

Minutes of the
Fifth Regular Meeting of the Twenty-First Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne

February 11, 2002

12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of December 10, 2001 and January 14, 2002
3. Acceptance of the agenda – P. Hamburger
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Purdue University – P. Hamburger
 - b. Indiana University - B. Fife
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – L. Wright-Bower
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Educational Policy Committee (SD 01-9) – D. Oberstar
 - b. Nominations and Elections Committee (SR No. 01-8) – D. Marshall
7. Question time (SR No. 01-9)
8. New business
9. Committee reports "for information only" – P. Hamburger
Executive Committee (SR No. 01-10)
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment

Presiding Officer: L. Wright-Bower

Parliamentarian: D. Turnipseed

Sergeant-at-Arms: J. Njock Libii

Secretary: B. Blauvelt

Senate Members Present:

B. Abbott, H. Abu-Mulaweh, J. Bausser, E. Blakemore, W. Branson, J. Brennan, H. Broberg, G. Bullion, G. Campbell-Whatley, C. Carlson, S. Carr, M. Codispoti, S. Davis, L. DeFonso, W. DeMott, C. Erickson, B. Fife, L. Fox, R. Friedman, J. Grant, P. Hamburger, S. Hannah, S. Hartman, J. Hrehov, S. Isiorho, R. Kashyap, J. Knight, D. Marshall, E. Neal, M. Nusbaumer, D. Oberstar, B. Parke, J. Purse-Wiedenhoeft D. Ross, R. Sedlmeyer, K. Squadrito, D. Townsend, G. W. Ulmschneider, W. Unsell, M. Wartell

Senate Members Absent:

M. Bookout, C. Champion, C. Chauhan, N. Cothorn, V. Coufoudakis, T. Grove, L. Hite,
M. Kimble, H. Samavati

Faculty Members Present: L. Balthaser, D. Legg, D. McCants

Visitors Present: S. Alderman, J. Dahl, O. Clarke, R. Kostrubanic, P. McLaughlin, A. Weissner

"IU Speaker's Report – [Letter from Daniel Reagan](#) regarding faculty membership on boards of trustees of state universities" (Senate Reference No. 01-10a)

Acta

1. Call to order: L. Wright-Bower called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of December 10, 2001 and January 14, 2002: The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Acceptance of the agenda:

P. Hamburger moved to approve the agenda.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:

- a. Purdue University: P. Hamburger had no report.

- b. Indiana University:

B. Fife: I have two letters to read. I was asked by the University and Dr. Mary Helen Thuente to read the first letter, dated February 2, 1998, written by Chancellor Wartell to Dr. Thuente, then Professor and Chair of the Department of English and Linguistics. The second letter is from Dan Reagan of the Ball State University AAUP.

- 1) I am saddened that so much acrimony and so little understanding have resulted from the discussion of perceptions of racial bias during the last several weeks. From the perspective of the chancellor's office, I am convinced that neither the members of the Department of English and Linguistics as a group nor any member individually has exhibited racially-motivated behavior. However, to the extent that any constituency, on campus or off, perceives that not to be the case, we must all work together to dispel those impressions. I call upon the faculty in English and Linguistics, the Chair of the Department, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to do exactly that. Any help that my office can give will

be provided.

2) See attached letter. (Senate Reference No. 01-10)

5. Report of the Presiding Officer - L. Wright-Bower: The Presiding Officer had no report.

6. Committee reports requiring action:

a. Educational Policy Committee (SD 01-9) – D. Oberstar:

D. Oberstar moved to approve SD 01-9 (Proposed Amendment to the Academic Regulations [SD 85-18] – Military Service Withdrawals and Related Clarifications).

J. Brennan moved to suspend the rules in order to vote on the document (according to the regulations, votes on amendments cannot be taken at the meeting at which proposals are introduced). Second.

Motion to suspend failed on a show of hands.

b. Nominations and Elections Committee – D. Marshall:

D. Marshall announced that Michael Nusbaumer had been elected Speaker of the Indiana University Faculty and then proceeded to conduct the election for the Presiding Officer of the Faculty. (L. Wright-Bower was elected.)

7. Question Time:

Q: What are the specific criteria involved in moving some faculty members from a nine-hour to a twelve-hour teaching load per semester? Are all Schools/Divisions affected by this decision? What are the implementation guidelines? What percentage of the voting faculty may be affected? What are the criteria, if any, for reverting back to a nine-hour teaching requirement?

A: Let me begin by noting that my responses to these questions are based on the principles laid out in two university policy documents - SD 97-8: FACULTY WORKLOADS AND EVALUATION and OAA MEMORANDUM 96-10: ADMINISTRATION GUIDELINES FOR DEANS/CHAIRS TO ASSESS OPTION 1 FACULTY ON CREATIVE/RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES. SD 97-8 talks about expectations for workload assignments and the criteria for evaluating performance. OAA 96-10 makes the point that there is a great variety in the types of research, scholarship, or creative activity faculty might undertake. My own list would probably be even longer to make sure that the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of engagement, to use Boyer's terms, are included. Now to the questions posed today.

What are the specific criteria involved in moving some faculty members from a nine-hour to a twelve-hour teaching load per semester?

Faculty who have assigned time for research are, as stated in SD 97-8, evaluated on the “demonstrable pursuit of an active research program.” SD 97-8 goes on to make clear that the specific standards, manner, and appropriate time periods are determined by the department or school. The key principle, however, is that faculty must demonstrate such a pursuit.

Some universities have adopted specific standards, such as one publication every three years, and found having a clear standard very useful. I did at my former institution. Other campuses, however, believe that such an arbitrary number does not stand up to the variety of kinds and duration of legitimate scholarly or creative work across many different disciplines. Although there has been discussion at IPFW about setting a numerical standard, the practice has been to let departments make such determinations within the general principle that they must be made. Thus the standard for Music should be set in Music; the standard for Psychology should be set in Psychology. The core point, however, is that faculty, like the rest of us, are to be held accountable for their time. If for whatever reason faculty who have a research assignment do not demonstrate progress in their research program, chairs can, after due discussion and notice, reassign them to full-time teaching.

Are all Schools/Divisions affected by this decision? Yes.

What are the implementation guidelines?

The Academic Officers Committee (AOC) has been discussing a set of “shared principles and practices” for monitoring research/creative activity assignments since last spring. We now have a draft ready to take to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) - I believe the meeting is yet this week—for comment. The goal of the guidelines is to assure that the twin principles of departmental criteria and faculty accountability are evenly applied across the campus. Deans and chairs have already reviewed the draft and believe that it describes current practice. I look forward to the FAC discussion.

What percentage of the voting faculty may be affected?

I’m not sure how to answer this question. In one respect the answer is 100% since all faculty—and administrators—are evaluated on their performance for the tasks they have been assigned. If you mean just those with a research assignment, the answer—very, very roughly—is about 75-80%.

What are the criteria, if any, for reverting back to a nine-hour teaching requirement?

This point is covered in the “shared principles and practices ” document I will be taking to FAC this week. The wording there, in effect, is that in discussion with the chair, a faculty member may request, if the department policies allow, assigned time for research by the presentation of a plan for, in the words of SD 97-8, “an active research program.” If agreed to by the chair, the faculty member would then be obliged, as are other faculty with research assignments, to “demonstrate the pursuit” of such a program in their annual productivity reports.

The question about moving from nine- to twelve-hour loads and back again gives me the

opportunity to make a point about faculty career development about which I feel very strongly. I believe that we, as a university, should not only make it possible, but also encourage faculty to assume different kinds of responsibilities at different times during their careers. Junior, untenured faculty, for the most part, have no choice but to “demonstrate the pursuit of an active research program” as part of their promotion and tenure requirements, and we adjust their teaching load accordingly.

Tenured faculty, I believe, ought to have more choices. If at some point in their career they have come to a stopping point in their research agenda, or want to focus on teaching, governance, administration, a baby, building a house, or are facing dramatic personal changes, etc., faculty ought to be able, without prejudice, to focus entirely on teaching for a time. A small number of IPFW faculty have, in fact, made this choice. Then, when they are ready and have “an active research program” plan they want to pursue, they should be able to propose that to their chair and have their support. Faculty, no less than other professionals, can get to a point they feel trapped and unmotivated. The university, I believe—and perhaps this is another topic I can take to Faculty Affairs—ought to have more paths and more options that allow the work of the University to get done, while at the same time allowing more flexibility to faculty about how they carry out their share of the responsibilities. Sabbaticals, of course, are one familiar option, but perhaps we need more. . . . That, I am sure, is more than you wanted to know about my thoughts on the subject.

If any of you have further questions about the evaluation of research assignments, you should speak to your chair, to your dean, and certainly to me or another member of the FAC directly because we will be discussing that. I am also, as always, available to meet with anyone who has a specific point or suggestion.

K. Squadrito: We received some notification that we were going to be demanded, if we wanted to stay on a research option, to have one article in print every two years.

S. Hannah: That's interesting. I've never seen such a thing.

K. Squadrito: . . . I am not worried about people choosing. I'm worried about someone who is doing good research being bumped into an extra class too soon. I sent an article off a year ago and they haven't reviewed it yet, even though they usually say it will take three months. Let me make one suggestion: if someone has been here a long time, a better way to do that is to take an average number of articles. I have had three-year gaps in my record and yet I average a little bit more than an article a year.

S. Hannah: There is no numerical standard. It has been discussed, but there is no numerical requirement. Whatever the standard is, it is up to your discussion with your department chair.

K. Squadrito: If a chair bumps you up to a teaching option, is there a way you can grieve that decision?

S. Hannah: Certainly. The dean is the fastest way. And then you can come to me.

B. Fife: Of the 300 or so voting faculty that currently exist, what portion of the voting faculty has already been moved to a twelve-hour teaching load?

S. Hannah: I haven't the faintest idea. People move . . . because they haven't done any research in years; some because they choose to after a discussion with their chair. I can't give you a number.

B. Fife: How does service factor into this?

S. Hannah: I refer you back to the department. There is a lot of room there. . . . Where does service fit in? Service is not sitting on committees. Service is what you did while you sat there in a demonstrable way that affects the life of the institution, the local government, the hospital, etc. There is now a growing body of literature on how to document and justify service. As we talk about excellence in teaching, we also want to talk about excellence in what is now called engagement. A number of universities have redone their promotion and tenure documents in order to account for the scholarship of engagement. The scholarship of engagement is a rigorous standard as is excellence in teaching or excellence in research. It is not a casual thing. . . . If it is part of what you chose, with your chair's agreement, to be evaluated on. There is a certain amount of service that is academic citizenship. Being a member of this body is part of being a faculty member; it is part of what shared governance means. Assuming a leadership role that brings about a significant change in curriculum or academic regulations, for example, is taken seriously and evaluated. You and the chair agree on what your time is to be spent on. When the chancellor gives me work to do, that is what I get evaluated on.

M. Nusbaumer: Part of me reads this policy as teaching as punishment. If I don't do appropriate levels of research, I am punished by going back to the classroom more. Can you speak to how this policy is going to be handled for people who may be demonstrating problems in their teaching already—people that we don't particularly want to teach in the classroom any more than they already are?

S. Hannah: You have to manage your problems. . . . I really resent the notion that teaching is punishment. . . . I believe that the most important job of the chair is to talk with their faculty. The chair should ask what is happening or what isn't happening and how come? Being given a twelve-hour teaching load should not be a surprise. In this material that is going to the Faculty Affairs Committee, there is a gentle reminder to the chairs that it is their responsibility to take annual evaluations and discussions very seriously. Faculty should require their chairs to take them seriously. So, it is that discussion that I am trying to put at the center of this. A great deal of responsibility goes to the chair to manage this discussion. . . . In the classroom, I admit there are some faculty who have other strengths, and there are other constructive things they can do that would allow reallocating resources. I can think of a number of examples used in my own practice as a chair. They are very individual. Music, for instance, is talking about developing a Performing Arts building. They could probably use releasing a faculty member from other assignments to help that development effort. If you have the right personality and the right interest, that would be a wonderful use of their time for a couple of years. When you have your back to the wall, you have to manage. You look at the skills of the people you have and you look at the huge number of demands on departments—which get bigger all the time—and you

try to figure out how to allocate that talent to get the job done. Teaching is job number one and that comes first and takes priority over all other engagement issues.

M. Nusbaumer: Some years ago the Senate considered Option 1/Option 2 faculty status. There was an understanding that if people went to Option 2 and picked up four courses, they were guaranteed, at the time, that they would get at least the university average in increments. Does that still hold?

S. Hannah: Yes. That still gets tracked. There was a concern that faculty who were not doing research would not get as much merit money. That has been tracked for several years. It has not been proven that that is a concern.

M. Wartell: Let me answer that partially since Susan wasn't here when that was passed. That guarantee went with Option 1/Option 2. Option 1/Option 2 was removed, but the point is there has been no difference in salary distribution.

S. Hannah: Jack tracks it. Folks in the technologies have 12-hour loads anyway; instructors have 12-hours loads. They are not disadvantaged. Those are departments that do not typically have released time for research.

S. Carr: It seems there are two different scenarios here as to how this Option 1/Option 2 can work. One scenario is where a faculty member and chair comes to a mutual consensus. I have less concern about. I have more concern about a scenario where a faculty member is told by the chair that this is going to happen. My question is about that second scenario. Is there any document outlining the process or procedure by which a faculty member is told they will be teaching 12 hours?

S. Hannah: No. In discussions with deans and chairs, we talked about process and procedure, but every situation is an individual situation. Every conversation that I have heard about that has been held with faculty for whom this might be an option, this came as no surprise. You can look at your own productivity reports for eight years. They are not secret actions taken in the middle of the night with no warning of any kind. Usually there have been some gentle and not so gentle conversations. Chairs can stand up and give their testimonies about how they manage these conversations over time. . . . Usually there has been a considerable period of time in which there have been discussions about the performance in different areas. . . .

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports "for information only" – (Senate Reference No. 01-10) – P. Hamburger:

SR No. 01-10 (Items under consideration in Senate Committees and Subcommittees) was presented for information only. P. Hamburger mentioned the importance of Senate committees and subcommittees convening in a timely manner and electing chairs promptly at the start of a new academic year.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Wartell: We are up about 8.8% in headcount this semester and about 10.5% in credit hours. That will help us alleviate problems we are having with the state budget right now. The state budget problems continue. It is good that a bill cleared the House and now the Senate is working on it. . . . How the process will come out is an interesting question. The bad news, that I just learned this morning, is that the last income review for the state indicated that for the last month the income was 2% lower than projected. . . . There is a lot of work to be done on both the income and expenditure side within the entire state budget.

The Facilities Committee of the Board of Trustees and the Purdue University Board of Trustees have approved our student housing project. A great deal of credit goes to Walt Branson and Edna Neal. Edna had to hit the ground running. She has done a great job. Walt has spent uncountable hours working on this project. The great support we got from Ken Burns and his staff at West Lafayette shouldn't be ignored.

The next step in this process are the following: we must go to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education in order to get the lease of land approved, then to the State Budget Committee to get the lease of the land approved, and then to the Governor. At the same time, in parallel, we have to work with financial folks in order to get the financing in place for the entire \$29 million project. Please go out to the Physical Plan web site to look at it. . . .

M. Nusbaumer: Is the legislature going to open up the university budget again?

M. Wartell: It depends on your definition of "open up the budget." They may stop some expenditures. I would say that we are not going to be in a better position than we started out at the beginning of the biennium.

M. Nusbaumer: They have already stopped certain funds. They talked about withholding a payment. Is there a chance additionally of looking into actual allocation?

M. Wartell: Not that I know of. Holding up payments is a real possibility.

M. Nusbaumer: While I appreciate the trustees' support of the student housing, it appears we also got permission to seek three quarters of a million dollars for a soccer-support facility. If that is true, where does that fall into our strategic plan?

M. Wartell: Actually, they are very similar issues that have nothing to do with state money. The soccer-support facility is done totally with gift funds, and those funds have been donated previous to our request for the support facility. By the way, that facility was approved by the Board as an approximately \$700,000 contract. It is for restaurants, concession stands, and a press box over on the soccer facility. Mr. Hefner, who had given a great deal of the money to do the soccer fields in the first place, had gone someplace in California and seen a soccer facility there, loved it and said he would give most of the money. It is hard to turn that sort of thing down.

In terms of the residence halls, there is no state budget money involved in the residence halls. So the current budget problems shouldn't affect that. Within the strategic plan, one is an engagement; the second is a general university development and engagement. When you look at the residence hall project, that really is an economic development boon for northeast Indiana.

S. Hannah: Soon you should find in your mail the invitation for applications for the outstanding research scholar. They are due March 8. You have also been invited to be a volunteer for advising during SOAR this summer. The fifth annual undergraduate research symposium is scheduled for the 16th of April. Abstracts and applications are due March 19. All of this is in your mail. The fifth annual area deans' conference is February 22. The focus is on educating the students for a global economy. One very important item you will get in your mail this week is a call for applications for two new positions in my office. David McCants is retiring this summer. David is a person for whom there will be no replacement, only successors. He has had a long and distinguished career at this university. I have rethought the structure of the Office of Academic Affairs. That is explained in the memo you will be receiving. I am asking for applications for two positions. One is a full-time Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs position and the second is an experiment: a half-time Assistant Vice Chancellor position for external funding. Those jobs will be thoroughly explained in the material you get. Please consider them seriously.

11. The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Barbara L. Blauvelt

Secretary of the Faculty