

INDIANA UNIVERSITY SOUTH BEND
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING MINUTES
January 15, 1999

Present: S. Agarwal, D. Agbetsiafa, S. Ahire, G. Anderson, K. Barker, D. Barton, E. Bender, J. Blodgett, D. Bradley-Kantor, C. Brown, E. Bruning, J. Bushong, L. Chen, Y. Cheng, K. Clark, R. Clark, R. Cohen, A. Cooper, R. Cordell, L. Crimson, S. Cubelic, M. Darnel, J. Detlef, M. Duttaray, R. Espahbodi, L. Fisher, W. Feighery, B. Fong-Morgan, W. Frascella, L. Fritschner, F. Fujita, L. Garber, S. Gerencser, J. Good, A. Grens, G. Hadley, M. Heck, W. Hojnacki, J. Houghton, G. Huitink, P. Joray, K. Karl, N. Karakatsanis, B. Kern, G. Kern, J. Klein, K. Knauss, R. Kohli, S. Konzelmann, V. Larson, M. Lee, E. Lucal, M. Lynker, E. Maher, M. Makielski, V. T. Mawhinney, J. McIntosh, G. McLean, J. Metelli, G. Mettetal, M. Myers, A. Naylor, G. Nazaroff, P. Newcomb, S. Norton, R. Osborn, M. Pettengill, P. Pierce, C. Quinn, V. Riemenschneider, M. Russo, A. Sabbaghi, S. Sage, P. Saksena, C. Satre, M. Scanlan, E. Scarborough, A. Schnabel, B. Schuck, C. Schult, S. Sernau, D. Schlapentokh, S. Shore, K. Smant, K. Smith, V. Smith, C. Sofhauser, Y. Song, L. Steck, C. Sutton, M. Tetzlaff, R. Torstrick, M. Truex, D. Van Auken, D. Vollrath, K. Waters, S. Winicur, L. Young

President V. Riemenschneider welcomed senate members to the January 15th meeting of the academic senate and announced a change in the agenda. Chancellor Perrin would give his report first and the teaching award would follow.

I. Administrative Reports

- A. Chancellor Ken Perrin (See Attachment A).
2. Library Campaign, Michele Russo (See Attachment B).
3. John Lewis, Presentation of Teaching Award to Associate Professor and Director of Women's Studies, Pat McNeal-Dolan

John Lewis announced that Pat would receive an upward adjustment of her salary and also presented her with a plaque.

4. Acting Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs, Richmond Calvin (See attachment C).

Questions and Answers:

S. Winicur asked why all students don't take reading tests and what do we do with the students who can't read? Vice Chancellor Calvin responded that some students come in at the last minute and some transfer in from other schools, or the test is not offered and

students are asked to take it the next semester. E. Maher stated the admissions committee was taking a look at that question. She noted that some divisions don't require testing in every case. She believes there are enough opportunities to take the test, however, the need to take the test is not being communicated. She also believes there is not enough teeth being put into the results of the test (i.e., no consequence for low scores). The discussion was interrupted by President V. Riemenschneider due to the long agenda.

D. Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, John Lewis (See Attachment D).

II. Presiding Officer

A. Meeting officially called to order at 10:25 a.m.

2. The minutes of the October 16th meeting were approved as presented in the Academic Senate folder of the shared drive.

III. Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Risler

The resolution was presented by Professor Hojnacki, Director of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs (See Attachment E).

It was moved and seconded that the resolution in recognition of the contributions of Professor Emeritus Risler be adopted.

22. Old Business

The Faculty Board of Review has revised the amendment of Article X based on Senate discussion of this amendment at the September meeting. Professor Garber, chair of the committee, submitted the committee's revision for your discussion. The enactment of this amendment will only apply to cases initiated after the official vote has been recorded and reported to members of the Senate. (Please refer to Attachment F for a copy of the amendment.)

1. President V. Riemenschneider opened the floor for discussion of the amendment to Article X., Section 2, subsection C. The amendment deletes the word proposed and changes dismissals to dismissal. (There were no objections to this wording at the September meeting.) It was moved (D. Barton) and seconded (J. Lewis) to close debate. Motion passed.

B. Discussion of Article X., Section 2, subsection E. It was moved and seconded to close debate. Motion passed.

3. Discussion of the amendment to Article X, Section 2, subsection F. The amendment

deletes this subsection.

M. Darnell noted that the proposed changes eliminate the opportunity for the faculty member to have an open hearing if one is desired and also eliminates the requirement for a full stenographic record. He felt these points were well worth keeping in their present form. E. Maher, as a point of information, asked whether the UFC guidelines have priority over our guidelines. V. Riemenschneider responded yes. E. Maher stated that any changes we might make would represent substantive changes that contradict the UFC guidelines. V. Riemenschneider read the minimum standards regarding the Faculty Board of Review from the IU handbook (p. 27, See Attachment G). M. Darnell noted that the UFC described minimum standards and that there was no harm in going beyond those minimum standards. V. T. Mawhinney read the most recent UFC changes regarding item 7 (The faculty on each campus, through its governance system, shall establish the conditions under which the procedures for its Faculty Board of Review hearings will be open or closed.). E. Scarborough, suggested that an amendment be made such that the last two sentences in subsection F be retained. It was moved (M. Darnell) and seconded (R. Calvin and T. Mawhinney) that subsection F be amended as suggested. V. Riemenschneider read the revised amendment (In the hearing before the Faculty Board of Review, a full stenographic record of the hearing shall be prepared and made available to the parties concerned. The hearing shall be conducted in private but shall be open if the faculty member so requests.). J. Lewis made a point of clarification that the revised amendment would require both a full taped record and a full stenographic record. E. Maher made a friendly amendment that we add the two phrases to E rather than keep a section F. V. Riemenschneider replied that leaving the two sentences in section F would be easier. The motion in favor of the new amendment passed. A motion was made (R. Schreiber) and seconded (M. Darnell) to close debate. Motion carried.

4. Discussion of Article X, Section 2, G. There was no discussion. It was moved (R, Schreiber) and seconded (R. Calvin) to close debate. Motion passed. Motion carried.

VI. New Business

1. Resolution presented by the IUSB Assessment committee

Be it resolved that the IUSB Academic Senate supports the requirement for participation in a general education assessment activity prior to graduation for all students.

It was moved and seconded (L. Garber) to adopt the resolution.

2. Discussion

S. Winicur stated she supported a requirement for participation. However, she is hesitant to give endorsement for a general education (GE) assessment activity to a non-senate committee. S. Gerencser expressed concern over the lack of clarity in the resolution (e.g., what is the activity, who is participating, and what is prior to graduation?). R. Schreiber is concerned that we are moving towards an exit test requirement that could result in not granting a degree. R. Cordell stated that participation is by students and does not affect departments or their assessment efforts. The activity refers to the ETS test described in the October meeting. Because a better instrument may be found in the future, a specific test was not mentioned in the resolution. S. Shore expressed concern over not knowing what the purpose of the assessment was and saw no reason to accept the resolution. K. Smith stated that the most important purpose was to assess GE. If the Assessment Committee is to be responsible for assessing GE, then they need more power to enforce the taking of the test. Inviting students to take the test hasn't worked. P. Schnur reinforced K. Smith's comments and noted that GE assessment was an important part of our upcoming NCA accreditation efforts. D. Barton asked whether passing the test requirement would result in denying a degree if a student refused to take the test. R. Cordell responded that was correct. S. Winicur asked whose committee was the Assessment Committee. J. Lewis responded it was an Academic Affairs Committee. W. Fieghery asked how can you assess GE if there is no common GE requirement. President V. Riemenschneider noted that there were lots of questions and asked what should be done with the proposed resolution. S. Norton moved that the issue be referred to the curriculum committee (seconded by S. Winicur). D. Barton offered a friendly amendment to refer it to the Executive Committee. The friendly amendment was accepted. L. Garber stated that he thought it was appropriate for the curriculum committee to look at because the curriculum committee has purview over degree requirements. D. Barton withdrew the friendly amendment. The withdrawal was accepted. The motion to refer to the curriculum committee passed.

VII. Reports

A. UFC Report, Mawhinney (See Attachment H).

Questions and Answers:

S. Gerencser asked why the issue of changing P & T procedures has come up. V. Riemenschneider said that a concern was brought up by individuals of the all-university schools in which dossiers have to go back and forth several times from one campus to another. S. Shore asked whether we were being told we have to adopt one of the two proposed policies. V. Riemenschneider responded that we are indirectly being told that. The President has said that if we don't write our policy, Trustee Richardson will write one and pass it in the board. S. Shore asked whether we were doing this under coercion and whether the policy we adopt would be reviewed against

some ideal model. V. Riemenschneider responded that the Trustees have threatened to review each individual campus process. P. Joray added that we are being forced to do something, that our original position--that we already had review mechanisms in place--was not sufficient. V. Riemenschneider cut off the discussion and asked senate members to send comments to the faculty welfare committee.

B. Letter from Myles Brand (See Attachment I).

V. Riemenschneider added that the senate voted to impose Article X of our constitution and that article has been proceeding but was held in abeyance until further information became available. That committee will be meeting again. The only way this procedure will stop is if a motion to rescind is made from this body. Thus, the committee will meet and make a recommendation to our chancellor.

3. The Constitutional amendment to Article IX, Section 2 passed with 82 yes votes and 4 no votes. The Nominating Committee for the senate consists of Linda Blodgett, Jannette Shaw, and Nanci Yokum. Professor Furlong had to resign due to the surgery of his wife Trudy.

VIII. Announcements

- A. Lundquest Award Deadline (Feb. 12, 1999)
Professor Schnur
- B. TERA Award Deadline (Feb. 1, 1999)
Professor Anderson
- C. 1999 Job Fair - announcement will be sent out through e-mail
- D. Second Annual Dr. Martin Luther King Series,
Tonight, 7 p.m. in this room (NS 158)
Keynote speaker: IUSB Graduate Mrs. Tina M. Patton

It was moved (D. Barton) and seconded (P. Bushnell) to adjourn. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

IX. Attachments

1. Chancellor=s Report

Good morning!

It's good to see you all again. First, let me wish you a very Happy New Year! I hope you all had a pleasant holiday and that this first week of school, with all of our snow, hasn't been too trying and that your classes are off to a good start. As for me, I will have to make today's conversation very brief. I've been called to an emergency meeting with Myles to discuss the Higher Education budget proposal that is now in the house. I will report back to you on what we find on that point next month.

A couple of items. First, I'm very pleased to report that since we last met, the Trustees approved my plan to adjust librarian's salaries retroactive to July 1. This adjustment means that our librarians are no longer the poorest paid in the University. This correction was long overdue and I'm pleased the Trustees saw the wisdom of this proposal. With specific reference to the salary study we initiated relative to your salaries, the consultants will be on campus next week to meet with Paul Schnur's committee. Hopefully, they will wrap up their work this month and we can discuss their findings next month.

Speaking of consultants, the consultants reviewing the bookstore have submitted a draft report, and again, I think the final report will be available by next month. Shifting from bricks to mortar, we have been making steady progress on the bridge and should know in about three weeks whether the construction dollars will be released in this Congress. Unfortunately, this project, like so much other legislation, has been held up by the trial. We also have had some very positive conversations with a developer relative to building residential housing across the river. We are moving quickly to see if that project can be completed in the near term.

Speaking of housing, we did reduce our debt to the Foundation on the houses we acquired around the campus perimeter by some \$400,000 and we are working on re-financing the other \$800,000. As you will recall, we have only been paying on the debt service with no money going toward the principle. We also are close to acquiring the old Detention Center at a cost of \$260,000. Our plan is to demolish the facility as soon as possible and provide more parking. The architect has been working on a plan for the Associates= building and we were to see a plan this past Wednesday, but an ice storm resulted in the meeting being canceled. The session is now scheduled for next week. The plans for the Student Activity Center also are moving a pace with a schematic expected to be presented to the Trustees in February. The site selected for the center is now determined. It will be located between Wiekamp and Greenlawn. This will result in the loss of about 150 parking spaces. So you can see why the Detention Center demolition is so critical.

Well enough about facilities; let me turn my attention to two areas of concern. Since I spoke with you in October, I've spent a lot of time in Gary and also in Indianapolis. With specific reference to the IUN Chancellor's search, we have three more finalists to interview next week and one final meeting and then I'm free from that burden. My time in Indy has been focused on our own campus and the CHE. As you may have learned, we were able to convince the Commission that neither our BA in Physics, German and French should be eliminated! As Steve Shore says, We dodged that bullet! Unfortunately, we only dodged three as our Associates in Banking was hit. I am now working on an appeal to see if that program couldn't be spared. More important, probably, than any particular program being spared, I believe we have begun to see a relaxation in the Commission staff's position relative to the role of the regional campuses. The effort to delimit the role of IUSB has, at least for the moment, been taken off the table. Please be assured that I will continue to be extremely vigilant to see that our best interests are secured. I will be meeting with Stan Jones in the next several weeks to discuss the degree in Women's Studies and MIS. It has been a lot of work, but I think progress is being made.

Finally, I continue to worry a lot about the preparation of our students. Did you realize that roughly 25% of students we admit read at an 11th grade level and one-half would place lower than the 13th grade level. Sadly, the majority of these students do not have access to remedial reading classes. This mode of operation is totally unacceptable and sets students up for failure. **We must stop this practice!!** We will want to talk much more about our admissions= policies in the months ahead. Well, I could go on and tell you that we also need to discuss tuition waivers and athletic scholarships, but I have run out of time.

Let me conclude with some comments on the IUSB Faculty and Staff Library Endowment Campaign. The university has never before come to you collectively to for ask support of this kind. But this year, the library seemed a perfect project for us to tackle together. We are looking to establish a \$50,000 endowment. The interest on the endowment will initially be used to support the findings of the conspectus and collection evaluation projects which you and the library staff have been working on in order to provide a solid library collection based on our curriculum. When you receive your campaign brochure on Feb 1, I hope every member of the IUSB community will make a gift. It doesn't matter how large or small--all gifts are important. I'm happy to be here today to get the ball rolling a bit early. Shirley and I were happy to make our personal gift several days ago. Today, I want to offer some additional support. Michelle, please

come to the stage. I'm pleased to present you with a check for \$5000 in unrestricted funds that were raised these past several months to get the Campaign into high gear. Michelle, you know where to spend it!

2. Michelle Russo

Thank you, Chancellor Perrin. I'm so pleased to accept this check and I want to thank you for helping to get the IUSB Faculty and Staff Library Endowment Campaign off to a good start. I know that you and Mrs. Perrin have already made your personal gift to the campaign and I want to thank you for that as well.

The 1998-99 academic year is a special one for the Franklin D. Schurz Library as we celebrate our 10th anniversary with *The Year of the Library*. We've been, and will continue to be, engaged in many meaningful activities this year including guest lectures, book signings, and workshops. But, I have to say, and I think my library colleagues and Chancellor Perrin would agree, that the endowment campaign effort is the most meaningful and important one because it is something that we are all doing together. While *The Year of the Library* will eventually come to a close, the part that the IUSB community has played in the celebration will have a long-lasting effect on our campus. Each year this endowment will provide income allowing us to make the Franklin D. Schurz Library better for all of us.

I want to send a final word of thanks to the 14 faculty and staff members on the Library Endowment Campaign Committee who represent every division and all staff. They have worked hard to make this campaign a success and have provided valuable support. I hope you will join them in their support of the Schurz Library when you are asked to give to the Endowment Campaign in February. And, again, thank you, Chancellor Perrin, for your generous contribution.

3. Student Affairs Report, Acting Vice-Chancellor Richmond Calvin

1. This Fall as of Thursday we have about what is expected for the Spring enrollment, taking into consideration the inclement weather. In terms of head count, we are down by 113 students. We went from 6731 to 6618. On the positive side, we are up by 65 credit hours, from 56592 to 56657 and we still have one day for add/drop. So we will probably see some changes.
2. The IUSB Counseling Center is sponsoring a continuing group which includes topics on women's issues, such as: empowerment, assertiveness training, and communication. Also there will be a mixed group on relationship problems and communication.
3. If you are stressed and need relaxation the Counseling Center offers relaxation training from 1:00-2:00 p.m. on Wednesdays in Room A30C of the Administration Building.
4. Project Stay at IUSB appears to be moving at an excellent pace. For the Fall Semester 78 Faculty members referred 448 students who experienced academic and attendance problems. We appreciate your help and support. JoAnn Lowery will be contacting many of you.
5. Beginning the first week of February the Freshman Division will be hosting a series

of informal group discussions over timely topics. This is yet another facet of our student contacts outreach and will include faculty.

6. Black History Month is February and a number of programs are being offered on campus. Please observe the various postings.
7. The IUSB Job Fair is scheduled for Friday, February 12 from 1-4 p.m. at the Century Center. Career Management Services will be providing various workshops to prepare our students for success:

Making A One-Page Resume (January 27 & 28), Make the Job Fair Work For You (February 3 & 4), and Job Fair Simulation Interviews (February 8 & 9).

8. Mark your calendars now for Saturday, April 19, from 9:00 a.m. to noon. Career Management Services is working with Workforce Development Services to sponsor its annual job fair in the IUSB cafeteria focusing on summer and full-time jobs for 16-21 year olds.
9. We are currently reviewing 350 files for satisfactory academic progress. These are students who were given assistance for the Fall 98 term only. We are reviewing Fall grades to determine if they are eligible for financial aid for Spring.

We are also completing the review of two hundred seventy Quality Assurance files. These are used to determine what errors our population makes when completing the federal application.

We have received the new IUSB applications and Free Application for Federal Student Aid. 750 packets have been mailed to current students, anyone who has not received a packet in the mail by the end of January should pick up new forms and complete before March 1, 1999.

4. Academic Affairs Report, Acting Vice Chancellor John Lewis

1. I am very pleased to welcome four new full-time colleagues to the faculty this semester. Would they please stand, briefly, when I read their names, and I suggest the rest of us hold our applause until I have introduced them all.

John Davis, Visiting Lecturer in Spanish. John obtained the MA degree in Spanish from the University of Notre Dame in 1994 and is joining us for the present semester.

Matthew Holloway, Visiting Lecturer in Computer Science. Matthew obtained the MS degree in Systems Engineering from Oakland University in 1989 and has taught for us part-time since 1993. He joins the full-time faculty now for this semester.

Patricia Pierce, Assistant Professor of Nursing. Pat obtained the DNS degree from

IUPUI in 1989 and was a member of the faculty at IUSB from 1990 to 1993. We are delighted that she's come back to us.

LuAnn Woodrick, Visiting Lecturer in Nursing. LuAnn has just completed a Master's degree in Critical Care at Valparaiso University and joins us now for the present semester.

Please join me now in welcoming these new colleagues to the faculty.

2. Several faculty members and members of the professional staff were awarded grants by external agencies in the last quarter of 1998. They were Bill Hojnacki, Nanci Yokom, Connie Ruhl-Smith, Suzanne Burnham, and Sara Sage. Their grants totaled nearly \$968,000.
3. Lastly, I'd like to extend my thanks and the thanks of the IUSB community to Bill Knight for his leadership of our United Way campaign last fall. Owing to his care and energy, and to the generosity of the IUSB community, we raised just under \$26,000. I think we can all take pride in this commitment of support to the local agencies in United Way.
5. Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Risler presented by Professor Hojnacki, Director of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs

**Walt P. Risler
Memorial Resolution**

Beyond his family, Dr. Walt P. Risler had two major loves, IUSB and helping people. He pursued both of these loves faithfully until his death on June 2, 1998.

Although Walt would never claim to be one of the founders of this campus, he certainly was one of its most significant builders. For ten years, from 1963 to 1973, Walt sat at the right hand of Chancellor Lester Wolfson, while they transformed a small extension center of Indiana University into Indiana University South Bend. Those ten years were both heady and trying times. Northside was built, and Greenlawn was acquired and renovated. Faculty were hired and students recruited. The campus grew in both size and stature. At the same time, battles over promotion and tenure were long and often bitter. And, especially in the late sixties, student protests over the Vietnam war, civil rights, and other issues were a common occurrence. Walt lived through it all, and from his post as the Dean of Faculties, he forged a family of faculty, students and staff that was the match of any university in the country. It is fair to say that Walt shaped the character of this campus in ways that still influence us today. He believed in teaching, research and service; and that all three were inseparable.

In 1972, after the School of Public and Environmental Affairs was founded, Walt decided to go back to the faculty. For the rest of his career he split his time between SPEA and the Department of Sociology. There can be little doubt that each is what it is today, in large measure because of Walt Risler's influence.

At IUSB, Walt's first concern was for students. He talked with them, counseled them and encouraged them. To many he became known simply as Uncle Walt. He was someone to whom any student, or for that

matter, any faculty member, could turn for help or guidance.

Whatever else he did, Walt never forgot that he was a sociologist. He researched it, he taught it, and he lived it.

East Coast born and raised, after service in the military during World War II, Walt went to the University of Chicago in the late 1940's to study sociology with those who invented it. Walt came to believe, as they did, that sociology was an applied science; that working with people was more important than debating sociological theory. And Walt practiced what he preached.

In the early 1950's, before he finished his doctorate, Walt moved to South Bend to run the new Parkview Detention Center; then one of the most innovative Juvenile Justice programs in the country. It was at Parkview that Walt first earned his credentials as a progressive community leader.

He also, during this time, sought to extend his services to troubled families and others who needed personal advice and guidance. From adolescent intervention to marriage counseling, over the years Walt helped hundreds of families and individuals, especially young people, get through difficult times in their own lives.

Later in his career, Walt discovered a new challenge; a field that he largely created himself called threat assessment. This is a field that focuses on communication between celebrities and those who could potentially do them harm. It was his job to determine who was dangerous and who was not. In this field, which he practiced until his death, Walt gained a national reputation and following. He intervened in cases involving such notable individuals as actress Brooke Shields and Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

Walt's professional accomplishments were many, varied and significant. Yet, in the end, what he would want to be remembered for best is his role as a teacher; a craft at which he excelled in all of its many dimensions.

As important as anything is that Walt loved life itself. He was a loyal and devoted husband and father, who pursued with vigor those things he saw as both good and fun. He enjoyed fine dining and was himself an outstanding cook. He loved to travel and to see and do new things. He was a dedicated card player, and he liked nothing better than to sit down at a piano and play, by ear, fifty years worth of songs.

We grieve at Walt's passing. We are all diminished a little because of it. But, Walt lived well and did good work; for the campus, the community, and his country. We miss him in death, but his life is worthy of celebration.

In recognition of these contributions, let it therefore be resolved that the Academic Senate of Indiana University South Bend extends its deepest sympathy and sincerest condolences to Doris Risler and all the Risler children, that this resolution be recorded in the minutes of the Academic Senate and that a copy be sent to his family.

6. Constitutional Amendments

Article X. Dismissal.

Section 2. Procedures

- C. Formal dismissal proceedings shall be begun by a written communication from the Chancellor to the faculty member stating the ~~proposed~~ grounds for dismissals as formulated in "B" above.

- E. ~~Following the decision to proceed with dismissal, the~~ The Chancellor shall, by written communication, ~~also~~ inform the faculty member ~~of the dismissal and their right to appeal the decision to the Faculty Board of Review for a formal hearing.~~ that a Upon receipt of the faculty member's request for a hearing on the proposed grounds for dismissal will be conducted by the Faculty Board of Review at shall schedule a meeting at a specified time and place. This formal hearing will follow the guidelines of Article XI. FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW AND JUDICIAL COMMISSION, Section 3. Procedures and Policies beginning at B. Policies and Procedures for the Conduct of Reviews, 2. (a) and continuing through the end of Article XI.
6. ~~In the hearing before the Faculty Board of Review, the faculty member shall have the right to counsel of his/her own choice, shall be permitted to present witness or other evidence in his/her behalf and shall be entitled to the cooperation of the Faculty Board of Review in securing the attendance of witnesses and to examine all evidence presented in support of the termination of his/her appointment. A full stenographic record of the hearing shall be prepared and made available to the parties concerned. The hearing shall be conducted in private but shall be open if the faculty member so requests.~~
- F. (formerly G) ~~On the completion of the hearing, the Faculty Board of Review shall proceed promptly to decision.~~ The Faculty Board of Review shall make a recommendation on the dismissal and, at the same time, provide a written report within 45 calendar days of the completion of the dismissal hearing(s). The recommendation of the Faculty Board of Review shall be supported by explicit findings with respect to each of the grounds ~~of~~ for dismissals ~~proposed.~~ The final written report of the Faculty Board of Review shall be communicated in a registered letter immediately to the affected faculty member and to the Chancellor. The Chancellor who shall inform the President and the Board of Trustees of the action recommendation of the Faculty Board of Review and the Chancellor's final decision. The final decision of the Board of Trustees shall be communicated by the Chancellor to the affected faculty member in a registered letter.

7. FACULTY BOARDS OF REVIEW: MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR UNIFORM HEARING PROCEDURES

These minimum standards for uniform hearing procedures apply to all hearings conducted by Faculty Boards of Review established by campus governing bodies under Article V of the Constitution of the Indiana University Faculty. Purpose: These minimum standards are intended to ensure that consideration of faculty [In this document, the word "faculty" is generic and includes librarians] requests for review of university actions concerning academic freedom, reappointment, tenure, promotion, dismissal, salary adjustment, and the nature or conditions of work by Faculty Boards of Review are conducted fairly and reasonably.

4. All the members of a Faculty Board of Review shall be members of the faculty, and a majority of those shall be tenured. Members shall be elected by the faculty at large or by the faculty members of the campus faculty governance organization.
2. Complaints requesting a review of administrative action by Faculty Board of Review shall be submitted in writing. The complaint shall specify the action to be reviewed, the reasons for requesting the review, and a proposed remedy.
3. Upon receiving a complaint, a Faculty Board of Review shall provide written notice of the complaint and its particulars to the administrators 1) who are named in the complaint and 2) who are believed to be responsible for representing the University in regard to the complaint.
4. A Faculty Board of Review shall allow reasonable time for the preparation of cases to both parties, set deadlines in order to dispose of cases in a timely fashion, schedule meetings and hearings at times convenient to both parties and the Board, and provide written notice of meetings and hearings in due time to all concerned.
5. A Faculty Board of review, authorized to undertake informal efforts to resolve complaints, shall maintain a clear distinction between these efforts and its formal procedures and shall keep a written record of its informal efforts and the results these have produced.
6. A Faculty Board of Review shall prepare a written summary and a taped record of its proceedings in both formal and informal hearings, and these shall be available to member of the Board and both parties.
7. Complainants shall be allowed to choose either open or closed procedures at formal hearings.
8. A Faculty Board of Review shall develop rules to ensure that the confidentiality of all its proceedings, excepting open hearings, is preserved and that its findings and recommendations are determined and communicated without undue publicity.
9. Either or both parties to the complaint may be represented by an attorney or adviser at formal or informal hearings.
10. Both parties and the Faculty Board of Review may call witnesses, cross-examine witnesses, and request information bearing on the complaint from the University and others believed to have relevant information.
11. Members of Faculty Board of Review shall recuse themselves from considering a complaint at any stage of the process if they are members of the complainant's department (or school/college if that unit is not organized in departments) or if there is any other association with the complainant which will make (or create the appearance of making) them unable to serve impartially.
12. Formal hearings shall be conducted before the full membership of a Board of Review. The document establishing a Faculty Board of Review shall include a provision for filling vacancies on the Board.
13. Formal hearings shall be conducted so as to guarantee that both sides are present, are permitted to participate, and are able to examine and respond to all evidence presented to the Board, nor shall recommendations regarding any complaint be sent to the Chancellor or Vice President until both parties have been heard.

14. A Faculty Board of Review shall prepare written recommendations regarding complaints and provide copies to both parties within a reasonable time following the conclusion of hearings.

(Approved: University Faculty Council, April 8, 1997)

8. UFC Report, V. T. Mawhinney

President Miles Brand convened the meeting of the UFC at 1:45 p.m., on 11/10/98

President Brand and committee representatives made the following announcements and various discussions ensued:

1. It was announced that UFC minutes can now be found on the UFC web page. The address is: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc.meetings/minutes>
2. A new program is being designed. **What is it?** Professor Mike Dunn will head a 30 person advisory group. This group will be the point of departure for this project. The last similar initiative was the design of SPEA.
3. The Agenda Committee reported the following:
 - A. The proposal to accommodate expenditures for the 1820 retirement program was adopted by the University Trustees.
 - B. The Agenda Committee will not meet again until February. They expect to adopt guidelines for Faculty Review at that time. This will allow time for other IU campuses to have their policies in place for the next academic year.
 - C. In the spring the Agenda Committee will also make recommendations on the evaluation of Non-Tenure Track faculty. The strategic directions project has also been tentatively placed on the agenda.
4. The chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee asked that these dossiers be in preparation. President Brand emphasized the need to seek diversity in these nominees.
5. Faculty Affairs Committee representatives conducted a discussion of the 9 Guiding Principles for Post-Tenure Review, which it has supported. These principles are the following:
 1. Preserve academic freedom,
 2. Recognize situational differences of its diverse faculty,
 3. Define chronic lack of productivity,

4. Establish professional development as a goal,
5. Protect due process,
6. Establish dismiss process consequent to non-compliance,
7. Rely upon peer review at all steps in the process,
8. Incorporate existing faculty review mechanisms, and
9. Include the concept of intermediate sanctions prior to dismissal proceedings.

It was reported that IUB has independently specified 4 guidelines and that IUPUI has specified 6 guidelines. Professor Spector argued that these two sets of guidelines can be viewed as compatible. He believes that the Faculty Affairs Committee can reconcile these guidelines. President Brand stated that each IU campus can draft their own procedures that are compatible with the set of broader Faculty Affairs Committee guidelines.

Professor Riemenschneider stated that he has concluded that Guideline # 3 will be a big problem. He judges, based upon a meeting of the Dean's council, that each Dean has a different idea about what should trigger a review.

Professor Joray reported that the IUSB campus had voted, by a small margin, to support that the existing procedure for yearly faculty performance reviews was adequate and equivalent to the present Post-Tenure Review initiative. He stated that now we have the feeling that we must do something different and that we are looking for assistance with that project.

President Brand asked that each campus continue to work on the Post-Tenure Review process. He stated that the Post-Tenure Review process must be complete by the end of this academic year. He further remarked that you will have help in the two already existing models of IUPUI and IUB. He reminded the UFC that the goal of the Post-Tenure Review is not to dismiss faculty, but to assist them to become good faculty citizens again. We were reminded that Post-Tenure Review is specifically reserved for problems of faculty under-productivity. Faculty incompetence or misconduct may be grounds for dismissal under different guidelines.

6. There was a discussion of the Policies on Faculty Review, which were endorsed by the BFC Faculty Affairs Committee. According to a report from this committee (Circular U8-99), All such procedures shall be administered in accordance with principles of peer review, due process, and academic freedom.≡

The UFC Agenda Committee addressed the matter of Faculty Board of Review procedures. They judged that open hearings would be appropriate. However, to defer to campus preferences, they proposed a revision to item #7, page 28 of the Academic Handbook, Indiana University, June 1997. It was proposed to change the

current wording from:

Complainants shall be allowed to choose either open or closed procedures at formal hearings.

To:

The faculty on each campus, through its governance system, shall establish the conditions under which the procedures for its Faculty Board of Review hearings will be opened or closed.

The UFC voted to accept this proposed change.

7. There was discussion about the Promotion and Tenure Procedures for the multi campus units. It was reported that historically, the UFC has refused to adopt any specific suggestions asserting that such decisions should remain campus specific. This tradition started about 20 years ago, when IU went through a reorganization process. The UFC will determine whether or not to formally adopt the old standard (which clearly implies that such decisions should be carried out at each campus, up to the point that recommendations are forwarded to the President) ,or, to create new procedures. It is noted that this issue is important for may reasons, including the fact that it affects faculty representation on the UFC Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
UFC representative V. Thomas Mawhinney.

- 1.
2. Letter from Myles Brand

January 7, 1999

Professor Victor Riemenschneider
Northside Hall
Room 132D
Indiana University South Bend
1700 Mishawaka Avenue
P.O. Box 7111
South Bend, IN 46634-7111

Dear Professor Riemenschneider:

It has come to my attention that the Faculty Senate on the South Bend campus is preparing to resume consideration of the possible detenurization of Dr. Daniel Cohen. Because some length of time has passed since the Senate last considered this matter, and because there have been intervening events

that bear on this matter, I believe that it is appropriate for me to address this issue again and ask that you share this letter with your colleagues.

I am attaching a copy of a letter that I sent to Professor James Pattillo on April 18, 1996, that sets forth my position regarding the detenurization of Dr. Cohen, the position that I have taken since the time of Dr. Cohen's resignation as chancellor. Since the time that I wrote that letter, the allegations made against Dr. Cohen were litigated in federal court in Fort Wayne. I am sure that you are familiar with the outcome of that trial. However, I must advise you that, as a result of that trial, it became apparent to me that there was no additional information of which I was unaware that would cause me to change my position regarding the detenurization of Dr. Cohen.

As I stated in my letter to Professor Pattillo, the protection afforded by tenure is strong, and although that protection is not absolute, it should only be overridden in the most extraordinary circumstances. The facts here do not rise to that level. The institution of tenure is vitally important to higher education, and revocations which can lead to precedents should be considered as very serious.

While I fully understand and respect the principles of faculty governance and recognize the concern of the faculty in this matter, I believe it is only fair to advise you that, consistent with the position that I have taken and continue to take in this matter, I will not forward any recommendation of detenurization to the Board of Trustees.

Again, I will appreciate your sharing this letter with your colleagues.

Sincerely,

Myles Brand
President