

INDIANA UNIVERSITY EAST
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 4, 1997

Room 132 Whitewater Hall

11:00 AM

Presiding: Walter Wagor, President of Faculty Senate

Present: Avirappattu, G.; Baldwin, L.; P.; Bandish, C.; Barton-Kriese, P.; Bergen, M.; Blakey, G.; Branstrator, P.; Breitenbach, G.; Brown, E.; Browne, B.; Browne, C.; Carter, R.; Clark, K.; Dalphin, J.; Day, P.; Dhawale, K.; Fahl, D.; Fitzgerald, E.; Folkerth, M.; Foos, M.; Fulton, D.; Gallo, E.; Goerss, B.; Henry, M.J.; Hertzog, B.; Hufford, L.; Jayasuriya, K.; Kauffman, J.; Lafuze, J.; Ludlum, C.; Marling, V.; McCarty, J.; McFadden, S.; Morse, M.; Nwobodo, P.; Osborne, R.; Osgood, T.; Pandya, V.; Phipps, A.; Rains, J.; Rankin, S.; Rao-Dev, V.; Rivard, T.; Roman-Royer, J.; Sabine, N.; Shapiro, S.; Sherer, S.; Spencer, S.; Stolle, C.; Szopa, A.; Telfer, K.; Tolley, R.; Turk, E.; Veramallay, A.; Vincent, J.; Wagor, W.; Watkins, M.; Weber, G.; Williamson, T.; Wyett, J.

I. Call To Order

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 am by Senate President Walter Wagor.

II. Approval of Minutes

Randall Osborne moved to accept the minutes of the February 4, 1997, meeting. T.J. Rivard seconded. Minutes approved.

III. President's Business -Walter Wagor

- A. Dr. Mary Ann Baker, from IU Southeast, will be on campus Thursday, March 13, from 11:00-12:30, in Whitewater 132, to discuss the preparation of the IU Lilly Grant Retention Proposal. Dr. Baker is visiting regional campuses to get their input.
- B. The Bookstore will be sending out information about ordering caps and gowns soon.
- C. The Commission on the Status of Women will be distributing a Campus Climate Survey sometime in April.

IV. Student Government - Pam Fine

No Report

V. Standing Committees

Faculty Affairs - Joan Lafuze

- A. Bill Browne, Chair of the TERA Steering Committee, said a TERA policy must be voted on at this session. He reviewed events in the process so far. Following the January 24th Board of Trustees meeting, Faculty Affairs received recommendations which include the main points:

- The Trustees have adopted a final report of the President's Committees (a 10 page summary attached to the March 4, 1997 Senate Minutes)
- The funds have been released to campuses
- Indicates that recipients can choose to receive cash or establish an account
- States exactly the minimum and maximum amount of the awards
- Requires that the money be spent by the end of April

With that in mind, Faculty Affairs proposes three categories for discussion: Eligibility; Process to be used on the IU East campus; and, Actual awards.

The first category for discussion:

1. Categories of eligible faculty

- full-time tenure eligible and tenured faculty
- full-time clinical rank faculty and lecturers
- full-time librarians who engage in classroom teaching
- emeriti faculty actively engaged in teaching

Bill Browne said that Faculty Affairs did not recommend the inclusion of adjunct faculty due to the time line and the fact that there is no standardized procedure currently on the

IU East campus for evaluating adjunct faculty. This does not mean they could not be included at some time in the future. Discussion.

Tom Osgood asked for an explanation of why Emeriti faculty were included. Bill Browne replied there was no reason not to include them and that in the future there may be emeriti faculty actively engaged in teaching.

Mike Foos asked for an explanation of fulltime faculty. He was told it meant fulltime faculty appointments, not to include the Chancellor and vice Chancellor.

Cathy Ludlum asked if there was a minimum courseload. Bill Browne said the President's Council report did not indicate a minimum, but did state three calendar years at Indiana University as an eligibility requirement.

Bob Hertzog asked about some people not teaching a full load. George Blakey clarified that the faculty would be eligible - and when they were nominated they would then undergo review of credentials and evaluate factors of number of courses, etc., then they would be eligible. Kris Dhawale made a point that the award is for quality of teaching, not quantity.

The second category for discussion:

2. The process to be used on the Indiana University East Campus

- All eligible faculty with a sustained level of teaching excellence and who have completed at least three calendar years at Indiana University and who receive a rating of highest merit in teaching will have their case automatically forwarded by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (with the consent of the faculty member) to the Teaching Award Committee for consideration for TERA without special application
- The Teaching Award Committee will use only the teaching portion of the annual Faculty Service Report plus documents that the faculty member presently uses for the purpose of annual evaluation.
- The Teaching Award Committee will use the current Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for excellence in teaching in reaching its recommendation. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information in the annual service report sufficient to substantiate a case for excellent teaching. Documentation involving self-analysis and reflection is viewed as important evidence for determining excellence in teaching.

In the first section - Bill Browne said that the Committee was trying not to create another process where a dossier had to be put together. There was not supposed to be a committee created to review these nominations. The time period being considered is the year preceding the nomination. Persons with highest merit in teaching are automatically eligible. The Division Chair will make the recommendation to the Vice Chancellor, who in turn forwards the nomination to the Chancellor. The final decision rests with the Chancellor.

In the second section Bill Browne pointed out that the same teaching materials submitted for annual reviews are submitted for TERA. Professional Development and Service are not included.

In the third section Bill Browne noted that an existing committee and current P & T guidelines are to be used. Faculty are responsible for providing information and documentation.

Carol Browne said that the Teaching Award Committee is comprised of faculty who have distinguished themselves as members of FACET, Distinguished Teaching Awards, etc., and who have demonstrated excellence in teaching.

John Dalphin said that BEST had some concerns with the sections about "sustained" level of teaching - what does it mean and who determines. Another concern was the word "report" and suggested Annual Faculty Service Report which would show how merit is determined. He also felt that the third section should be divided. He said he would distribute the suggested changes later for discussion.

Kris Dhawale asked how a Chair would make a recommendation for highest merit if no documentation is turned in.

George Blakey said a process is being set up. The Chair would recommend all faculty with highest merit and the committee would have to evaluate who has the documentation to substantiate highest merit.

Bob Hertzog asked if the faculty member could add to the teaching area of their annual report.

Bill Browne said the President's Committee Report stated that three pages could be added because some campuses did not include teaching materials in annual reports.

Judith Roman-Royer, a member of Faculty Affairs, said she felt this was an effort to bring more consistency into what was submitted in annual reviews and what constitutes highest merit. Next year people can add more, but this year there just had to be a plan in order to get these awards.

Judy McCarty agreed and added that the timeline came into play this year as the checks have to be issued by the end of April.

Joan Lafuze called the question. Bill Browne said that the third section needed to be reviewed and then the entire proposal would be voted on.

Discussion of the third recommendation

3. The actual awards to be made

- no more than 25% of eligible faculty may receive an award
 - the 25% number will be verified each Spring Semester by Academic Affairs
- the amount to be awarded will be equally divided among all recipients
 - awards must be between \$500 and \$1500
 - award winners may choose whether to receive the award in cash or to establish an account to be used for other professional purposes (both are subject to IRS taxation as a supplement and are not base adjustments).
 - funds remaining following the awarding of TERA will be held for the following year.

Bill Browne said that Faculty Affairs recommended any remaining funds should stay in a fund to be used the following year.

David Fulton pointed out that no more than 25% of eligible faculty may receive an award. That would mean at IU East, 25% of 70, which is 20, faculty would be the maximum number who could receive an award.

Jo Rains pointed out that the "3 year requirement" was not part of the category of eligible faculty. Bill Browne said the eligibility requirements are in Section I, the 3 year teaching is part of the process. Walter Wagor read from a document approved by the Board of Trustees, under eligibility, where both criteria were mentioned.

- Jo Rains moved to amend the wording in, 1. Categories of eligible faculty, to add "completion of at least 3 calendar years at Indiana University". Mary Folkerth seconded. George Blakey called the question. Passed by voice vote. Motion passed.
- George Blakey moved to delete, in 2. The process . . . , the first bullet, after the word faculty, "with sustained . . . Indiana University and". Tom Osgood seconded. Bill Browne pointed out that the Board of Trustees approved the section on "sustained level of teaching excellence" which was in the middle of the deletion. George Blakey made a friendly amendment to the motion to delete from "and who have Indiana University and". Tom Osgood seconded. Amendment passed.

John Dalphin passed out a sheet with some recommendations from the BEST Division as an amendment to the recommendations in:

2. The Process to be used on the Indiana University East Campus

- All eligible faculty who have completed at least three calendar years at Indiana University and who receive a rating of highest merit in teaching will have their case automatically forwarded by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (with the consent of the faculty member) to the Teaching Award Committee for consideration for TERA without special application.

- The Teaching Award Committee will use only the teaching portions of the *Faculty Service Report and the Supervisor's Review of Performance* plus documents that the faculty member presently uses for the purpose of annual evaluation *for the immediate past three years to evaluate a sustained level of teaching excellence.*
- The Teaching Award Committee will use the current *Indiana University East Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* for excellence in teaching (*Section IX-1, II. Substantiation of Teaching Activities*) in reaching its recommendation.
- It is the responsibility of the faculty member *when preparing his/her annual Faculty Service Report* to provide information sufficient to substantiate a case for excellent teaching. Documentation *including* self-analysis and reflection *will be* viewed as important evidence for determining excellence in teaching.
- The first bullet will remain as amended earlier in this meeting. Additions appear in italics.
- In bullet # 2, the addition of "and the Supervisor's Review of Performance" and "for the immediate past three years to evaluate a sustained level of teaching excellence" was defeated.
- In bullet #3, as a point of clarification, "Indiana University East" and the section of the Academic Handbook were added. Amendment approved.
- In bullet #4, as clarification, "when preparing his/her annual Faculty service Report" was added. There were two wording changes - "including" in place of involving and "will be" in place of is. Amendment passed.

Discussion. Judith Roman-Royer said that including documentation from previous two years might not be possible because not everyone saves everything. She asked if the supervisor's review of performance should be included and what would be done about a person on sabbatical.

Cathy Ludlum asked how to document "sustained".

Bill Browne said the original document indicates that the evaluation is based on one year, not over a three year period.

Vandana Rao-Dev said the effort should be sustained over one year.

Ed Fitzgerald said that the Board of Trustees gives the option for three years sustained activity. That activity goes on for a period of time.

Ron Carter said that since this is a new process, no one will have had three years to prepare. As a compromise he suggested that the last calendar year be included. Then next year add a second year until the process is better understood.

Carol Browne mentioned that it was never the intention of the committee that faculty submit more than one year of documentation.

Walter Wagor reminded faculty that a motion was on the floor to approve the entire document as amended. He asked for the vote. Motion passed.

Chancellor Fulton congratulated faculty on completing the work in the time allotted. The Trustees were pleased with the response of the entire University faculty to the challenge in getting TERA up and running by April. IUEast is the only IU campus to exclude adjunct faculty from eligibility for TERA awards. This was because there are no adequate evaluation procedures for adjunct faculty. The Chancellor extended the challenge to create an evaluation procedure for adjunct faculty and to include adjunct faculty in the next round of TERA awards.

The TERA Recommendations as passed by the Indiana University East Faculty Senate are attached to these minutes.

Joan Lafuze moved to extend the meeting to finish the business of the agenda.

Mike Foos asked if there was still a quorum. Walter Wagor verified that there was a quorum.

Motion to extend meeting time approved.

Nominating Committee - Rob Tolley

- A. Walter Wagor said that a new UFC representative needed to be elected by March 1, and asked for a motion to have that election now. Randall Osborne so moved. Suzi Shapiro seconded.
 Rob Tolley reported that he had received one self nomination to serve as the IU East representative to UFC - Mike Foos. Ashton Veramallay moved the nominations be closed. Cathy Ludlum seconded. Mike Foos was unanimously elected UFC representative for 1997-98. Ashton Veramallay expressed appreciation to Jane Vincent for serving as UFC representative.

Faculty Affairs - Joan Lafuze (continued)

- B. Clinical Ranks Policy Proposal
 George Blakey said the discussion of Clinical Ranks could be a long and tedious process. Since the proposal needs to be approved this semester, not at this meeting, he requested that faculty read the document prior to the next meeting and be prepared to vote at that time. Joan Lafuze asked for faculty feedback. Eleanor Turk made a motion to delay discussion of Clinical Ranks until the April Senate meeting. Paul Barton-Kriese seconded. Motion passed.

Academic Affairs - Vandana Rao-Dev/Kumara Jayasuriya
No Report

There was a motion to re-order the schedule of business. John Dalphin seconded.

Curriculum Committee - Cathy Ludlum

- A. The Curriculum Committee brought, moved and seconded, a new course proposal from the BEST Division, I500-Financial Management. The course is a foundations course with the IUEast articulation with Ball State. It is also cross-listed as an undergraduate course F301. The course exists within the University but not on the IUEast campus. Course approved.
- B. The approval of the curriculum revisions to the Secondary Education Program was delayed until the next meeting.

Budgetary Affairs - Lora Baldwin

- A. John Dalphin moved to postpone the discussion of the Salary Policy Proposal until the next meeting. Lora Baldwin seconded. Motion passed

There was discussion about having a special meeting prior to the regularly scheduled April Faculty Senate meeting to complete this agenda. George Blakey moved the special meeting be March 25 th at 11:00 am. Motion passed.

XII. Adjournment

Mike Foos moved to adjourn. George Blakey seconded. Meeting adjourned at 12:35 pm.

SPECIAL MEETING

INDIANA UNIVERSITY EAST
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
March 25, 1997
Room 124 Middlefork Hall
11:00 AM

Presiding: Walter Wagor, President of Faculty Senate

Present: Avirappattu, G.; Baldwin, L.; Blake, J.; Blakey, G.; Branstrator, P.; Brown, E.; Browne, B.; Browne, C.; Carter, R.; DaCosta, C.; Day, P.; Fell, M.; Folkerth, M.; Fulton, D.; Gallo, E.; Goerss, B.; Henry, M.J.; Hertzog, B.; Jayasuriya, K.; Kauffman, J.; Lafuze, J.;

Logston, J. ; Ludlum, C.; Marling, V.; McCarty, J.; McFadden, S.; Morse, M.; Nishihara, L.; Osborne, R.; Osgood, T.; Pandya, V.; Rains, J.; Rankin, S.; Rao-Dev, V.; Rivard, T.; Shapiro, S.; Sherer, S.; Spencer, S.; Stolle, C.; Szopa, A.; Tolley, R.; Turk, E.; Veramallay, A.; Vincent, J.; Wagor, W.; Watkins, M.; Weber, G.; Williamson, T.

I. Call To Order

The meeting was called to order at 11:12 am by Senate President Walter Wagor.

- II. President Walter Wagor explained the purpose of the meeting was to complete three voting items from the Agenda of the March 4th Faculty Senate Meeting. Additionally, he said that only tenured, tenure-track and tenure eligible faculty are able to vote on the first item, Clinical Ranks. There had been a request to use written ballots on the Clinical Ranks vote and President Walter asked faculty if they felt that would be necessary. Jo Rains pointed out that that only the people present would be voting and she didn't feel written ballots were necessary. Hearing no motion to use written ballots, President Wagor said he would proceed with the discussion and voting.
- III. Faculty Affairs
- A. Clinical Ranks - Joan Lafuze
- Joan Lafuze explained that three issues regarding Clinical Ranks would be presented by the Sub Committees and voted on separately.
- a. George Blakey gave a condensed explanation of Clinical Ranks as passed by the Board of Trustees in 1996 and presented the one voting item, shown below between the parentheses. In the section covering the number of Clinical Rank appointees: "Clinical rank appointees shall constitute no more than 20% of the total full-time faculty(at IUE no more than 5% of the total IUE full-time faculty can be in Clinical Ranks within any one Division). Tenure/tenure-track members of the faculty governance body may establish a smaller percentage." The Committee's rationale was to set some parameters so Divisions would not be on a first come, first serve basis, realizing that some divisions would need more clinical rank positions than others. Suzi Shapiro said it might be alright now but if there is campus reorganization it might be a problem. Jo Rains questioned equal distribution among divisions since not all divisions have equal clinical need. Ron Carter suggested that there be a one year trial basis. Walter Wagor clarified that the committee wanted to vote on individual sections separately. Following further discussion, Judy McCarty called the question. Passed by voice vote. The question was to approve the statement "at IUE no more than 5% of the total IUE full-time faculty can be in Clinical Ranks within any one Division". Proposal defeated by a show of hands vote(11-yea, 19-nay). There will be no parameters on divisional allotment of Clinical Ranks.
- b. Randall Osborne presented, from Faculty Affairs, the Proposal for Transitioning into Clinical Ranks Policy. The four issues to address in a transition policy are:
- Clinical Rank not be utilized as a transfer mechanism;
 - the number of years for a Clinical Rank Contract;
 - probationary period; and,
 - a system of "grandfathering" the policy
- There was discussion relating to the process and review involved in granting long term contracts and promotion to clinical rank individuals. Mary Fell said that promotion can only be granted by the Chancellor from recommendations from the P&T Committee. George Blakey suggested that Faculty Affairs review the language and clarify the distinctions between extending long term contracts and promotion. Randall Osborne said the committee's interpretation of granting the long term contract was a divisional review process, while promotion would follow the established P&T process. After much discussion, Joan Lafuze said the Faculty Affairs Committee would withdraw the Proposal for Transitioning sections for further discussion.
- c. Sherry Rankin presented the recommended Criteria for Appointment and Responsibilities of Clinical Ranks Faculty levels; Clinical Lecturer, Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, Clinical Professor. Judy McCarty called the question. The motion to approved the criteria passed. (26-Yes, 0-No, 2 -Abstain) Walter Wagor asked Faculty Affairs to put together UFC recommendations with IU East recommendations for the Handbook.

IV. Budgetary Affairs - Lora Baldwin

- A. Lora Baldwin suggested each section of the Salary Policy Proposal be discussed and voted upon, before voting on the entire proposal. She also said due to budget restrictions that some areas may need to be phased in over time.
- B. Salary Floors - The Committee recommended adjustments to salary floors to reflect actual starting salaries so increases each year at the same rate will keep beginning salaries in line with campus salaries. Bill Browne said that Clinical Ranks will need to be added to the list. Lora said the rate of inflation was figured into the new salary floors. Suzi Shapiro moved to postpone a vote on this item. Eleanor Turk seconded. Passed.
- C. Search and Screen Hiring Procedures
There were several areas of concern. One area omitted was advertising the actual salary amount. Basically the Divisional Search and Screen Committees must determine and record the salary range and job descriptions which may not be changed without Divisional approval. Salaries for successful candidates may differ by 5% when considering experience, but only after Divisions and the Search and Screen Committee have agreed. This is an attempt to bring everything "up front" and eliminate "negotiating". Discussion. Mary Fell called the question. The motion is to add the Search and Screen Hiring Procedures to the Salary Policy Proposal. Motion passed.

***NOTE: The presiding officer was aware that a quorum did not exist for the preceding vote. After consulting with Robert's Rules of Order, it is deemed that the preceding item needed to be re-voted.**

George Blakey moved to extend the meeting time to complete the business. Mary Fell seconded. Motion passed.

D. Negotiating Parameters

All new faculty will receive a computer, not necessarily the top of the line, acknowledging the campus focus on technology. Also, faculty would receive up to \$750 toward moving expenses, and 50% over that amount if they are moving a long distance, but not to exceed the maximum allowed by the Board of Trustees. There was discussion about the limit on moving expenses and with whom a faculty member would negotiate to receive computer up-grades. David Fulton said that negotiating should take place between the Chair and Vice Chancellor before it gets to the Chancellor. Bill Browne said he felt there were some holes in the policy regarding what is negotiable. Walter Wagor expressed concern that the policy is not well articulated and perhaps a better document should be created. The question was called, but due to a lack of quorum there could not be a vote.

V. Adjournment

Due to the lack of a quorum, the meeting was adjourned at 12:35 pm.