

Indiana University South Bend  
Minutes of the Academic Senate  
21 February 2003

Members Present: P. Aghimien, G. Anderson, A. W. Bartholomew, D. Barton, M. Basolo-Kunzer, E. Bender, E. Bennion, J. Blodgett, L. Blodgett, J. Bushong, J. Chaney, L. Chen, Y. Cheng, N. Colborn, L. Collins, R. Cordell, S. Cress, M. Darnel, T. Demmon, J. Detlef, T. Dobrzykowski, N. Duncan, K. Egerton, S. Elder, R. Espahbodi, W. Feighery, E. Fenner, L. Fisher, L. Garber, S. Gerencser, K. Gindele, J. Good, J. Gottwald, A. Guillaume, G. Hadley, H. Hakimzadeh, C. Harrington, P. Henry, G. Huitink, J. Hurst, R. Isaacson, K. Jackson, J. Klein, W. Knight, P. Kochanowski, L. Lambert, M. Lee, J. Lewis, E. Lucal, E. Maher, M. Makielski, D. Marr, J. McIntosh, D. McMillen, P. McNeal, S. Meyer, T. Miller, E. Mooney, F. Naffziger, S. Norton, S. Opasik, P. Pierce, C. Quinn, U. M. Reck, E. Roth, A. Sabbaghi, M. Scanlan, R. Schreiber, C. Schult, B. Schwartz, R. Schwartz, F. Shan, M. Shillingsburg, S. Shore, K. Smant, K. Smith, C. Sofhauser, Y. Song, D. Surma, R. Torstrick, D. Vernon, D. Vollrath, C. White, J. Wolfer, N. Yokom, D. Youngs, L. Zynda.

Thanks to the generosity of IUSB Dining Services, light refreshments were available just outside the meeting room during the half hour preceding the meeting.

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

## I. Administrative Reports

### The Report of Chancellor Reck

1. The budget process is on schedule. Hearings have been held. At the April meeting information will be given about priorities. It may be necessary to tweak the process for next year.
2. The one-time monies available this year are substantial: about \$783,000. The sources of these monies are salary savings from Academic Affairs, HRS, and unspent funds for PeopleSoft implementation. About \$200,000 will be set aside for emergencies. The lion's share of the remainder will go to Academic Affairs. Administrative and Fiscal Affairs will get just under \$100,000. More details can be found at the following URL:

[www.iusb.edu/chancellor/remarks/2002-03augequipchancellorpresentation-1.pdf](http://www.iusb.edu/chancellor/remarks/2002-03augequipchancellorpresentation-1.pdf)

3. Soon each student who enters IUSB will be charged a \$500 "Academic Enhancement" fee. Our campus has just submitted to Vice President and CFO Judy Palmer a revised proposal for the way we intend to use the funds on our campus. Chancellor Reck read an email from Palmer that suggested some things that could be part of the revision. The revised proposal includes such things as (a) reducing dependence on part-time faculty with two new lecturers and two new tenure track positions each year for the first three years; two new tenure track positions each year thereafter;

- (b) improving retention with increased use of Supplemental Instructors in lower division courses and bringing SAC staffing to full strength;
- (c) ensuring library access;
- (d) promoting diversity among students and faculty;
- (e) enhancing instruction (e.g., increasing overhead projector availability).

More details can be found at the following URL:

<http://www.iusb.edu/chancellor/remarks/acadehanc03.pdf>

If this proposal receives approval, it may not be necessary to maintain a cap on summer salaries, although that depends on the report of the Summer School Task Force.

4. The faculty were thanked for their help in having students fill out the survey on campus residential housing.
5. On March 27 the YWCA Women's Luncheon will be held on our campus. Gloria Steinem will be the speaker. Parking plans to accommodate the visitors to campus and meet the needs of students and faculty are being made.
6. The chancellor read an email from a student praising IUSB faculty and the experience the student had on returning to school at age 50.

#### The Report of Vice Chancellor Guillaume

1. Interviews for the Dean of the Division of Nursing and Health Professions have been completed, and candidate recommendations have been made to Chancellor Reck and Vice Chancellor Guillaume. Interviews for the Dean of Education are being conducted, with two scheduled for next week. Interviews for the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology have been completed and a report has been given to the chancellor. Interviews for the Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs and University Advancement are also in the process of being conducted.
2. There are three important dates that faculty should keep in mind:  
March 28 is the reception for associate faculty;  
April 11 is the reception for faculty who have published in the last year;  
May 12 is the reception for retiring faculty.
3. The proposal for a B.S. degree in Informatics will be presented by our campus administrators and the IU Dean of Informatics at the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting next week.
4. At the next Academic Officers Council (the council of chief academic officers from the various IU campuses) Guillaume will present our campus proposals for a certificate in Applied Informatics, an M.A.T. (Master of Arts in Teaching) degree in English, and an M.A. degree in English.
5. There will be a job fair for our students on March 21 at the SAC, from 10:00 to 3:00.

6. Today at noon, Tom Mawhinney of the Psychology Department will present a Dean's Seminar talk on "Behavioral Contagion: How Our Bad Behavior Gets Worse."

## II. Approval of Minutes

President Schreiber asked for approval of the minutes of the Senate meeting of January 17. The minutes were approved without dissent.

## III. Senate Constitutional Amendment on Quorum

Secretary Knight reported the results of the balloting on the proposed constitutional amendment to change the quorum number for Academic Senate meetings to 50 members:

54 members voted in favor of the amendment;

21 members opposed the amendment;

10 envelopes had no signature or other identification to allow authentication of senate membership;

4 envelopes had illegible signatures and no other identification to allow authentication.

## IV. Report of the Nominations Committee

The Senate Nominations Committee, whose members were Jennifer Klein, Katherine Jackson, and Jim Blodgett, proposed the following nominations for the elected posts and committees of the Senate. The nominations were presented by Klein.

Vice President: Mike Keen (LAS)

Secretary: Scot Opasik (Library)

Executive Committee, members at large: Rosanne Cordell (Library), Paul Joray\* (General Studies)

Marta Makielksi\* (NHP)

Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment: Randy Colborn\* (Arts), Michael Kinyon (LAS), Andy Schnabel (LAS), Bruce Wrenn (B&E), Jim Hurst (Education) (non-tenured)

Athletics: Randy Isaacson\* (Education), Betsy Lucal\* (LAS), Judy Schafer (NHP)

Faculty Misconduct Review: Anne Brown (LAS), Reza Espahbodi (B&E), Ellen Maher (Library),  
Doug McMillen (LAS)

UFC representative: Nanci Yokom\* (NHP)

Faculty Board of Review: Wayne Bartholomew (B&E), Linda Blodgett (B&E), Nancy Colborn  
(Library), Chris White (NHP), Lyle Zynda (LAS)

[Nominations for the Budget Committee, Information Technologies Committee, and General Studies Committee were also presented, but it was pointed out that these are not elected committees, and so their membership will be determined by the Executive Committee.]

An asterisk by a name indicates that the individual is presently serving in that post or on that committee and is willing to be re-nominated.

President Schreiber asked if there were further nominations from the floor. There being none, a motion was made to close the nominations and accept the slate proposed by the Nominations Committee. The motion was approved without dissent.

#### V. Proposal to Amend the Senate Constitution (Responsibilities of the Faculty Welfare Committee)

President Schreiber presented a proposal from the Senate Executive Committee to amend the description of the responsibilities of the Faculty Welfare Committee to take into account the fact that, by mandate of the IU Board of Trustees, there is now a Senate Faculty Misconduct Committee. The proposal would affect the wording of ARTICLE VII. [Standing Committees], Section 7 [Committees and Their Authority] D. [The Committee on Faculty Welfare].

**Current Wording:** The Committee for Faculty Welfare shall have authority over matters pertaining to faculty conduct, discipline, salaries, fringe benefits, research, academic freedom and working conditions. It shall be concerned with all academic personnel and procedure matters not specifically delegated to other committees.

**Amended Wording:** The Committee for Faculty Welfare shall have authority over matters pertaining to salaries, fringe benefits, research, academic freedom and working conditions. It shall be concerned with all academic personnel and procedure matters not specifically delegated to other committees.

There being no comments from the floor, a motion was made to close the discussion. The motion was approved without dissent. The motion will be submitted on a ballot to all members of the Senate.

#### VI. A Resolution from the Senate Faculty Welfare Committee

Karen Gindele presented the following resolution proposed by the Faculty Welfare Committee for adoption by the Senate:

**Resolved:** We, the members of the Academic Senate of Indiana University South Bend, hereby endorse the policy of family leave for faculty members as defined below:

1. During a partially-paid family leave, the academic appointee released from normal teaching duties shall be paid two-thirds of the appointee's salary.
2. No additional duties shall be assigned during a partially-paid family leave.

The resolution was presented (in the words of the committee) "in order to promote consistency and fairness in the application of the family leave policy, the Faculty Welfare Committee would like to present to the Senate a resolution urging more uniform expectations for the duties and salary of the faculty person requesting family leave. The Faculty Welfare Committee has been the body at IUSB to approve leave but ordinarily has no knowledge of compensation. We are presenting a resolution which we would like to see adopted by the IUSB faculty because proposing changes to the Faculty

Handbook, which governs all the campuses, would be a lengthy and complex process that we believe could better (and more quickly) be implemented by and for this campus alone.”

Members of the Welfare Committee explained that the IUSB Faculty Handbook at the present time is not consistent with the IU Faculty Handbook, which governs all campuses, and that as a result, the IUSB handbook will have to be brought into line, in several of its clauses governing family leaves, with the all-IU handbook. The goal of the resolution is to promote equity in granting family leaves on this campus.

Comment: The IU Faculty Handbook goes on to say that duties during a family leave shall be negotiated, and that the salary will be based on those duties. Someone who wants their duties reduced to the minimum possible may now not have that option if everyone is to be given 2/3 of their salary. This might lead to individuals being forced to take a complete leave without pay just because they could not continue the duties required for 2/3 salary.

Response: We felt that we were taking that into account when we said that the individual would be released from teaching duties. The expectation was that scholarship and service would continue at normal levels.

Comment: I feel it would be better to stick with the IU Handbook language. I don't see any reason for different language.

Question: How would this apply to faculty members who are administrators and have no teaching duties or reduced teaching?

Response: This language is not meant to apply to administrators who have not teaching duties.

Comment: All faculty members are covered under the Family Leave Act. So any policy about leaves for faculty members needs to apply to administrators, directors, etc.

Response: The same problem applies to librarians and clinical faculty. It's clear that in those cases there has to be negotiation as to what the duties will be.

Question: How would this apply to lecturers whose responsibilities are essentially 100% teaching, with some service expectation?

Comment: Maybe the language should say that this policy applies to tenure and tenure-track faculty with a 75% teaching responsibility, and that other situations should be negotiated. The policy makes a lot of sense for faculty with 9 hour teaching loads.

Comment: What that says is that you can't have a child until you're tenured.

Comment: I believe this policy contradicts the IU Handbook policy, which is in effect our contract. These two have to be aligned. As they stand, one is a requirement and one is a guideline with a cap.

Comment: The problem is that people have been treated inequitably under the current system. Even though the handbook may say that extra work is not to be given when people return from leave, some people have been told that in order to be given more than 25% of their salary while on leave, they must do extra service. We have left too much discretion to individual administrators to decide what is required for what fraction of salary.

Comment: In terms of equity, I think it would be very unfortunate to have a policy that distinguishes between lecturers and tenure or tenure track faculty, or between librarians and regular faculty.

Comment: The handbook states that there must be a panel of faculty and administrators appointed for the purpose of reviewing the granting of leaves. I'm not aware that we have been following that requirement. What has been said suggests that this has been left up to department chairs to negotiate and make the final decision.

Comment: This resolution seems to have an impact on the benefit that the Board of Trustees has decided that we are entitled to. I'm not even sure that if we pass this resolution we will know what it means.

Comment: This resolution would not be binding. It cannot actually force administrators to follow the guideline suggested here. I would note that in times of budget difficulties, universities that adopt family-friendly policies are more likely to attract and retain the best qualified people.

Comment: By adopting this policy we would be encouraging administrators to use the most generous interpretation of the stated policy when negotiating leaves.

President Schreiber asked whether the members were ready to vote, and whether they wished to vote on the two items as a unit or possibly divide them for the purpose of voting. A motion to divide was made and approved without dissent.

A voice vote on the first item was inconclusive, so a show of hands was taken. The motion failed by a vote of 30 to 23. There were 7 abstentions.

The second item was approved by voice vote without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
William Knight  
Secretary of the Academic Senate