

**Agenda
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL**

**IPFW Library B37
IUB Education 2140
IUE Whitewater Hall 119
IUK Main Building 111
IUN Hawthorn Hall 338
IUPUC Main 156H
IUPUI Education/Social Work 2101
IUS Knobview 112
IUSB Northside Hall 072**

**January 27, 2009
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)**

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Simon Atkinson, Carol Baird, Charles Bantz, Karl Besel, Christian Bjornson, Jacqueline Blackwell, Elizabeth Boling, James Capshew, Janice Cox, Diane Dallis, Erika Dowell, Cathy Foos, Charles Gallmeier, Steven Gerencser, Kathleen Gilbert, Mary Gray, Jerry Hinnefeld, Joyce MacKinnon, Anna McDaniel, Michael McRobbie, Jonathan Plucker, Markus Pomper, William Potter, John Minor Ross, William Schneider, Herb Terry, David Vollrath, Joe Wert, Marianne Wokeck, Michael Wolf

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bruce Bergland, Alan Bender, Dane Blue, Grason Bolinger, Terri Bourus, Bruce Burgun, Stephen Burns, Nick Clark, Donald Coffin, Harold Evans, Lucas Fields, Mary Fisher, Greg Garrett, Stuart Green, Karen Hanson, Padraic Kenney, David Lindquist, Lesa Lorenzen-Huber, Bryan McCormick, Eduardo Nieto, Michael Nusbaumer, William Orme, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Nasser Paydar, Una Mae Reck, Alan Schmetzer, Michael Wartell, Karen West, Kim White-Mills, L. Jack Windsor

GUESTS: John Applegate (VPPP), Tom Gieryn (VPFAA – Bloomington), Tony Ribera, Debbie Santucci, Philemon Yebei, Desiree Zerquera, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Erin Rykken (Faculty Council Office)

Agenda

1. Executive Session: Honorary Degrees [ACTION ITEM] (15 minutes)
(Attendance limited to UFC members and Chief of Staff only).
2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(President Michael McRobbie)

3. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)
(Professors Herb Terry and Professor Simon Atkinson)
4. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(President McRobbie and Professors Terry and Atkinson)
5. Formation of the Learning Technologies Steering Committee. (20 minutes)
(Professors Herb Terry and Simon Atkinson) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY09/U4-2009.pdf>
6. Promotion and Tenure Concerns (30 minutes)
(Professors Herb Terry, Simon Atkinson and Joe Wert) [DISCUSSION]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY09/PTFinalRec.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY09/PTMemo.pdf>

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie, Professor Terry, and Professor Atkinson should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc>.

Minutes

AGEND A ITEM #1: EXECUTIVE SESSION: HONORARY DEGREES

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: (some remarks lost) ---one cost saving measure. I announced in my State of the Union speech, many of you will remember that we started to slow down in hiring and the based on the 1 percent cut that we received from the State just before Christmas, just after Christmas I announced that we would have to cut budgets for the rest of the year by that one percent, which in fact is closer to two percent because it was for only the last 6 months of the year. So those are the, so far the three major stipulations. Obviously all Deans others in the various committees in all the schools are starting to consider ways in which they will have to cut expenditure if there are further cuts. The position I'm taking is obviously the Governor has made his statement of his proposal as far as the budget is concerned, but in the State the budget is the final decision of the legislature, of the House and the Senate in conference, and they have just started the process of determining the budget for the state. The House and the Senate have really only just started that process. I appear before the House Ways and Means Committee, I believe it's next week, and then I appear later in the following month before the Senate Finance Committee to make our case again, and I've already spoken to the overall State Budget Committee and I've spoken to the higher education commission. The position I'm taking is not wanting to in any way underestimate the seriousness of the situation of the state. I believe it's my responsibility to continue to advocate for our needs as strongly as I can, and so I will continue to make the case for our needs for operating funds and for capital funds, and for some of the special initiatives that we've proposed to the state. And you will have seen none of this is secret, that clearly in a legislature with very many people of disparate views, there are many people who have already

expressed their support for the agenda of higher education, as have a number of the newspapers as well.

This is, as they say, about the second inning of a nine innings game; the budget is determined literally at the night of the last day in April, unless there's a special session. We are not quite at the end of January and there's over three months to go and it just gets more and more intense in terms of discussions, cases being made, positions being taken and so on, over that period and much of the final determination of the budget is done in that last couple of weeks in April. The final area of course is tuition. I think all of us understand that in these circumstances with unemployment growing and with family incomes falling many cases, that when it comes to tuition, we obviously need to be moderate and responsible in that regard; as to what that is, I recommend that to the Trustees later in the year, so we're a long way away from that point. Our concern there simply is any proposals that might be put to cap tuition. This, I think, would be very damaging to the university, if on the one hand there are state appropriations being cut and on the other hand, tuition is being capped, it doesn't really leave us anywhere to go in terms of continuing to try to find some of the funding that we need to pursue our principle mission of excellence in teaching and research. So the big unknown, just to stress again, is the federal stimulus package, there is as I indicated already, funding for the funding agencies in that, there's a lot of money for capital, and again that's being argued out, and there's money for a significant increase in Pell grants and quite a few other things, too and that's all coming to culmination in the next 24 hours. So that is, in pretty broad brush strokes, the budget situation.

I do think it's worth commenting that we're in an interesting position where, and this could all change, where I think, the publics are in a marginally better position than the privates because we have a more diverse funding base and they are so reliant on their endowments for their funding. We are much less so, and my hope is that with good management and with support from all our supporters and with, obviously, the hard work of faculty that continue to bring in external funding, that we can continue our momentum and come out of this quicker and faster and more vigorously than maybe some of the more luminous institutions in the nation. So let me stop there - and actually let me not stop there - because maybe I can take question under four on what I just said, although I don't want to be too slowish about this I'd be happy to take them now, but unless anybody's dying to ask me something, why don't I just take them under four?

The only other thing I wanted to note was that we appointed, I appointed, actually in conjunction with Herb and Simon, appointed a search committee for the position of Vice President for Research which basically will fill the position that actually I held until I was appointed as President. In putting this together, we endeavored to balance a range of different constituencies. There's a couple of people I should mention in particular on that committee. I added Geoff Conrad, known to some of you, I think at our last meeting we commended Geoff, I think he gave a presentation to us and we commended Geoff for the great work that's being done on the New Frontiers Program. I've added him because of his role as the Director of the New Frontiers in Arts and Humanities program, probably because he has a very extensive knowledge of research in the arts and humanities right across the University having been the director of that program which is our principle internal funding source for research in the arts and humanities for many years and having been an advisor in that office, in fact I appointed him in that position previously, and I think he brings a lot of understanding of the scale of research we do, probably more than just about anybody else does across all those disciplines as well. I've added a couple of people to represent some of the other offices even though they're also faculty members, the great bulk of the members of that, not all of them are faculty members, there are two graduate students still to be appointed, I know we have one already and we're still waiting on one and that should be done in the

next day or so. This committee holds its first meeting, I believe, on Thursday, so this is obviously an extremely important position for us. It will take over the responsibilities of the Office of Research Administration, which is an extremely important area to us and also take over the overall responsibility for the development of research across the university between campuses too, so that's underway. I would hope that, I think it's an excellent committee of first rate people, that they will consult appropriately with various groups for input as the process unwinds over the next few months, so I'll defer questions on that, too since they naturally come up under four, and jump to three where Herb and Simon tell me they have very little business, but let me ask Herb if he's got any business under three and then we can go to questions under four.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

TERRY: Actually, my business has grown slightly, there are a few things. Number one, if you are at one of the remote sites, please push your mute button if you're not speaking because we're picking up background noise from you. Second, I think I can speak for Simon, we'll take a look at the Indiana connection issue with regard to honorary degrees, and we'll see if we can come up with a recommendation there that will still make that an important but not essential component of an honorary degree nominee and recipient in the IU University System.

Later today when we get to item five, we're going to, I'm going to have to offer what I hope will be a friendly amendment to that document because it talks about the Dean of Faculties at IUPUI and IU Bloomington and because of restructuring we don't have a Dean of Faculties here. Because we at Bloomington no longer have a Chancellor but have a Provost, I can tell you that down here I'm spending a tremendous amount of time sorting out how policies adopted at various times mentioning various officers that no longer exist or have changed should be applied, and I'm sorry Simon, that I couldn't consult with you on this in advance because it came up during the Agenda Committee meeting, but I hope we will bring to you some kind of a proposal to create a procedure, wherefore policies that were adopted by the UFC or by a campus body, there will be a way for the faculty leaders on that council to, at least on an interim basis if there's problem, decide which officers should inherit some duty or responsibility under a policy that's already been adopted. I trust that nearly all times this will not be difficult. It probably becomes most difficult if something like what happened at Bloomington occurs, where you had one office that was doing at least two major things, those were divided out. Most of the time again, I think it's very clear which successor office it should go to but not always, so hopefully we'll be bringing back to you before the end of the year, some kind of proposal that would delegate to the councils and the leaders on each campus and then the UFC some ability to deal with this problem pending an actual modification of the policy by the appropriate body.

Finally, let me comment just a bit about the president's comments about the budget. As he said, obviously various parts of the university, deans, committees and others are trying to make some preliminary notions of what to do under various budget scenarios. What I hope all of you will do is find ways for your campus and faculty leaders to contribute to that process. You know, just as the president indicated, the General Assembly will decide on its budget at the end of April in rather short order and short period of time. There's not a lot of time to finalize the university's budget between that point when the General Assembly concludes its work and we know what tuition is likely to be from the Trustees, and when we actually have a budget that has to go to the Trustees for approval. What I'm urging the schools, largely on the Bloomington campus, plus our Budgetary Affairs Committee to do is to try to have a discussion with the chief budgetary officers of the schools and their deans and their administrative leaders, not so much about specific scenarios, it's not right to do that at the moment, but

about what values the faculty would hope motivate adjustments in the budget, if we have to make them, and to the extent they can be discussed, what priorities the faculty might have. The goal I think, would be to make sure that the budget officers of units and the deans who lead those units, have some feedback when we get into the final stage of making the university's budget, which will come after most of our campuses have adjourned for the Spring semester, so that they have some feedback, some sense of what faculty would value in the process of adjusting to whatever budget situation we find ourselves in. I hope that would be welcomed feedback from the administrators involved and I urge you to do it on your own campuses. Simon, do you have anything to say? Simon?

ATKINSON: Just a couple of things. With regards to the honorary degrees, I think we should wait for information from the Honorary Degrees Committee before we proceed to any action with the UFC or on the Agenda Committee level. We've actually already instituted a process for making technical amendments to our bylaws in Indianapolis on the recommendation of our parliamentarian who is also the UFC parliamentarian, and we can share that language with anybody else who's interested in doing that. We have the same situation where administrative officers who remained in our bylaws have changed titles or functions and we needed a process to deal with that without wasting a lot of time on debates on amending the bylaws, and with regard to the budget, I just endorse what you've said that we've encouraged everybody here to begin the conversation as to what our academic priorities are, so that when tough decisions can be made, they can be made in the framework of a discussion that's been ongoing with faculty. One addition to that, there are some units of the University, I'm particularly thinking of UITS, that are very important to our academic priorities system wide and are so intertwined that it's hard for decisions to be made on any one campus to decide what the priorities there are, so I think we need to be thinking about how to have input at the University wide level into decisions that maybe need to be made in those areas.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: Okay, so thanks Herb and Simon. Let's move on to four. We have no written questions, any other questions from any members of the Council.

TERRY: Simon, did you receive any written questions?

ATKINSON: No.

TERRY: Okay.

MCROBBIE: Any questions?

SCHNEIDER: I've got a question, Michael. You've outlined the legislative time table such as it is, could you briefly describe the university's time table for its budget, at least the main points of decisions to see how they line up with the legislature?

MCROBBIE: Well, I mean budget conferences have already started on all campuses and will start at the university level. Until we know what the state budget is though, clearly final budget construction can't start, and obviously the tuition figure comes into that as well, so the work really begins after the state budget is determined and then some idea as to what recommendations will be for tuition that can then be used to start to form the budgets at that point. They may have to change depending on the final figures there. So the months of May and June are very intense for all the financial people and the

people on the various advisory committees and so on and so on. But a lot of what we do now, what all - well many - of us in this room are involved in, is sort of preparatory to that final two months push.

TERRY: Michael, is it the June 11th meeting where the Trustees would approve the budget?

MCROBBIE: Yes, yes, yes.

TERRY: So between the end of April and the middle of June.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, right. Tuition would normally be set at the May meeting. The complication here is sometimes the legislature has a special session which effectively is an extension, as I think as you all know, an extension of the budget session.

TERRY: In Minnesota they pasted cardboard over the clock and pretended the day never ended.
(laughter)

MCROBBIE: The ingenuity of these people is very impressive. Other questions from members of the Council for myself or the co-Secretaries? Yes, Marianne.

WOKECK: I have one observation and want your reaction. In times of uncertainty, as these definitely are, a lot depends on how the leadership is responding to it and how it's setting the tone, how the institution as a whole is going to respond to it, and I want you to give us some idea of how you're anticipating, as things progress and as things are going to be articulated, how are you going to manage to really have everybody in the same boat and talk out of the same mouth, so to speak, that there are not the anxieties at one level articulated differently in another, that there is indeed some cohesion, that there is a way of making this conversation that, not only within the institution, but more importantly, the institution with our constituents outside, that is, with the regular people, regular in the sense of with the workers who are losing jobs while tenured professors don't. How are we or how are you going to shape that conversation to help all of us to keep the integrity of the institution in light of really, really great pressures from the outside?

MCROBBIE: Well, the key thing...well, let me say before I make that comment. This will be, for the next three months and frankly beyond that, the key issue that dominates my agenda. I mean I have something on my schedule everyday that is in some way connected to these issues, and a series of some of the key people who work on these issues I meet with every couple of days as well. Clearly, even just preparing for these major presentations to the various legislative committees takes a lot of work and a lot of preparation. And then there's the *ad hoc* making of our case to people in business and in government and so on around the state. All of that takes a lot of time. A lot of this is obviously, you know, work of a highly complicated, sophisticated kind and that's why we have people like Tom Morrison, the Associate VP for Government Affairs, and Mike Sample and others, who -- Amy Conrad Warner out there, and others who are intimately involved in this process. At the university level, I think we've already discussed what we do internally and how we put things together internally. Part of the problem with, you mentioned at the outset of your comments, you talked about uncertainty, part of the problem really is uncertainty. We just don't know. I mean, there is one scenario here where the stimulus bill is passed as is and we end up with a better than recommended so far outcome in the state, our philanthropic dollars stay firm, our research scholars stay firm, and we actually, although we have to trim things and will need to do everything we can to be seen to be as efficient as effective as we can, we'll come out of it in reasonably good shape, especially compared to other states and other

institutions. Another scenario, obviously, where all of those things don't work as well as we would like, where it's going to be a lot more difficult for us, and that is going to have an effect on our ability to fully pursue, discharge our mission. There's no other way of putting it, but it is as I said at the moment a time of uncertainty, and I think that the best thing we can do is to advocate for our priorities now, our budget, and for the support of the broader university community, and its support as vigorously as we can. Everybody here should feel that they should be part of that and do what they can to support that process, too, through the mechanisms that we already have in place. Other comments or questions?

WOLF: This is Mike Wolf from Fort Wayne.

MCROBBIE: Yeah?

WOLF: I had a question about the joint mission campuses and how much coordination you're doing with President Cordova.

MCROBBIE: This may be unprecedented, I don't know, the historians can check it for me, but she and I appeared before the State Budget Committee late last year to jointly advocate for the Innovation Alliance. I believe it may be the first time the IU and the Purdue president have done that before a state legislative committee and then she and I will be appearing jointly next week before the House Ways and Means Committee and I believe we'll be appearing before the Senate Finance Committee as well, and we've also appeared on the same platform advocating for that particular initiative as well. She and I are in pretty regular contact on these matters, as I am with Tom Schneider, the president of Ivy Tech as well. So, I, you know in my twelve years, twelve years exactly yesterday in the state, I don't think I've ever seen a closer collaboration or cooperation with Purdue. Any other questions, maybe one more if there's any others? Okay, let's move one. Agenda Item 5 which I believe Herb will introduce.

AGENDA ITEM #5: FORMATION OF THE LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES STEERING COMMITTEE.

TERRY: Right, first of all let me commend those who have finally brought this proposal to the Council. As you can see, it's been around since 2007. I'm glad to see it here for final approval. That said, based on a discussion in the Agenda Committee meeting, I'm actually going to suggest what I hope is a friendly amendment to the entire first paragraph. It was pointed out in the Agenda Committee meeting that we never really expressly created a committee. We described one, but we never said we were creating one, so I offer the following substitute language for the entire first paragraph. It incorporates, I think, the concepts in that paragraph. "In order to enhance faculty involvement in the development of teaching and learning technologies and systems at Indiana University, the University Faculty Council hereby creates a Learning Technology Steering Committee," and then it proceeds to describe the committee and all of that sort of thing. I hope somebody will move that that be accepted as a friendly amendment before we go forward with discussion.

MCROBBIE: I think can't you...

POMPER: So moved.

MCROBBIE: Okay, go ahead, it's moved.

TERRY: Okay, could you call a vote on that?

MCROBBIE: Well, first we have to see if there's any discussion Herb. Any discussion on Herb's, you can sense Herb's enthusiasm for his amendment. (laughter) Any discussion on Herb's amendment?

TERRY: Just being nimble.

MCROBBIE: Any discussion? Okay, I will put it to the vote. All those in favor of the amendment as read by Herb. Say 'aye,' please. [Aye] Against, say 'no.' Okay, I think we can regard that as carried.

TERRY: A second small amendment deals with the problem we noted earlier about changing administrative offices. On page two of U4-2009 under non-voting members, point 1 says that one member of the Dean of Faculties' offices at both IUPUI and IUB shall serve *ex officio*; we no longer have a Dean of Faculties' office here in Bloomington, so I propose the following: "One member from the Dean of Faculties' office at IUPUI and one from the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs at IU Bloomington appear (*ex officio*)." That is to make a decision that it is more appropriate to hand this responsibility to our Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs than for our Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. You could make another case perhaps about learning technologies, but the faculty has a deep interest in learning technologies, and my suggestion is that it go to the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

MCROBBIE: So just read it again Herb.

TERRY: The amendment would be to change, under non-voting members on page two, item 1 to "One member from the Dean of Faculties' office at IUPUI and one member from the office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs at IUB (*ex officio*)."

MCROBBIE: Okay, I think that's clear. Any discussion on that amendment? Yes, Tom.

GIERYN: I'm Tom Gieryn. I am the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Bloomington. I think this is just fine. I want to indicate however that Sonya Stephens, who is the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and I work very closely on issues that are of mutual interest. We keep each other informed and work together towards the right solution, so I don't think Sonya would object to this at all, and insofar as it connects to undergraduate education, she would be involved.

MCROBBIE: Okay, any other comments on this at all? No comments? Okay, we'll put the motion; all those in favor please signify by saying 'aye.' [Aye] Against, say 'no.' Okay, that's carried, too, good. Thanks.

TERRY: As amended, I think this proposal in many ways responds to some things that the - could you please hit mute if you're not speaking - ?. As amended I think this proposal responds to concerns that have come up frequently in the UFC in recent years. This will create a Learning Technology Steering Committee that will work with UITS and probably with others, to give faculty input on learning technologies and systems. To the extent we've had complaints about Oncourse and other sorts of things like that, this may be a way in which some of those can be dealt with by faculty earlier in the stage, and I hope you will approve it. Simon do you have anything to add?

ATKINSON: Yeah, I just want to strongly support that we do this. One of the issues I alluded to earlier is the fact that UITS systems are so intertwined at the university level that it's very important that we have a university level, faculty driven process for getting input into those systems.

MCROBBIE: As somebody with some knowledge of these things, I think that's a good idea. I think we probably need someone to move this as a motion.

TERRY: It didn't come from a committee, so I think that's true.

MCROBBIE: Right.

BOLING: I'd like to move.

GILBERT: I'll second.

MCROBBIE: Okay, mover and a seconder here at Bloomington, so any discussion on the substantive motion as it has now been amended? Any discussion? Okay, being no discussion again let me put the motion. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye.' And against? That's carried seemingly unanimously. Good, thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM #6: PROMOTION AND TENURE CONCERNS

MCROBBIE: So let us now move to Agenda Item 6, the report of the Promotions and Tenure Committee, the joint faculty council/administration committee that was established last year. I wanted to let, maybe Herb and Simon and Joe Wert, who was one of the co-chairs of this discuss it, but let me just make a couple comments. I think the committee is to be congratulated on their report. I think, by and large, it's a very good report that really does move these issues forward. Obviously there's going to be some matters for discussion and debate, but I was very pleased with what, to me, is a lot of progress that's being made in this report. Obviously this is the beginning of a process to address the report. There's no decisions being taken today, except for maybe how to proceed as to the next step, but having said that, let me hand it over to Herb and to Simon to, and I'm sorry, to Joe, who's on the telephone to comment on this.

TERRY: I'll leave to Joe the discussion of the sort of substance of the recommendation from the joint committee because he's one of the co-chairs of it, but let me address one thing that the president talked about. Where do we go from here? We discussed that in the Agenda Committee of the UFC and what I think we plan to do at this point is that the president and Simon and I will pay a great deal of attention to all of the points raised in today's discussion of this document. We will get together and we will prepare what we think is a realistic consensus document. It may not do everything that everybody suggests today but we'll pass one that we think would be good for the university based on the discussion. We will distribute that back out to your campuses. We will set some kind of a date of a subsequent UFC meeting where it will come back for discussion and a vote, but we'll allow time for the document to be discussed in any way you wish to do so at campuses so that they can adopt resolutions on it if they want. They can then direct or inform their UFC representatives. They'll be plenty of time for additional campus discussion of this consensus document, but I do hope that when we have to take this up, we'll be able to pass it and agree upon it and incorporate it into the *Academic Handbook*; because it is a description of tenure and promotion procedures. We currently have descriptions of tenure and promotion procedures in the *Academic Handbook* and frankly, I think this is a dramatic improvement upon the sometimes vague descriptions we currently have. In that light, however, I want to say one thing that Simon and I and the president will do once this document, once today's discussion is over, is that we will look at how the document we will bring to the UFC dovetails with the existing

statements in the *Academic Handbook* and I think it may be necessary for us to propose changes in the existing language of the *Academic Handbook* in light of the new document, so anticipate that the next time that this comes forward, it will include a document to be adopted but in order to integrate it in the *Academic Handbook* there are likely to be some recommendations for changes in the handbook that are mandated by the new policy . So, that's the procedure, and I wanted to let you know that we will attempt to reconcile it to the handbook once we have a sense of what the new statement might say. With that, Joe, would you care to present this on behalf of your joint committee?

WERT: Thank you...

TERRY: Oh, let me explain that poor Joe is working from home because IU Southeast is closed, so you won't be able to see him on any of these screens at the various campuses.

WERT: Thank you. First of all I would like to thank the joint committee and my co-chair, Alfred Guillaume from the South Bend campus. They did, I think, an incredible job. A lot of work was put into this, and I'd especially like to thank our administrative assistant Kelly Kish. She made things a lot easier than they would have been without her assistance.

I've gotten a few comments from people since the document was put out. It seems like, from what I've seen, a lot of the comments that I've gotten since then, if I could characterize them in a sentence, it basically seems to be, you know, 'we do things differently and we really don't want to change,' and so I think the hard part of this is maybe in front of us in getting this as one document at all the campuses. That said, we worked on this, we tried to make this process as transparent as possible. Kelly Kish had set up an Oncourse site where we could post our progress on the documents as we went along and were able to accept comments, which we got very few; we got most of our comments after the final document was printed actually. But I don't know what else I need to say. If anyone has any question or comments...?

GIERYN: I'm actually representing Provost Hanson who can't be here because of budget meetings but I'm also in a way representing the former Dean of the Faculties, Jeanne Sept, whose position was dissolved, and I'm assuming some of those responsibilities so what I'm reporting here is some of the reactions of my predecessor, Jeanne Sept, but with the addition of new materials that have come to light since I took office. I'd like to refer to three specific points. The general tenor of this response is that we're very pleased on the Bloomington campus that this is not a vote meeting. We think there are some issues that need to be sorted out. We very much appreciate having some time to do some additional research and check with constituencies on our campus about how the proposal would change ongoing procedures.

The three points are as follows: Under the faculty review committee's point number 4. This is a point that deals with absentee or proxy voting. There are a wide variety of practices and policies on the Bloomington campus. My office has just completed a fairly quick review of those policies. We examined the policies, T and P policies, for 53 units. Of those, 11 policy documents specifically mention absentee or proxy voting, and of those 11, 8 specifically allow absentee or proxy voting. However, there are 42 units at Bloomington where there is no specific mention of absentee or proxy voting. I'd very much like to continue the research we're doing, contact those units and find out what their practice is, even if it's not a matter specified in their policies. At this point, the proposal as worded would require a change of practice in Bloomington. We can see the point of the change. On the other hand the conditions of faculty in Bloomington often require faculty members to be away from Bloomington for legitimate

professional reasons; research, performances for artists, attending panels of the National Science Foundation, consulting. Because of those absences, the question that Jeanne Sept raised dealt mainly with an issue of faculty governance and faculty rights. Is this in fact an infringement on a tenured faculty member's right to vote in a tenure case?

The second issue is also under the Faculty Review Committee's section, it's number 5. This refers to the access to dossier materials. The proposal would require that all review committees would have access to all materials in the dossier. Here again, we need a little bit more time to find out about practices in Bloomington. We already know that in the Kelly school that this particular proposed change would conflict with their current practices, although it's not clear how much the Kelly school is wedded to their current practices. The external letters come in after the promotion and tenure review committees reach a vote, and therefore the external letters are not made available to the voting members of the committee, so the wording here is a little ambiguous if you take the Kelly situation into account. In the dossier that is not straightforward. Does it mean, at any time in the process, or specifically at the time when the committee votes? At the time the committee votes, the external letters are not technically in the dossier so Kelly would be in compliance with this policy. I think we need a clarification on whether that reading is a correct one of the intent of the framers of this policy document, and we need to find out whether or not there are other units on the Bloomington campus which deny access to certain parts of the dossier. We just don't know yet.

Finally, at request for clarification, this is in the section on further recommendations, page number 2 and has to do with the categories of readings. The question of clarification: We presume that in identifying the categories; excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory, that this policy would not preclude the use of additional categories between the categories of excellent and satisfactory on the Bloomington campus, and maybe others, I don't know. Frequently departments will use very good, good, and satisfactory in between excellent and unsatisfactory. I suspect that the units would very much like to be able to continue to give those, even though, as a matter of university policy we realize that excellence in one area, typically research in Bloomington, is required and a rating of good, very good and satisfactory would not constitute excellence. So long as that's understood, this is just a matter of clarification. Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Tom, just a comment there, I think the spirit of the letter that we wrote establishing this committee was to try to establish a sort of base level for all campuses and they can be expanded, elaborated and added to in all kinds of ways that seems appropriate, but the idea was to get that base level right because I think there were inconsistencies on pretty basic matters. That was the spirit of it.

GIERYN: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Other comments or questions?

WERT: This is Joe Wert. We actually talked about that last point, and the intention of number 2 and the further recommendations that was alluded to here, was that other campuses could use different categories along with the excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory, which I believe are mandated by the faculty manual. We understand that some campuses use good and very good. We didn't have a problem with that as long as, you know the spirit of the faculty manual was adhered to.

MCROBBIE: Go ahead, yes Jack, first.

GALLMEIER: IU Northwest. I'm not sure if this is appropriate here, but I know my colleagues will be upset if I don't say something. Regional campuses, like IU Northwest, and I'm sure others have a large dependence on lecturers. We're wondering here where lecturers fit into this. I know they can't get tenured, but they can go up for senior lecturer promotion. I'm wondering if that's going to be separate issue, or is that something for each campus to decide themselves. Where do lecturers fit in with this?

WERT: Could I take that comment? We talked about this in the committee, and actually at one of the UFC meetings, I brought this up with President McRobbie and we agreed with his suggestion that this document should only apply to tenure and tenure track faculty members, and that both lecturers and clinical faculty, should be dealt with in a separate document and the committee agreed with that although they did say that we should proceed with all possible haste in getting a document together that would apply to lecturers and clinical faculty.

MCROBBIE: Let me, I can't see who it is but there's a woman in red at the back of the IUPUI room. She has the call first. Who is that, I can't see who it is?

MCDANIEL: (Laughter) Anna McDaniel from the School of Nursing at IUPUI. ---ing the further recommendations, point number 2, I understand that the first sentence comes from the current manual, but I think we need to add a category called ---excellent, I believe that's the proper term, or the 'balanced case.' The 'balanced case' is judged ---excellent in all three areas. That's, how I believe, how it is determined.

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: We need to look at the language.

MCDANIEL: What?

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: We need to take that language into account.

MCDANIEL: Yeah, whatever it is we need to make sure that the language is consistent with the 'balanced case' dossier.

WERT: I'm not sure that there is actual language for a 'balanced case' is there that's suggested? Or is there?

WOKECK: For the 'balanced case,' yeah, but nothing else.

TERRY: I would take that as an admonition that when we try and reconcile it with existing *Academic Handbook* language; we will try to deal with the 'balanced case.' We'll see if there is something that needs to be done with regard to that. Thank you for calling that to our attention.

MCROBBIE: I think Bill Schneider was the next person to call.

SCHNEIDER: Yeah, I have a number of questions, but they may be resolved by the first one. I just want to make sure this is what I think it is. Is this a document that originally was prompted by the regional campus review of procedures that initially came out and then we decided a committee should look at it, and now it's changed into a procedures for all campuses?

MCROBBIE: I think the history was that it was. It may have started that way, but when the committee was put together it was to apply to all campuses. So that...

SCHNEIDER: So was...

MCROBBIE: ...that goes back to whatever it was, a year or so ago, eight months ago or whatever it was, that Simon and Lisa and I wrote that memo.

SCHNEIDER: Okay, so was their representation from all the campuses on the committee.

MCROBBIE: Yes.

TERRY: Yes.

SCHNEIDER: Then, there is just one other part that I want to signal, that's been a problem on this campus, and it has to do with the words 'procedures' and 'guidelines.' It seems to me that there's a very important distinction between the two and I presume the committee paid a lot of attention to it but it may be even worth a bit of a definition to be put in to make sure that it's clear, but those are some things that have caused some confusion on our campus and I think that'll be worth taking a look at in this as well as when talking about the campuses' implementation.

MCROBBIE: Okay, we'll certainly take a note on that Bill. Other questions or comments from people out in cyberspace? Simon?

ATKINSON: I just wondered Bill, if you could elaborate a little on your last comment?

SCHNEIDER: Well, it seems to me that procedures are clear cut and must be followed whereas guidelines are less rigorously followed and leads to leeway. On our campus, well, the procedures in the handbook, at least the way I usually associate it, is on a page or two. Our campus has a forty page guideline, to seventy page guideline document that grows every year. I hope our campus takes advantage of this to straighten things out. I don't know if that's happened on other campuses, but I think part of it has to do with those words and the leeway that's allowed. So that's where it comes from Simon.

MCROBBIE: Other questions or comments? In this room or in cyberspace?

GERENCSEK: This is Steven Gerencser from Indiana University South Bend, and I have a question that maybe goes back to one of Joe's first points about the concerns at each campus about how it does things, and I'm wondering if you could comment on point 11. The last of the under "Faculty Review Committees." All the language above it talks about campus wide communities. Point 11 says that all other committees should reflect these guidelines, and I'm wondering about the amount of flexibility and how that will be interpreted when in section, or point 11, it says "the guidelines should be consistent, as appropriate, with the above points."

WERT: Yeah, point 11 deals with what should happen at the, kind of the base level, at the department or school level. Basically, I think we wanted to keep this kind of as loose as possible, saying that as long as you're not violating one of the above guidelines that the procedures that you use at the department or school level are left up to you.

GERENCSEK: May I ask for an example? We know that at some campuses, like ours; have had non-tenured faculty members on committees. Clearly, this new policy would restrict that, but if we would want to have non-voting member of the committee, non-voting members who were non-tenured, would that be within the principles or ideals of the guidelines?

WERT: I would say, yes. There was less problem with their participation, and I think there was some agreement that participation from non-tenured faculty members can be important for them. We had more of a problem with their being required to vote on individual cases.

GERENCSEK: Thank you very much.

MCROBBIE: Other comments or questions?

TERRY: I have a comment, if there are no more comments. While Simon and I and the President, we will meet very soon on this, please send any further comments that you have, to one of us and we'll try and take those into account.

MCROBBIE: But that's how we're proposing to proceed. Someone at IUPUI, Simon?

ATKINSON: I think Bill has a...

SCHNEIDER: My question is; what's going to happen now with the future for those next steps?

TERRY: I described that at the beginning. What we're going to do is that Simon and the President and I are going to meet together and see if we can come up with a consensus document. I don't think it's going to be that hard given the comments that have just been made. I've taken notes, but we'll have a transcript of this. We will get together. We will put that together. We will send it out to the faculty leaders at all of the campuses. We will pick a UFC meeting somewhere before the end of this semester, probably the next to last meeting - although I don't want to commit to that here - at which we will schedule this for discussion, and I would hope, approval. That will leave time for the other campuses, all campuses, to look at what we've proposed, and to bring their comments to that UFC meeting.

MCROBBIE: Okay, I think there were no final or further comments...sorry, what about it?

TERRY: Some people have asked that we discuss the President's December 5th, 2008 memo. It was on the agenda.

MCROBBIE: Oh was it? Sorry.

TERRY: Now are there any questions that anyone wants to raise about that? It was one of the documents that was linked to under item six.

MCROBBIE: Right, so that's there for discussion, too.

TERRY: But let me throw something in. From a few people, I received comments that they thought this amounted to a substantial change in the way tenure and promotion cases have been considered. Here at Bloomington, and I'm actually contacting some people away from Bloomington, I tried to learn how

these cases have been handled under recent Presidents. As best as I can determine, what is here is what has been done at least since the presidency of Tom Ehrlich. I think the virtue of this memo from the president is that it puts this out in paper and should eliminate any doubt as to how the final decisions before they go to the Trustees are reached. Personally, I thought it actually might make a change in procedure, but when I did the research, I discovered it didn't and I think our existing documents are sufficiently vague, that what prior presidents were doing was probably consistent with them. The specificity of this is, I think, helpful.

MCROBBIE: Having spoken to presidents Ehrlich and Brand and having worked on this with President Herbert, and having now to do it myself, that's right.

TERRY: Yeah. That's what I can confirm.

MCROBBIE: Comments, questions?

WERT: Was it true then that on other campuses, that the candidates for promotion and tenure did not get any kind of notification from the Chancellor?

POMPER: That is not true. At IU East, typically a notification from the Chancellor was given.

WERT: We always have, on Southeast campus, and there was some concern on Southeast campus that that was going to be a change.

MCROBBIE: But there was then the final discussion that was held with the President after that point.

TERRY: from what I can determine, even those statements were sort of equivocal. I think they tended to say that we're still going to have this discussion with the president

MCROBBIE: Yes, right.

TERRY: ...before it becomes final. One thing that has changed is that under the prior structure, I believe all of these cases ultimately went through Ken Gros Louis or whatever was the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs...

MCROBBIE: Right.

TERRY: That's changed somewhat from the way it used to work, but Ken was the first to assure me that when I showed this to him, this was pretty much what happened.

MCROBBIE: Right. There was no letter received from Ken. Ken discussed them with Myles was how it worked.

TERRY: Right. Yeah, so.

MCROBBIE: And then a decision was made by the two of them, and that's sort of roughly what happens now except that it's expanded because Charles now takes on some of that role and the provost does on this campus so that's its effectively still the same process.

TERRY: And another virtue of this memo is that it makes it very clear that there is an appeal mechanism from this final executive group decision. It's spelled out in here that the...

MCROBBIE: There's not from the final.

TERRY: Oh right, from the procedural review.

MCROBBIE: It says that all the procedural reviews that are in place now, continue in place. Okay, any questions or comments on any of these matters?

TERRY: Tom, you commented on point 4 under "Faculty Reviewed Committees." Can you comment on behalf of Bloomington on point 3? Is there absentee voting or ballots on the Bloomington campus level?

GIERYN: No, in fact on both the Tenure Advisory Committee, and the Promotion Advisory Committee, which are run through the Office of the Vice-Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, all members must be present in order to vote, so at a campus level were consistent with the new policy, the new proposed policy.

TERRY: Right and that was what I suspected. Those of you on other campuses might want to confirm that that's what happens on your campus, but I think it does. I don't know for IUPUI, I saw Charles in the room somewhere, but I don't think 3 is going to result in any campus having to change but let me know if it does.

MCROBBIE: Ladies and Gentleman, I know there are people trying to get home, at least on this campus, because of the oncoming storm, so let me try to have some sense of urgency about lining up unless there are any major questions or matters that people want to raise? Okay then, in that case, the meeting is adjourned and we'll see you in a couple of weeks. Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 2:52pm