

Indiana University South Bend
Minutes of the Academic Senate
15 November 2002

Members Present: S. Anderson, E. Bennion Turba, J. Blodgett, L. Blodgett, J. Bushong, L. Chen, Y. Cheng, C. Choi, T. Clark, J. R. Colborn, N. Colborn, J. Davis, J. Detlef, K. Egerton, B. Fong-Morgan, L. Fritschner, P. Furlong, L. Garber, S. Gerencser, J. Gottwald, A. Guillaume, M. Heintzberger, J. Hinnefeld, G. Huitink, J. Hurst, R. Isaacson, K. Jackson, P. Joray, N. Karakatsanis, B. Keith, W. Knight, L. Lambert, J. Lewis, E. Lucal, B. MacMillan, E. Maher, D. Marr, J. McIntosh, D. McMillen, G. Mettetal, E. Mooney, J. Mucha, R. Muralidharan, K. Okrah, S. Opasik, C. Pace, P. Pierce, U. M. Reck, C. Rios, E. Roth, M. Russo, M. Scanlan, R. Schreiber, R. Schwartz, K. Smant, D. Smith, R. L. Smith, Y. Song, C. Sprague, M. Tetzlaff, G. Trench, D. Vollrath, L. Walker, C. White, S. Winicur, B. Withers, N. Yokom

Thanks to the generosity of the Alumni Association, light refreshments were available just outside the meeting room during the half hour preceding the meeting.

At no time during this meeting was there a quorum, so the meeting was never called to order as an official meeting of the Academic Senate. No official business was transacted, but Chancellor Reck and Vice Chancellor Guillaume give reports, a resolution concerning promotion of lecturers to the rank of Senior Lecturer was discussed, and Paul Herr gave a report for the Senate Budget Committee.

President Roy Schreiber began the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

I. Administrative Reports

The Report of Chancellor Reck

1. Organizational structure

The chancellor displayed the campus administrative organizational chart she had shown at the October meeting. She announced that as of November, in accordance with the chart, she has shifted three administrators so that instead of reporting directly to the chancellor they now report to the Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration (Mary Ann Zemke). The chart can be viewed on the Web:

<http://www.iusb.edu/chancellor/remarks/Org-Charts.pdf>

or simply go the IUSB Web page, click on Chancellor's Office, and click on this item.

2. Revised Budget Process

The chancellor displayed a revised Budget Process timetable. Two items had been added at the end: March 19, the chancellor will share her budget recommendations with the vice chancellors; March 21, the chancellor will share her budget decisions with the Academic Senate. Web location of the chart:

<http://www.iusb.edu/chancellor/remarks/budgetprocess.pdf>

3. Allocation of Salary Savings

The chancellor displayed a chart with the title One-Time Salary Savings Allocation Process. The chart has been discussed at the cabinet level and shared with the transition team. The chart outlined the process that will be followed in determining how to spend these savings. The decisions are expected to be made by February to give academic units plenty of time to spend funds that they receive. It may be prudent to hold back some of the money, at least until late in the year. Web location of the chart:

<http://www.iusb.edu/chancellor/remarks/salariesavingsprocess.pdf>

Suggestion: We have had the unpleasant experience in recent years of appearing to be consulted on such matters and then seeing the input ignored at the chancellor level. In earlier years a consensus was generally built at the chancellor's cabinet level. I hope there will be no "gap" between steps 5 and 6 in the chart.

Response: As you get to know me, I think you'll be comfortable with the way this is done.

Question: For those of us who are not aware of how these salary savings come about, could you explain that?

Answer: They arise in various ways. For example, if someone retires with a high salary and is not immediately replaced, associate faculty may be hired to fill in, at much less cost.

Question: Is the Budget Committee's input into this process going to take place through the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs?

Answer: yes.

4. Results of Campus Survey

The chancellor displayed the list of questions that went out in July to survey campus opinion. She then displayed the tabulated survey results. She noted that they seemed fairly consistent with what

she had heard during her interview process and what she has learned since coming here. For each question, the list of responses was lengthy. They can be viewed in their entirety at

<http://www.iusb.edu/chancellor/remarks/TransitionSurveyResults.pdf>

A few of the top-scoring responses were noted:

- a. In response to the question about the strengths of IUSB: Strong, dedicated faculty; dedicated staff; academic programs; community support; dedicated administrators.
- b. In response to the question about the challenges facing IUSB: Financial and budgetary difficulties; image and marketing; student retention; communication and trust; faculty recruitment.
- c. In response to the question about goals for the next year: Improve communication, trust, and morale; address budgetary issues; clarify and stabilize the administration; fill interim and acting positions; improve image through marketing and advertising. The chancellor feels that progress is being made in these areas.
- d. In response to the question about goals for the next 3 years: improve external funding; increase enrollment and retention; strategic planning; student housing; clarify and stabilize administration.

5. Commencement

The chancellor announced that for commencement her office will provide robes to faculty at no cost. She is looking into the idea of allowing students receiving certificates to march across the platform to receive them and to have their names listed in the program. She noted that the May 2003 commencement is already set for Notre Dame; she wants to experience it there before discussing the possibility of changing the location. She noted difficulties connected with returning to our earlier location. The date of commencement is May 13.

6. Residence Halls

With respect to residence halls for IUSB, the chancellor has formally requested of President Brand that an updated housing facilities study for our campus be made. She has been in contact with Lynn Coyne who works in Vice President Terry Clapacs's office. Next week there will be a conference call with Coyne and the company that did a similar study a couple of years ago. She will be making a presentation in April to the IU Board of Trustees, whose meeting that month will be on our campus. The trustees will be here April 3-4, and their meeting will be publicized in advance. She hopes many of us will attend.

7. New Title: Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management

She noted that a question has been raised concerning the title of the individual in charge of enrollment management on our campus. Currently that individual is the acting "Dean of Enrollment Management". The chancellor felt that the title "dean" should be reserved for academic positions, and so the title is being changed to "Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management". It is not a new position.

8. Bepko to Visit IUSB

Acting IU President Bepko will visit IUSB on Dec. 19, at 1:00 p.m. An agenda will be distributed in advance of the visit. He wants to meet with the Academic Cabinet, as well as with various groups, faculty, and students.

9. Search for New IU President

The search committee for IU President is asking for input from all campuses on four questions: What should IU focus on for the next 10 years? What are the qualities of a leader? Which qualities are necessary, acceptable, unacceptable? Other comments? Our Campus Directions Committee (CDC) will formulate a campus response and deliver it in a meeting with our region's trustee, Cora Breckenridge, who will convey it to the search committee. The CDC will also convey our campus response to the regional campus faculty member on the search committee.

10. Holiday Party

The chancellor renewed her invitation to us to join her for a holiday party on December 6 at 6:00 p.m. in the Associates Building.

Question: Can you provide an update on searches to fill acting positions?

Answer: Vice Chancellor Guillaume will provide a full update. Two VC searches have begun. The Affirmative Action search will begin in January. The most recent letter from the chancellor lists members of these committees.

The Report of Vice Chancellor Guillaume

1. Searches

VC Guillaume is chairing the search committee for the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology. So far there are 46 applicants. Guillaume is confident that they will find a well qualified person.

VC Zemke is chairing the search committee for Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs & University Advancement. So far there are 43 applicants.

Dean Schillingsburg (Liberal Arts and Sciences) is chairing the search for a dean for the School of Education. So far they have 21 applicants.

Dean Miller (Arts) is chairing the search for a dean for the School of Health Professions. So far they have 3 applicants.

2. Budget Matters, Past and Present:

Last year it was necessary to develop a list of possible budget cuts, in consultation with the Senate Budget Committee and others, for what appeared to be a serious deficit. Two rounds of consultations took place. In the end, Vice Chancellor Guillaume made recommendations to Chancellor Perrin, but Perrin took no action on that at all. Chancellor Reck asked Guillaume to have another look at those recommendations, especially the recommended cap on summer salary for full time faculty. The Budget Committee has reconsidered that recommendation under new circumstances, and now recommends that no cap be imposed. The Dean's Council will be considering the committee's report and will make recommendations after reviewing the matter. Guillaume hopes that salary savings can be used in part for equipment this year to make up a bit for the last two years.

3. Retention Efforts

Jennifer Good is chairing a faculty/staff committee to consolidate retention efforts on our campus. The committee is charged with producing a cohesive student retention plan for IUSB. The report will be presented to IU Vice President for Diversity, Charlie Helms. It must be done by December.

4. B. S. in Actuarial Science

The Bachelor of Science degree in Actuarial Science is now a reality on our campus. It was approved by the Indiana Commission on Higher Education last Friday. One commissioner noted

that the math requirement for this new degree is higher than the math requirement for an engineering degree at Purdue.

5. Scholarships for Students

We have been working hard to consolidate our efforts for scholarships for students and to produce a brochure listing them all. This year we received 500 applications but were able to award only 131 scholarships totaling a little over \$200,000.

6. Dean's Seminar

At noon today there will be a Dean's Seminar talk given by Roy Schreiber, with the title "Hollywood: Red and White and Blue, Too." Everyone is invited to attend.

7. General Studies Representation

The Director of General Studies has been invited to rejoin the Academic Cabinet to give that program a voice at that level. That program serves a large number of students.

II. Announcements

Schreiber announced that the Alumni Association provided the coffee and rolls at the door.

III. Committee Presentations

The New Senior Lecturer Rank (Senate Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee)

Schreiber said that Kevin Smant would describe the current status of the proposed guidelines for handling promotions to the rank of Senior Lecturer, and then the floor would be opened to a discussion. No action would be taken today, but expressions of disagreement with and suggestions concerning the guidelines would be considered as advice by individual members to the Non-Tenure Track committee. The committee will take such advice into account as it sees fit in preparing a revised set of guidelines, which will be presented to a future Senate meeting.

[NOTE: The proposed guidelines were distributed at the meeting. They were crafted by the Non-Tenure Track Committee with the hope that IUSB academic units will adopt them. The document containing the guidelines begins with a resolution expressing Senate support for them. The resolution of support passed "by default" at the April 19, 2002, Senate meeting when departures of members from the meeting reduced the number remaining below the required Senate quorum.]

Smant gave assurance that it was not the intention of the Non-Tenure Track Committee to "sneak into effect" the resolution of support. The committee was glad to have this discussion of the guidelines. He stressed that each of the guidelines incorporates some important principle. He expressed his hope that all suggestions would respect those principles, so that the committee would be able, if necessary, to offer compromises on the details. He expects that compromises will be necessary.

Schreiber asked that the discussion begin with point 1 in the guidelines.

["1. To be eligible for promotion to senior lecturer, a lecturer must have taught full-time, or its equivalent, at IUSB for no less than five years."]

Schreiber also mentioned that at no time up to that point in the meeting had the number of members present risen to the Senate quorum, and thus no official business could be transacted even if motions were made concerning the guidelines or the resolution of support.

Comment: I represent an academic unit [Nursing] that has a significant number of lecturers. It is embarrassing that we can't do business for lack of a quorum. Creation of the rank of Senior Lecturer was passed by the Board of Trustees almost two years ago. It has been passed by the University Faculty Council (UFC). It is important that IUSB develop a process for promoting lecturers and those with clinical appointments to a rank in which they can be given long term appointments. The Senate should develop a mechanism for encouraging attendance by the faculty.

Question: Does adoption of the resolution of support by the Senate have any binding force on the academic units and administrators who will implement the process of promotion to Senior Lecturer?

Answer: no.

Question: The resolution of support refers to "other clinical ranks". What "other clinical ranks" are there?

["Resolved: We, the members of the Academic Senate of IUSB, hereby endorse the guidelines below for the establishment of the rank of Senior Lecturer and Clinical Senior Lecturer and the promotion to the respective ranks. We urge all schools, colleges, and other academic units at IUSB

to follow them. Furthermore, be it resolved that current faculty members who hold other clinical ranks be afforded the same rights for promotion and reappointment as described for the lecturer positions.”]

Answer: There are clinical assistant professors and the possibility of clinical associate professors.

Response: I think the wording there should be clarified.

Question: If the Board of Trustees and the UFC have adopted it, and all we can do is recommend it to someone who already wants to do it, then what the [expletive deleted] are we talking about?

Answer: We need a mechanism to do it efficiently. Also there are many gaps in the trustees' language concerning how this is to be implemented and what principles will be used. For example, we have information that at Bloomington they have decided that five years after hiring, a lecturer will be required to be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer; if they are not so promoted, then they will be let go. The fact that their action does not bind our campus indicates that we are free to adopt our own policies governing promotion to Senior Lecturer.

Question: Suppose a unit did not follow these guidelines. Would that provide a lecturer denied promotion any leverage or recourse on the grounds that the guidelines were not followed?

Answer: That is something the Senate will have to determine as it works through this.

Question: Will lecturers be required to go up for consideration?

Answer: If the Senate decides they should be required, then that will be the recommendation of the Senate, and it will be binding.

Question: In the spirit of the complaint earlier about the lack of a quorum, would it possible to come up with some document today and send out a mail ballot to members of the Senate?

Answer: Since we are not officially in session as the Senate, I believe we cannot properly order such a ballot. The only thing we can do is advise the Non-Tenure Track Committee. Now it is also true that if that committee makes any decision concerning these matters, then that becomes binding on the Senate unless it is over-ruled within a month. I suppose it may come down to that if we can't get a quorum.

Question: Has this document been reviewed by the Senate Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (PTR) Committee?

Answer: no.

Question: Wouldn't that be an appropriate body to take up this matter? Wouldn't the committee have to consider such promotions?

Answer: Well, that's exactly one of the things that is not yet determined. It's conceivable that the campus might adopt a different mechanism for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

Comment: I would think that it would be more appropriate for the PTR Committee to consider the document after we have suggested whatever changes we think are appropriate and the Non-Tenure Track Committee has had a chance to consider making such revisions.

Comment: The Non-Tenure Track Committee welcomes input from anyone, any committee, at any time.

Comment: The title Clinical Senior Lecturer appearing in the resolution of support is not a recognized title in Nursing nation wide. We go from clinical lecturer to clinical assistant professor. I suggest that the words "and Clinical Senior Lecturer and the promotion to the respective ranks. " be struck and that the "Furthermore ..." sentence be allowed to take care of the matter.

Question: In point 1 in the guidelines, I note the phrase "or its equivalent". Perhaps that refers to point 4, which talks about service as a part-time faculty member.

[“4. (first paragraph) If an IUSB associate faculty member gains a lectureship position, for the purposes of promotion to senior lecturer every eight (8) courses he/she taught as an associate faculty member will count as one (1) year of full-time teaching experience.”]

My question is whether there has been any consideration of people with long experience as full-time lecturers at other institutions?

Comment: That's an important question. It's really an issue relating to the initial appointment. For tenure-track appointments, we negotiate in some cases a certain number of years toward tenure. We should do a similar negotiation for lecturers. For individuals who have been hired as lecturers already, but without such an initial evaluation, we could reexamine those cases and possibly reduce the time before they become eligible for Senior Lecturer status. The same procedure should be used in point 4. This should be a matter for negotiation and not a mandate.

Suggestion: I would like to suggest that an additional, separate point be added, to the effect that "Appointees to the rank of lecturer may negotiate credit toward service at the time of appointment. Qualified candidates may be hired at the rank of Senior Lecturer."

Comment: I agree with the first clause, but I'm not sure we want to commit ourselves to hire people at the rank of Senior Lecturer. There should be a probationary period.

Comment: If we're going to be giving credit toward Senior Lecturer rank, then something should happen if the person doesn't qualify for appointment to Senior Lecturer. There should be an up-or-out requirement. Regular faculty who take credit for prior service are forced to go up or out sooner than if no credit had been taken.

Response: It seems to me that this depends on whether we make this compulsory or optional. If it's not compulsory, then I don't see how we could throw them out, but if it is compulsory, then it is like a tenure case.

Comment: We need to first address the issue of whether going up for Senior Lecturer is compulsory or optional, because everything else depends on that. It's a very different thing if it's mandatory up-or-out as opposed to an optional, can-try-again sort of situation.

Comment: I agree with that. And I also agree that it can only be up-or-out if it is compulsory. Otherwise it would take a lot of nerve to go up voluntarily if failing to make it meant you lost your job.

Question: Is there any implication that a person achieving Senior Lecturer status would then have an enhanced status regarding which courses they may teach or what service they may perform?

Answer: The only thing the trustees have mandated is that the person be given a longer term contract.

Question: What is the current status of lecturers with regard to membership in the Academic Senate? Can they serve on committees? For example, can they serve on the PTR committee?

Answer: They are members of the senate, and generally speaking they can serve on committees. There are certain restrictions on membership in the PTR committee. There is one slot for a non-tenured person, but without looking carefully at the language I can't say whether a lecturer could serve in that slot.

Comment: There is a big difference between getting tenure and becoming a Senior Lecturer, which is a limited term appointment.

Comment: I would like to speak against an up-or-out policy, because I think it would have negative effects. I suggest that we view it as an academic promotion instead of its being like a tenure decision.

Comment: I agree. The potential benefit is low but the sanction is high.

Comment: This question of whether it is compulsory and the linked question of up-or-out are extremely important, but I doubt that we can decide that today. Also, the deans might have some things that they want to say about this question. I believe that the Non-Tenure Track Committee should debate these matters and decide whether to put them into the guidelines. And they should be ready to state their reasons for their decision.

Schreiber: Let's move on to point 2 in the guidelines. Are there any comments on the basic criteria for promotion to Senior Lecturer?

["2. (first paragraph) The basic criteria for receiving a promotion to senior lecturer will consist of displaying 1) excellence in teaching, AND 2) a satisfactory performance either in a) service or b) scholarship; OR in achieving excellence in those responsibilities that have been assigned to them by individual colleges, schools, and units."]

Suggestion: The clause starting with OR is redundant. Anything that a lecturer would be assigned to do would surely fall under teaching, service, or scholarship.

Response: The lecturer who serves as Director of ARC [Academic Resource Center] has a quasi-administrative appointment, which is different from performing routine departmental tasks like serving on committees.

Response: In PTR discussions, all forms of administrative work are counted in the service category.

Response: That clause was put there because of wide differences among the various schools and colleges. It was meant to cover any cases not anticipated by the committee. If no one feels that the clause is necessary, we can take it out.

Response: The implication as it presently reads is that a candidate could be excellent in teaching, unsatisfactory in both service and scholarship, but qualified nevertheless for promotion on other grounds.

Suggestion: The second paragraph in point 2 states what a candidate must do to establish the case for promotion to Senior Lecturer, but it speaks only to the matter of documenting excellence in teaching. It should also speak to the question of how candidates can demonstrate appropriate achievement in scholarship or service. I think a single sentence could do it.

Question: Do lecturers have responsibility as part of their jobs to perform service and scholarship?

Answer: Yes in the case of service; no in the case of scholarship.

Comment: The expectation for service is somewhat less than the expectation for tenured and tenure-track faculty. We have no obligation in the area of scholarship, and may I say we have no time. We teach 12 credits per semester. I have some concern about the possibility of being expected to demonstrate scholarship when the university gives us no released time to do it.

Comment: In nursing the lecturers and clinical ranks are not obligated to engage in scholarship, but the expectation of service is at the same level as for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Comment: If that were not the case, then there would be no reason to have full time appointments. The difference between hiring associate faculty to teach 4 courses and hiring a lecturer to teach 4 courses is exactly the service component.

Comment: The language of the first paragraph in point 2 comes from the Associate Faculty Handbook, and the OR clause comes from the Faculty Handbook of Indiana University.

Question: In the first paragraph of point 2 the relationship of the AND and the OR is not clear. Excellence is mentioned after the OR, but only satisfactory performance is mentioned after the AND. Is the OR a replacement of 1) and 2) above, or is it a replacement of 2) only?

Suggestion: the committee should probably clarify the language there.

Response: the intent was that the OR refer only to 2), but we will try to clarify that.

Suggestion: In the interest of simplicity, just leave out the OR clause. In my unit we are very creative in shoving everything relevant to into the teaching, scholarship, or service category. The point is to document any contribution so that people can evaluate it.

Schreiber: Any more comments on point 2? [Pause.] Let's move on to discuss point 3.

[“3. Those currently holding IUSB lectureship positions who have held such positions for five years or more shall be eligible to immediately apply for promotion to senior lecturer in the next academic year.”]

Comment: Here again the issue of whether going up for promotion is obligatory becomes very important. If a lecturer came in and checked their mail and discovered that they were going up for promotion to Senior Lecturer, that could be a real downer.

Schreiber: Any more comments on point 3? [Pause] Let's move on to discuss point 4.

[See above for first paragraph of point 4.]

Question: Concerning the second paragraph of point 4, I'm not familiar with the qualifications required to achieve Merit Status for associate faculty. Are they essentially the same as those stated in the first paragraph of point 2?

[“4. (second paragraph) If a current holder of an IUSB lectureship position previously was a member of IUSB's associate faculty, and if that individual during that time applied for and received

IUSB Associate Faculty Merit Status, he/she shall be considered to have been promoted to the rank of senior lecturer as long as all other qualification are met.”]

Answer: The qualifications include all elements in the first paragraph of point 2.

Comment: I think that having achieved Merit Status while an associate faculty member should be regarded as a big plus, but there could be cases where a person could get one but not the other. I don't think it should allow a person to be grandfathered into Senior Lecturer rank. It's not done in the analogous situation for the tenure process. It is possible that someone might achieve Merit Status and then be hired as a lecturer years later but not really be not performing at the level expected of a Senior Lecturer.

Question: I wonder about the rationale for having 8 courses taught as an associate faculty member count as one year of full-time teaching. Are we confusing terms of appointment with initial appointment here?

Response: The committee felt that prior service as an associate faculty member should qualify for some credit toward the probationary period before going up for Senior Lecturer rank. We used 8 courses because a full-time lecturer teaches 8 courses during one year.

Comment: I am nervous about the extreme cases that would be possible under that condition. If an associate faculty member has been teaching two courses a semester for eight years and then is hired as a lecturer, that person could go up for Senior Lecturer after just one year teaching full time. Although the responsibilities of the two positions overlap strongly, they are not the same job. Someone who flourished as an associate faculty member may perform poorly under the pressure of teaching 12 credits a semester and meeting the heightened expectation for service. I am not aware of anyone being able in the case of the tenure probationary period to have it shortened on the basis of part time service. I am sympathetic to the view that long experience as an associate faculty member should count for something. Maybe there should be a compromise such as a cap of three years toward Senior Lecturer status.

Comment: I think this should be handled as was suggested earlier. When someone is hired as a lecturer, they sit down with the dean and negotiate the number of years of credit toward the probationary period. That's a better way to handle it than having some mandatory credit forced onto a school. It provides some flexibility.

Comment: I agree. The faculty member may wish to have all the time allowed and not be forced to go up for promotion too soon.

Question: What about visiting lecturers? How would their service be counted?

Response: That should be dealt with in the guidelines.

Comment: Just so people know what we're talking about when it comes to Merit Status, let me provide some facts. Merit Status was introduced in 1984. In the 18 years it has existed there have been 20 persons given Merit Status. Of those, 14 are still here at IUSB. Many have moved into permanent positions. One is deceased, two are in the private sector. Some have gone elsewhere. We are not talking about very many people.

Comment: Having seen dossiers for Merit Status, I would say they contain about the same material that would, under these guidelines, have to be in a dossier for promotion to Senior Lecturer. But the dossiers have been judged by a committee that's not the PTR committee, so I am against simply grandfathering in lecturers who have attained Merit Status. I think, however, that anyone who has achieved Merit Status should be able to update their dossier without much effort in preparation for consideration by the PTR committee. As a number of people have said, most of these issues about credit toward Senior Lecturer status can be handled during negotiation of initial appointments. If we put a cap on the number of years of credit, say 2 years, then that can take care of most of our concerns. I believe that in tenure-track negotiations there are caps on years toward tenure.

Comment: One factor that should be considered is that many associate faculty would have become lecturers sooner if positions had been available to them earlier. Only with the recent increase in the number of lectureships available have these individuals had the chance to become lecturers. Many would have been lecturers if those positions had been available.

Schreiber: Let's move on now to a discussion of point 5.

["5. The procedures for evaluating a candidate's application, and the routing of that application, should be the same as that followed by candidates for tenure."]

Question: Does this mean that these cases will go to the Senate PTR Committee?

Answer: That will need to be determined. Should they be routed through the PTR committee, or should a parallel structure be set up to handle these cases?

Comment: I think they should go through the regular PTR committee. I think it is important that they be judged by the regular faculty, whose responsibility it is to make judgments of this kind.

Question: Should there be a lecturer on the PTR committee?

Response: There can be one already. There is a slot for a non-tenured faculty member.

Comment: The word "non-tenured" implies tenurable.

Comment: It seems to me that there would be vagaries in the composition of the PTR committee, because some departments use lecturers and some don't, so the PTR committee might not have members that are very familiar with lecturers. I wonder if there could be some mechanism by which various academic units could address that problem.

Response: All that the Senate can do is decide matters concerning the Senate PTR Committee. Each academic unit will need to determine for itself how these cases will be handled.

Comment: Point 5 actually speaks to 4: if candidates for Senior Lecturer are to be treated in the same way as tenure candidates, then when an associate with Merit Status is hired, they should not automatically be given Senior Lecturer rank.

Comment: The fact that most of the faculty are not familiar with the process by which Merit Status is awarded to associate faculty suggests that these cases should go through the PTR committee to make faculty aware of the qualifications of those holding Merit Status.

Comment: I think we should look at the workload that will be forced on the PTR committee. That's already one of the most heavily burdened of the Senate committees. These cases could add significantly to their work.

Comment: Actually it might reduce the load on that committee. As things now stand, every lecturer and every clinical faculty member must be reviewed for reappointment every year.

Comment: I would like to add to an earlier comment. It would be an advantage to lecturers to go through the regular PTR committee. That would emphasize for everyone that they are regular full time faculty.

Schreiber: Let's move on now to a discussion of point 6.

["6. A successful candidate who is approved for promotion to senior lecturer must receive a long-term contract, being no less than three years in duration."]

Comment: The term should be longer. Already lecturers are being given 2-year contracts. I suggest that it be at least 5 years.

Comment: I agree. Let's make it worthwhile for people to take the trouble to be promoted.

Comment: I want to be careful here in what I am about to say. I am not attacking any of our fine associate faculty or full time lecturers. But I find this discussion profoundly disheartening. We have been talking about this in a blissful way, ignoring the very real possibility that some future unscrupulous chancellor could use this provision to hire a faculty made up entirely of lecturers and

Senior Lecturers, abolish tenure, and turn IUSB into a glorified community college and not a university campus. There is nothing in these guidelines or resolution that would prevent that.

Comment: I understand that concern, but I think the protection of tenure has to stand elsewhere than in a document of this kind. It rests with the Senate, with the president, with the Board of Trustees, with the faculty handbook. I am not as worried about it as my colleague.

Comment: I want to second that comment. The same idea could be applied to associate faculty, who have been with us for years.

Comment: It's here. The University of Phoenix is here.

Comment: It's not here. It's not in South Bend.

Comment: Well it can be tomorrow morning.

Comment: Just a point of information: the Chronicle of Higher Education reports that Western Michigan University is now granting tenure to clinical faculty and lecturers.

Comment: The Purdue campus in Fort Wayne has a provision for tenuring lecturers.

Comment: Schools I have taught at earlier have had a de facto rule about the percentage of tenured and non-tenured faculty, which I don't know whether IU has. Perhaps we should consider having rules that say no more than a certain percentage of the faculty can be lecturers, and similarly for Senior Lecturers.

Comment: For the Medical School and the School of Nursing, which is a system-wide school, there is such a restriction on the number of clinical faculty.

Comment: I believe that restriction applies more broadly. I believe there is a restriction on the percentage of faculty who can hold the position of lecturer.

Schreiber closed the discussion of the Senior Lecturer rank and asked those present which of two items they wished to deal with next: a report from the Senate Budget Committee, or a discussion intended to advise the CDC on how to respond to the four questions from the IU presidential search committee (see item 9 in the Chancellor's Report above). There appeared to be more support for a Budget Committee report. During the report, President Schreiber left the meeting, leaving Vice President McMillen to preside.

Report on the Campus Budget (Senate Budget Committee)

The chair of the committee, Paul Herr, thanked Chancellor Reck for the openness of the process she is using to deal with budget matters. As an indication of that openness, he remarked that he will be meeting with her twice each semester. Also, there has been a return to the practice of having the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs and for Finance be ex officio members of the Senate Budget Committee.

Last year there was considerable concern on campus about how to deal with a projected budget short-fall of about \$800,000 in the year 2003-4 budget. That projection is no longer accurate because of two things that have happened: we had a significant increase in student credit hour enrollment last year that generated substantial income, and the Board of Trustees also allowed the campus to raise tuition more than we had anticipated. So now there is about a \$200,000 gap that is being covered by one-time monies. We still have budgetary difficulties. First, the legislature is not likely to have new money to help us out in the coming year. Second, the legislature withheld one month's allocation of funds to IU, so we were forced to borrow money and pay interest on it. Third, the IU administration absorbed some of the cuts that the university was asked to make last year by deferring the spending of renovation and technology money. We may need to come up with some of that money this year.

Herr displayed a number of slides showing current budget figures and percentages. All information in the slides was also available in paper form at the meeting. Herr encouraged anyone with concerns about the budget to contact committee members listed there.

Herr noted that about 54% of our budget comes from state appropriations. This percentage has been decreasing steadily in recent years. The students are being forced to make up for most of this decrease. About 69% of our expenditures are for personnel, so that makes our budget somewhat inflexible. Of that, about 50% is faculty salaries, 25% goes for other salaries and wages, and about 25% is retirement and benefits, a percentage that has been increasing.

Figures for income and expenditure changes from last year to this were noted. In particular, a large percent increase in faculty compensation dollars was explained primarily by the fact that 10 new lectureships were added (it was not a case of some people getting gigantic raises). The Budget Committee has been discussing a "template" for reporting budget figures to the faculty. The committee believes that one of its important responsibilities is to keep faculty informed about the budget. It would be useful to develop a set of numbers that will be reported each year so that faculty can see what is happening. We might also want to look each year at the allocation of

dollars to the various academic units. This will give us an idea of where our money is going and what we are supporting.

Last year an item that came to the committee was a suggestion that faculty summer salaries be capped at \$5,000 per course. That was part of the discussions by the committee with the deans. The committee endorsed a series of cuts, including the summer salary caps. When these matters came before the committee again this year, the committee took a somewhat different position. Herr read a statement sent by the committee to Vice Chancellor Guillaume concerning the salary caps:

“The Academic Senate Budget Committee took up and considered the Dean’s Council recommendation that faculty summer salaries be capped at \$5,000 beginning in the summer of 2003. The committee had given its assent to a proposal to cap summer salaries last year in the context of an impending budget crisis. However, even in agreeing to that proposal, the committee expressed reservations about the focus of proposed cuts on academic support. After considerable discussion of this proposal, the committee declined to support the recommendation for several reasons. The major concern was that money heretofore going to faculty salaries not be used to expand programs or hire administrators. Over recent years, increases in support for S&E, travel, research etc. have been minimal or non-existent and salary increases have not been large. In addition, some faculty argued that this proposal would undercut the summer programming while others thought that this would make us less competitive for new faculty. We think that this proposal would weaken academic programs and further erode our competitiveness for excellent faculty members. Because committee members do support hiring someone in institutional research, we urge the deans to consider other alternatives to funding this position.”

Vice Chancellor Guillaume added a clarification that the summer salary cap proposal was intended by the administration to free up funds to support the newly created position of Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research, which has been ranked by nearly everyone on campus as extremely important.

Question: Is that position being funded entirely out of the Office of Academic Affairs?

Answer: That position now will report to the chancellor, but it will support strongly the mission of Academic Affairs.

Comment: The reason I asked the questions is that it seems the position would also provide support for communications and marketing, fund raising, lobbying, and all those activities that lie outside affairs. It seems that money is not coming from those areas to fund that office.

Response: The money for that office would not all come from a cap. A cap would not cover the cost because there will be other costs than just the salary of that person. It will also have to fund the support services (secretary, etc.) for that person. So Academic Affairs will pay for part of it.

Comment: I'm glad that the committee voted as it did. I think that a policy to cap summer salaries should be part of a bigger discussion of the summer session. Adopting a cap may have a large impact on the summer program that we have not anticipated. Both we and our students have a large stake in the summer program. We have been discussing the summer program for about 3 years. Adopting salary caps may decide some issues in ways that we may not approve of.

Herr said that the committee seeks faculty input. Budget discussions with Vice Chancellor Guillaume will begin on Monday, November 18, and members of the Budget Committee will be sitting in on that. The Budget Committee has decided to emphasize certain priorities, but if faculty members think others should be emphasized they should let the committee know. The priorities that the committee has adopted are as follows:

- (1) The preservation of the salary pool.
- (2) All new programs should be funded from base budget money.
- (3) No new programs should be begun without review of existing programs.
- (4) Funds for travel, S&E [supplies and equipment], and research should be increased.

McMillen adjourned the meeting at 11:55.

Respectfully submitted,
William Knight
Secretary of the Academic Senate