

# FACULTY ORGANIZATION MINUTES

**November 21, 1997**

## 1. Call to Order and Approval of the Minutes

Linda Rooda, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00am. The minutes of the [October](#) meeting were approved.

## 2. Chancellor's Business

- **A. Buildings.** Bids for the Academic Affairs building have been received and contractors will be visiting the campus next month. Designs for the child care center are being drafted by the same group that prepared Purdue Calumet's child care facility. **B. Strategic Plan.** The open forums were successful and produced good ideas. If you wish to comment, please respond to Dan Lowery by December 1st.
- **C. Annual Gala.** Scheduled for December 12th. Waiting to hear if President Brand will attend.

## 3. Vice Chancellor's Business

- **A. FACETS Award** applications are due by December 1st.
- **B. Summer Leadership Institute.** Response was good and we are trying to get approval for five attendees.
- **C. Schererville Site.** We have received \$33,000 of distance education equipment free and have arranged free line charges. Training in equipment use is going forward.

*Fac: Why is there no furniture in the Tamarack Lounge?*

*Chan: Bloomington has given us permission to purchase our own furniture and I believe the furniture is on order.*

*Fac: Is there anything that can be done in the interim?*

*Chan: I will take the issue to John Black.*

## 4. Chair's Business

- **A. Post Tenure Review.** The issues has taken on a life of its own, generating position papers and meetings. If you have any concerns or opinions, please forward them to D. Nardi.
- **B. Illinois Residents.** The tax situation between Illinois and Indiana was defeated, therefore Illinois residents working in Indiana will probably be paying more tax.
- **C. UFC Report--L. Ciminillo**
  - 1. Faculty salary equity. The issue will be studied on every campus as it relates to gender and minority status.

*Fac: where is the money coming from for this initiative?*

*Ciminillo: I don't think the issue was discussed.*

*Fac: I thought only Bloomington would receive money from the legislature.*

*Chan: the Board of Trustees did not pass that resolution.*

*Chair: President Brand seemed to say that the emphasis to obtain money from the legislature would come from Bloomington because they are most easily compared to other Big Ten institutions. The implication seemed to be that the other campuses would have to find their own way.*

- 2. University documents are now available on the Web.
- 3. [Faculty leave proposal](#) has been reviewed by the Trustees.
- 4. Compensation. There will be a University wide committee to determine how to pay for 18/20.
- 5. Copyrights. A policy has been approved. Please see [document U7-98](#) on the Web.
- 6. [Sexual Harassment](#). Changes to the policy will be university wide, however the procedures will vary at each campus. UFC strongly recommends that the Affirmative Action officer be a member of the faculty.
- 7. Non Tenured Faculty. The co-chairs of the [UFC Faculty Affairs Committee](#) passed out a document which appears to come from the entire committee. However, it does not appear to have the approval of said committee. This confusion has led to the resignation of a committee member.
- 8. Post Tenure Review. Information is being collected, but no decision has been made.

*Fac: What is the point of all this discussion? Is there talk of abolishing tenure?*

*Ciminillo: No. There seems to be some disagreement on the purpose of post tenure review*

*Fac: How would this differ from the annual reports?*

*Ciminillo: That is part of the difference of opinions.*

*Chair: There seemed to be consensus among the Executive Committee that annual reviews, if carried out accordingly and consistently, were forms of post tenure review. Again, you are encouraged to speak with D. Nardi on the issue.*

*Fac: There doesn't seem to be a clear idea of what constitutes a "productive" faculty member.*

*Fac: What is the situation on other campuses with regard to reviews of tenured faculty?*

*Ciminillo: It's my understanding that most turn in reviews*

*Chan: In our reviews, do all faculty need to submit something with regard to teaching?*

*Fac: Although everyone should, some do not. However, those who do, usually provide student evaluations as supporting documentation.*

*Chan: That could be the inconsistency which is trying to be addressed by this issue.*

*Chair: Seems like we may just need to strengthen the existing process.*

*Fac: Tenured faculty are not required to submit student evaluations. Other than salary, what other repercussions could this have? Is tenure being threatened?*

*Ciminillo: I can't give you an answer because I don't know, but I have not heard any talk in that regard.*

*Fac: There seems to be divisional differences regarding student evaluations in the annual report.*

*Fac: Yes, that's where the current practice seems to fall apart.*

*Fac: I know that at other institutions, the post tenure review issue is mainly an outgrowth of the research and grant process; tenured research faculty with low grant numbers are being threatened.*

*Chair: There doesn't seem to be any clear direction on this issue. There has been no mention of rescinding tenure. There does seem to be some question as to why the issue is being raised.*

## 5. Committee Reports

- o **A. Calendar Committee**--D. Krause. Copies of the proposed calendar were distributed.

*Krause: The Committee received correspondence regarding starting new semesters with Monday rather than Saturday classes, especially around Labor Day Weekend. We looked over past calendars and this seems to be a problem every few years. Then we looked over classes and sessions offered on Saturdays and saw low enrollment. As a result, we decided to continue the current practice of beginning semesters on Saturdays.*

*Fac: Why are Saturday enrollments so low? Perhaps changing the schedule to begin on a Monday might improve weekend enrollment.*

*Krause: Looking at the academic content of weekend classes may help, because we seem to offer the same weekend classes every year. The Committee did not think it appropriate to its charge to study academic content, but strongly encourages the divisions to consider the issue when drawing up class schedules.*

*Fac: Perhaps we need to do something more concrete to address this issue.*

*Krause: Perhaps Academic Affairs needs to look at it.*

*Chair: Maybe the Registrar could gather some statistical data on weekend class offerings.*

*Fac: Would changing to upper division class offerings change the calendar?*

*Chair: Remember that this is a Committee report and D. Krause is simply providing additional information on the academic content issue.*

*Krause: It's important to note that preparing the calendar requires working backward from the commencement date.*

*Fac: We are ending later in August and that's presenting a problem, particularly for the Education division where students must begin student teaching prior to the end of the Summer session.*

*Registrar: That's the beauty of the new summer schedule; it gives your division more flexibility in arranging schedules.*

The discussion concluded, the calendar was approved.

- o **B. Library Committee**--D. Jackson. The Library materials budget was presented for approval.

*Fac: How are allocations determined?*

*VC Moran: The allocations are determined by a formula which includes periodicals costs, credit hours, and enrollments.*

*Fac: Well, what seems strange is that sociology's credit hours are among the highest on campus, yet the allocations do not seem to reflect this.*

*VC Moran: There is also a historical component which looks at the seven year average of periodical costs, so it's possible that is affecting your allocation. I invite you to come over and look at the figures. There are faults in the formula. Every couple of years the Library Committee looks at the formula, but has not determined a better way.*

*Fac: Why does the budget stay flat?*

*VC Moran: That's an administrative decision.*

*Fac: How do periodical costs get determined, is it by some published index?*

*VC Moran: No, it is each department's actual periodical expenditures.*

*Fac: As we move away from printed sources, the formula needs to take that into account, particularly since electronic resources tend to be more expensive. Is this occurring?*

*VC Moran: The budget is a materials budget and therefore includes all formats. We do buy other formats, like videos, but the growth in this area has been small.*

*Fac: Have any journals been canceled because of electronic journals.*

*VC Moran: No. The movement in electronic journals tends to be new publications rather than printed resources moving toward a solely electronic version. There are lots of major problems inherent to the electronic journal issue and it's going to take some time before we see print journals disappearing in favor of electronic. The University Libraries as a whole are looking at the issue.*

The question was called and the budget was passed.

- o **C. Teaching and Classroom Technology--A. Lindmark**

*Lindmark: The Committee looked at the TERA awards issue and decided to send the decision back to the division, as each division is in a better position to determine its own criteria for excellent teaching.*

*Fac: Each division would have its own procedure?*

*Lindmark: Yes, with some guidelines prepared by the Teaching Committee.*

*Fac: This seems to be a departure from last year's procedure. I seem to recall the Faculty voting on a procedure last year.*

*Chair: Could the Secretary check the minutes?*

The Secretary proceeded to read portions of the minutes from [February](#), [March](#), and [April](#) 1997. There was no evidence of a faculty vote regarding the TERA award procedure.

*Fac: The change in procedure seems counter to the Committee's charge. I thought the Committee was to make the award recommendations.*

The Secretary then read the charge of the Teaching and Classroom Technology Committee as it applies to awards.

*Fac: The charge seems to leave the role of the Committee open for interpretation.*

*Fac: I move that we authorize the Teaching Committee to determine how the awards will be distributed.*

*Fac: Second*

*Fac: I offer a substitute motion that the awards be determined on a campus wide rather than a divisional basis.*

*Fac: Second.*

*Parliamentarian: The substitute motion should be discussed first.*

*Fac: It's not reasonable to expect a committee to judge excellent teaching in the various divisions.*

*Lindmark: Each division dean has been given a set of guidelines. The divisions will then establish a procedure which will be submitted to the Committee for approval.*

*Fac: Sounds like the Committee will be a rubber stamp*

*Lindmark: No*

*Fac: Is there a numerical guideline regarding the number of awards for each division?*

*Lindmark: Yes, that information was given to the deans. There are a total of 49 awards, and the guidelines are set so that each division will not submit a total number which would lead to more submissions than awards.*

*Fac: I understand the concern about having a committee judge excellent teaching, however this is already done in the Founder's Award. The proposed method seems inequitable. Basically, the proposed method has the truly excellent teachers competing against one another, the average teachers competing against one another, and so on.*

*Lindmark: There are a lot of problems with the whole process.*

*Fac: Didn't everyone who applied last year get the award?*

*Fac: No, the committee was not a rubber stamp. The process was that each application was examined by a group of five people, scored, and ranked against the other applications. The end result was that everyone who applied received an award.*

*VC Vasquez: Last year participation was self selecting, which was counter to the Trustees original intention that everyone be eligible.*

*Fac: Can we choose not to participate?*

*Lindmark: Yes. Let me remind you that this award is new and is in a three year trial period. If the award is continued, then we should make every effort to centralize the process, determine what*

*constitutes excellent teaching, etc. Compared to the way the award was handled on other campuses, our process looked pretty good.*

*Fac: What is the eligibility requirement, can you receive the award every year?*

*Lindmark: No, you can not win more than 2 consecutive years. This fact has been sent to the deans.*

*Fac: I call the question.*

The motion was defeated. Discussion continued on the original motion to authorize the Teaching Committee to determine how the awards will be distributed.

*Fac: This motion seems to imply that as the compensation of the Teaching Committee changes, the way the awards are determined could change. Is that correct?*

*Lindmark: Again, the awards are only for a three year process, so it's for this year and next year.*

*Fac: This seems like a proposal and we don't have the guidelines given to the deans, which is different from our regular process. I would feel better if we had those guidelines in front of us.*

*Lindmark: Since all faculty, lecturers, etc. are eligible for the award, several hundred copies of the guidelines would need to be prepared and I just didn't have time.*

*Fac: This seems to change the charge of the Teaching Committee.*

*Parliamentarian: No, this is just a motion, not a motion to change the committee's charge.*

*Fac: If passed, how long would this be in effect?*

*Parliamentarian: The motion does not contain a time limitation*

The question was called and the motion passed.

## 6. Old Business

**A. Mission Statement.** Paul Kern recounted the history of the proposed mission statement and moved that the issue be reopened. The motion to reopen the discussion was seconded.

*Fac: I move we approve the statement.*

*Fac: Seconded*

There was no discussion and the motion was passed.

## 7. New Business

**A. Faculty Organization Meeting Time.** The Chair asked for informal discussion regarding the issue. There was little discussion, therefore the group agreed to continue meeting at alternating times. The schedule for next year is as follows:

- o January 16, 1998 10:00 am
- o February 20, 1998 1:00 pm
- o March 27, 1998 10:00 am
- o April 20, 1998 1:00 pm

## 8. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm

Submitted by: Ellen Bosman, Secretary

---



3400 Broadway - Gary, Indiana 46408

**219-980-6500**

**888-YOUR IUN**

(1-888-968-7486)

Comments: [Faculty Organization Secretary](#)

Last updated: 18 April 122

<http://www.iun.edu/~facorg/meeting97/fom11-97.htm>

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

[Copyright Complaints](#) <sup>1</sup>, [Privacy Statement](#)