S. Usman

Parliamentarian: M. Mansfield

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, V. Coufoudakis, J. Davis, A. Finco, D. Linn, D. McCants, R. Svoboda

Visitors Present: D. Benson, J. Dahl, M. Dinnerstein, R. Steiner

Attachments:

"Election of replacement members of the Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs and the Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee" (SD 88-12)

"Results of the 1989-90 Faculty Board of Review Election" (SR No. 88-9)

Acta

1. Call to order: J. Lantz called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 14, 1988: The minutes were approved as written.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

J. Owen moved acceptance of the agenda as distributed. Seconded.

The agenda was accepted as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Purdue University:

K Stevenson: As you are aware, we have been asked to begin to constitute a Chancellor's Selection Advisory Committee. You received a memo from either me or Mike asking you to nominate yourself if you would care to serve on this selection committee. All I know about the committee is, first of all, that Pete Zonakis and myself have been asked to co-chair the committee, which is a departure from the last time we did a chancellor's search when the chairs were sent up from the main campuses. I want to encourage you, as much as possible, to send in your self-nomination if you are interested in serving on this committee. Some people may be a bit shy, please don't be shy. Send it in. By tomorrow noon we will put together a slate and vote on ten people from the Purdue University side and ten people from the Indiana University side. The names of the top 20 people will be forwarded to President Beering, and he will select from seven to ten people to serve on the committee. There hasn't been a specific charge to the committee other than that we are to make some kind of recommendation to the president regarding the selection of the chancellor. He indicated that he would like the search to be limited to the state of Indiana, but other than that we haven't been given any kind of specific charge. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

- b. Indiana University:

M. Downs: I don't have very much more to add except to say that these nomination slips have been distributed and I strongly encourage people to nominate themselves. We will, as the nomination slip advises, hold the election so that the ballots will be counted after we all return in January. The committee will begin work right away. I have heard that the committee has been given a March deadline by the president. I think that the way this is being done is an improvement over what was done last

time. A panel of faculty members will be elected by the faculty, and the two co-chairs are faculty members from this campus. This is all to the good. I expect that the results of this committee will be very acceptable to all.

5. Report of the President Officer:

J. Lantz: I don't know whether all of you have received your most recent copy of *Current*. It has very wide circulation. If you did receive it, I presume you got to page 11, which lists contributors to the university. It goes on through page 19. I was impressed ... in two ways: It cost extra money, which we had to pay for, but I was especially impressed with the number of # signs behind people's names--meaning that our faculty have contributed to the university. I am also impressed with how many of our clerical, service, and administrative staff have contributed. I don't think anyone can work here and not be proud of the contributions, not only that you have made with your everyday work, but with your money as well.

On page six of last month's Senate minutes in the report that I gave, I was reminded by Professor Leddick that I was using incorrect terminology. So I want to remind you of what the correct terminology is. We were discussing what appears on page six as the M.S. in Educational Counseling. It is an M.S. in Education and it is in counselor education. We are, in fact, training people--educating people--so that they are qualified when they graduate from our program to become either licensed school counselors or certified clinical mental health workers. I only call that to your attention so that you know--that we all know--exactly what we are talking about.

Also, on April 11, this body approved a document on the policy of Faculty Workload, Evaluation and Reward. I would like to just read to you some of the items in it. I will not read the entire document to you. In the second paragraph it says, "The character, variety, and changing roles of faculty make it unrealistic to specify workload in terms of clock hours ... the maximum teaching load should be the equivalent of nine credit hours of lecture-type undergraduate instruction per semester." ... It says, "The appropriate level at which to determine the mix of responsibilities for each faculty member is the department.... Units shall develop standards for judgment which can be applied consistently and meaningfully to the specific activities being assessed.... Therefore, each unit shall determine in a collegial manner the job-related activities to be rewarded, the kinds of rewards to be offered, and the relationship between activities and rewards.... Unit policies shall be written, with copies available to each faculty member in the unit. Expectations for faculty members held by administrators at all levels (department, school or division, university) shall be clearly articulated so that (1) individual faculty members know what is expected of them and how their behaviors will be evaluated and rewarded, and (2) others involved in the evaluation procedure at different levels understand the overall process and their roles in that process so that they are able to perform effectively and judiciously..... Each faculty member will receive an annual written review. . . ."

I only recite all of those to you because I want to tell you what is going to happen to the document. I have discussed this document at length with the vice chancellor for academic

affairs, Mark Auburn. We have discussed the implementation of it. He will be working with the AOC so that we can begin to implement that document.

The second document I would like to report to you on, then, is Senate Document 88-4, which is the policy on the Evaluation and Reward of Faculty Service. The only sentence I would quote in this document is that "Units must have specific written policies applying to the evaluation and reward of service activity." I have also discussed this document with Vice Chancellor Auburn, and it seems to me that in the next few weeks or months (less time, I hope) the schools and departments will be working on promotion and tenure documents. It seems appropriate to me that we take no steps to implement this at the present time, but in fact it should be kept in primary importance. It should be a document that departments and schools pay particular attention to as they build their promotion and tenure criteria.

The next item I want to report to you on is that we have renamed or reconstituted a General Education Study Committee, and I would like to announce those members as a matter of public record: Van Coufoudakis will be the liaison person with the vice chancellor's office; Ann Dirkes, Bill Frederick, Linda Graham, Steve Harroff, Les Motz, David Onwood, Jack Quinn, Zoher Shipchandler, Hermine van Nuis, and Doug Wartzok will constitute the committee, and that committee will be chaired by Jim Owen.

There is a new brochure which is out which talks about the capital request from Purdue University, and there is a very modest spread about our campus. We don't have a lot of them, and it's not that we don't want you to see it, but we are not going to distribute them to everyone. If you want to look at it, here it is. We will make these available for a meeting with our legislative committee, the Chamber of Commerce, and our area legislators so that they have a kind of capsule summary. Also, several people from this campus and the community were involved in a videotape that was made, highlighting our needs for capital, and that videotape has been sent to every area legislator.... If you want to see the videotape, please see Judith Clinton.

This Thursday, the 15th, our Community Advisory Council will be meeting. We will be talking about our capital request. We will be showing them the videotape. We will also be giving them an update on the planning for our 25th anniversary. You may also want to have an update of the 25th Anniversary Committee for this body; if you would like that, I would be happy to ask the chair to come and give us a report. That concludes my report unless you have questions.

6. Committee reports requiring action.

a. Agenda Committee-(SD 88-121- J. Owen:

J. Owen moved to approve SD 88-12 (Election of replacement members of the Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs and of the Computer Users Advisory Subcommittee). Seconded.

Motion passed on a voice vote.

b. Indiana University Committee on Institutional Affairs (SR No. 88-8) - M. Downs:

M. Downs conducted the election of the 1989-90 Faculty Board of Review (see Senate Reference No. 88-9).

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (SD 88-13) - D. Oberstar: [Note: A copy of SD 88-13 as amended is attached to the agenda of the January 16, 1989, meeting.]

D. Oberstar moved to approve SD 88-13 (Document on Campus-Wide Procedures for Promotion and Tenure) with one correction: in section 1.3, 2nd paragraph, 4th line, the word "is" should be "are." Seconded.

D. Swinehart moved to amend SD 88-13, section 1.1, 1st paragraph, by inserting the sentence, "The preponderance of the evaluation effort of a candidate shall occur at this level" after the words "review of this procedure." Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

M. Lipman moved to amend SD 88-13, section 1.1, 2nd paragraph, by adding the following words in parentheses and deleting the following words in brackets: and that (only) those persons possessing the same or higher rank or the status to which a candidate aspires (have voting) [, where possible, should have major] responsibility in formulating the department's recommendations. Seconded.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

M. Downs moved to amend SD 88-13, section 1.1, by moving the sentence, "The preponderance of the evaluation effort of a candidate shall occur at this level" to section 1.0. and by replacing the word "this" with the words "the first" and by deleting the words "the following" and replacing the word "seven" with the word "several." (The sentences would read: "Nominations for promotion and/or tenure shall be considered at several levels. The preponderance of the evaluation effort of a candidate shall occur at the first level.") Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

M. Downs moved to amend SD 88-13, section 1.3, 2nd paragraph, by adding the following words in parentheses and deleting the following words in brackets: Nothing in this document shall be construed as requiring a school or division without departments to perform a (second) review and make a (second) recommendation on promotion and tenure cases [above the primary level]; however, when such a review and recommendation are made by a committee, the committee shall be constituted in such a way that a majority of its voting members will not have served on the primary-level committee. Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

S. Hollander moved to amend SD 88-13, section 1.3, 2nd paragraph, last line, to replace the words "primary level" with the word "first." Seconded.

Motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

D. Swinehart moved to amend SD 88-13, section 1.5, by adding the following sentence: "The purpose of this committee is to review the actions of the earlier decision levels to assure that the candidate has been afforded basic fairness and due process in accordance with established university policies and procedures." Seconded.

J. Smulkstys moved to amend the amendment by adding the word "principle" in the first line between the words "The" and "purpose." Seconded.

Motion to amend the amendment passed on a voice vote.

S. Hollander moved to amend the amendment by replacing the words "has been" with "is." Seconded. Motion to amend the amendment passed on a voice vote.

Motion to amend, as amended, passed on a voice vote.

Discussion of this document will be continued at the January 16 meeting.

7. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara L. Blauvelt
Secretary of the Faculty