



Executive Committee Minutes



April 3, 2009

12:00-2:00

LCC 140A

Members Present:, Chuck Gallmeier (Presiding), George Bodmer, Don Coffin, Iztok Hozo, Jim Tolhuizen, Linda Delunas, Frank Caucci, Cynthia O◊Dell, Paul Blohm, Bill Dorin, Ranjan Kini, Sam Flint, Arena Stevens, Ellen Szarleta

1. Approval of minutes of March 6, 2009:

a. Prof. Blohm moved to accept and Prof. Caucii seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Meeting with Dr. William Cast ◊ April 8, 2009 ◊ 2:30-4:00 p.m. - LC140A

a. Pres. Gallmeier announces the scheduled visit of Dr. Cast. The committee should come prepared with questions for Dr. Cast. A discussion ensued regarding the topics of concern including the search for a new Chancellor, fundraising, diversification, merger and the four-year medical school. Pres. Gallmeier notes that Dr. Cast is looking forward to the discussion.

3. Proposal to Alter Change of Grade Proposal ◊ Academic Affairs Committee (see attachment)

a. Prof. K. Evans will be discussing the proposal at the April 17th meeting of the faculty organization. V.P. O◊Dell notes that Academic Affairs has reviewed the proposal and clarified some of the language that was originally proposed. The proposal comes to the faculty organization moved and seconded and therefore will be set for a vote.

4. UFC Meeting ◊ P & T Document Revisited (see attachments)

a. There are three problematic areas in the proposed P&T document, namely part #1, #2, and #4. Pres. Gallmeier and Prof. Coffin note that only Bloomington faculty supported #4. The committee noted that #4 reinforces the perception that the regional campuses are ◊second-class◊ citizens. Pres. Gallmeier notes that this section will likely not remain in the document.

b. Part 3(c) was also viewed as problematic in the UFC meeting. This section of the document led the South Bend campus to pass the attached resolution. Pres. Gallmeier notes that this section of the document first appeared in the most recent version of the P&T document. Prof. Bodmer notes that this

most recent version is significantly different from previous versions. It is noted that there is no specification regarding the need to supply summary versus full dossiers to the executive review. The committee discusses the difficult issues associated with determining whether a dossier is problematic and the need/desire to send a summary dossier. Summary dossiers could be seen as a negative recommendation.

c. At this point Chancellor Bergland enters the meeting and the P&T discussion is temporarily suspended.

5. Chancellor Bergland 12:30 p.m.

a. Chancellor Bergland states that the President of IU wrote a letter to the President of Ivy Tech and Purdue in an attempt to engage the parties in a discussion regarding inter-university collaboration. Ivy Tech expressed an interest in the collaboration. Purdue's response was less enthusiastic. Additional action in the future may still be possible but ultimately the Higher Education Commission would have to determine that a need exists. The three legislative action individuals were consulted regarding the issue and it was determined that this issue should remain dormant until the legislative session is concluded.

i. The committee asks questions and discusses the issue further. Prof. Flint asks what Purdue would gain and Prof. Coffin notes that the Purdue business school would benefit from IU's accreditation. Prof. Hozo notes that a combined campus of 15,000 students would have greater weight. Prof. Coffin notes that Purdue NC would have little incentive to participate given the distance between campuses and Chancellor Bergland agrees.

b. Chancellor Bergland notes that he has no news on the hospital topic but states there is some engagement by Methodist Hospital and Rep. Brown regarding the hospital.

c. P&T: The Chancellor remains in the meeting and the topic of the P&T document is addressed again.

i. Prof. Bodmer asks the Chancellor if letters were written on behalf of this year's P&T candidates. The Chancellor notes that letters were not written, however a phone call did take place. Prof. Bodmer notes that this could be seen as a weakening in the power of the regional campuses. Prof. Coffin notes that the substitution of informal for formal communication would make it more difficult to hold individuals responsible.

ii. V.C. Malik enters the room and the discussion.

iii. Pres. Gallmeier notes that there is no formal meaning of executive review in the document. Prof. Delunas asks if this move is made with the intention to eliminate the Chancellor's input. She notes that if a problematic case is presented then the Chancellor could say whatever he/she wishes and no one would be aware of the statement.

1. The Chancellor agrees with the later statement. He then gives an example of how the process would work, including an explanation of how the problematic case would result in a discussion between the Exec. VP, the V.P. and the Chancellor.

2. VC Malik adds that Bloomington receives a spreadsheet detailing the summarized information for all campuses. Therefore, McRobbie is aware of all decisions made in the P&T process on each campus. If there is a dossier of concern, then more attention is devoted to the dossier. The EVP

would present both sides of the case to the President in a private conversation. He notes that since many thought this process was not transparent, the memo was constructed and the procedure is now documented in the P&T proposal.

- iv. Prof. Flint notes that in the absence of a letter from the Chancellor regarding the dossier there is some concern regarding the impression that will be made. VP Malik notes that a phone call could serve a similar purpose.
- v. Pres. Gallmeier notes that the regionals are upset because they feel they are set apart.
- vi. Prof. Coffin notes a number of concerns including the fact that the problematic case will come into the EVP's office with the label. He also notes concern with the footnote in the memo regarding the meaning of executive review. He notes that more than one-half of the language just showed up. VP Malik states that #4 was a compromise resulting from negotiations of the joint committee. Prof. Delunas expresses similar concerns. VP Malik notes that he is not in favor of including #4.
- vii. VC O'Dell notes that the phrase summary dossier has been removed and Pres. Gallmeier notes that it will be included in future documents.
- viii. It was decided that the discussion would continue at the meeting of the faculty organization.

6. Interim Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs 1:00 p.m.

- a. See above. The V.C. entered the discussion on P&T.
- b. The VC also noted the following:
 - i. He will support faculty equity adjustments, but he will not know much more regarding financial issues until after April. In the best case scenario he predicts a 2% base increase and 1.5% in equity and in the worst case scenario there will be no changes in salary.
 - ii. RCM is a wonderful system
 - iii. He is proposing a Chancellor's Professorship.
 - iv. Notes he would like the former president of the faculty organization to lead graduation.

7. Ken Schoon Chair, Constitution Committee (10 minutes)

- a. The committee reviewed the question posed and the constitution. Proposed changes are documented in attached document. He concludes that the current administration's position is consistent with the constitution. He also notes that the committee discussed the need to revisit the constitution.

8. Task Force on Administrative Structure and Process no report.

9. Academic Excellence Document

- a. Pres. Gallmeier proposes the discussion be tabled until P&T is resolved. The committee agrees. A brief discussion follows on a number of issues including the issue of Dean service on Campus P&T, the

fact that the committee can determine the area of excellence (at IUN), and confusion regarding the number of letters required for promotion and tenure dossiers, as well as the scope of review by external reviewers.

10. Calendar Committee (see attachment)

a. The proposed calendar will be coming out of committee for a vote at the next meeting of the faculty organization.

11. New Business

a. none

12. Old Business

a. The ballots are on their way and all votes will be due by April 15th.

b. Pres. Gallmeier states that the executive committee will be the task force that examines the characteristics desired in a new chancellor. He was unsuccessful in recruiting members. Prof. Coffin notes that this reassignment must be brought before the faculty organization.

13. Meeting Adjourned 2:00 p.m.

Return to [Faculty Org Main Page](#)



3400 Broadway - Gary, Indiana 46408

219-980-6500

888-YOUR IUN

(1-888-968-7486)

Comments: [Faculty Organization Secretary](#)

Last updated: 3 March 122

<http://www.iun.edu/~facorg/executive/minutes05/ex09-05.htm>

[Copyright](#) 1997 - 2022, The Trustees of [Indiana University](#)

[Copyright Complaints](#) [Privacy Statement](#)