

Minutes
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
University Place Conference Center
Indianapolis
March 4, 2008
12:00 P.M - 2:00 P.M. (EST)

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Simon Atkinson, James Baldwin, Karl Besel, Christian Bjornson, Jacqueline Blackwell, Julie Bobay, George Bodmer, John Carini, Donald Coffin, Rosanne Cordell, Janice Cox, Mary Fisher, David Frantz, Marilyn Kintzele, Lloyd Kolbe, Anna M. McDaniel, Michael McRobbie, Bart Ng, Markus Pomper, William Potter, Lisa Pratt, Paul Rowher, William Schneider, Martin Spechler, Herb Terry, Rosalie Vermette, David Vollrath, Joe Wert

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Alexis Rose (Mitchum Owen)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Charles Bantz, Bruce Bergland, Angela Courtney, Patricia Foster, Trevor N. Fulk, Steven Gerencser, Laura Ginger, Floella Gonya, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, M. Gail Hickey, Kevin Hunt, David Lindquist, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Ann McNally, Michael Nusbaumer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Nasser Paydar, Ruth Person, Una Mae Reck, Deanna Reising, Richard Shockley, Alex Tanford, Michael Wartell, Karen West, Kim White-Mills, L. Jack Windsor, Marianne Wokeck, W. T. Wright

GUESTS: Kathy Marrs (AAC co-Chair, IUPUI), John Applegate and Karen Adams (President's Office), André De Tienne (UFC FAC), David Malik (Exec. V.P. Office), Adam VanOsdol (Ind. Education Insight), Nancy Eckerman (IUPUI Library Faculty Chair), Brad Wheeler (VPIT), Craig Dethloff (UFC Office) Karen Eckert (IFC Office)

Tentative Agenda
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
University Place Conference Center
Indianapolis
March 4, 2008
12:00 P.M. – 2:00 P.M. (EST)

1. Honorary Degrees: Executive Session [ACTION ITEM] (15 minutes)
(Attendance limited to UFC members and officers only).

2. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/minutes/01.22.08.htm>

3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(President Michael McRobbie)
4. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professors Bart Ng and Lisa Pratt)
5. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(President McRobbie and Professors Ng and Pratt)
6. Promotion and Tenure Review for Faculty on the Regional Campuses [DISCUSSION] (30 minutes)
7. Credit Transfer Resolution [ACTION ITEM] (30 minutes)
(Professor John Carini and Professor Kathy Marrs, co-Chairs of the Educational Policies Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/circulars/U6-2008.pdf>

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie, Professor Ng, and Professor Pratt should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc>.

AGENDA ITEM #2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Okay, let's move on to Agenda Item 2, Approval of Minutes, can I have a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting, please?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: So moved.

MCROBBIE: Thank you, can I have a second?

KINTZELE: Second.

MCROBBIE: Thank you. All those in favor? [Aye] Against? That's carried.

AGENDA ITEM #3 PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Let me move on to Agenda Item 3, I've just got a couple of things to comment on, really progress reports for you. The Family Leave Policy has been reviewed for the financial implications of that policy and will now be referred to the Deans and the Chancellors and with the goal of trying to get a decision made after the Chancellors' Meeting in early May. I don't believe that the approval of this policy requires Trustee approval and that I can approve it under the delegation and so it will come to me for consideration, for approval, once the Deans and Chancellors deal with it. So I'm hoping that May, early May even, should be the timeframe for

that. The Intellectual Property Policy, the group from the administration has looked at some issues there which are purely financial. I think there's broad consensus on most of the – they raised only a few concerns – and what we've decided is that that group will meet with the original group that Simon was a member of, Dennis Gannon and so on, to see if they can resolve the last couple of issues. I'm very confident they will. This is a Trustee policy, but assuming that those things can be resolved, I would want to take this to the Trustees at their May meeting and would like plenty of time to give them a heads up on it as well, because I think this is a policy that they'll want to absorb thoroughly before it comes to a discussion and they may have questions and follow-ups on it. I'm pretty confident we can resolve the last couple of issues there, so Simon it's you and Dennis Gannon and another person. I've forgotten who the other person is. Everybody forgets the third person, I had the person who knew who had consulted...

ATKINSON: Randy Arnold.

MCROBBIE: I thought it might be Randy, okay. And so I think that that one is moving forward, and then the Core Schools Operations Committee has met already. I think they have another couple of meetings scheduled co-chaired by Chancellor Bantz and Provost Hanson. My understanding is that meeting went pretty well and that's proceeding according to what I requested. So those are just updates on those three matters. So Agenda Item 4, Bart and Lisa, the Agenda Committee business?

AGENDA ITEM #4 AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

NG: Well, I don't have anything in particular. The President's already covered the IPP, the Intellectual Property Policy, and the Family Leave Policy. I only have an announcement to make, some of you already know that I have been asked to serve as Acting Dean of the School of Science effective April 1st of this year. And so I will serve as co-Secretary for another meeting and then I will have to step aside and Lisa Pratt will serve as senior co-Secretary for the rest of this year. And Lisa, herself, has an announcement to make, so I will turn it over to her.

PRATT: Some of you who know me personally are aware that I am increasingly being asked by NASA to serve on Science Analysis Groups for a new flagship mission to return a sample of Mars to Earth for study in Earth laboratories and given the opportunity to actively participate in that research with NASA, I've made the decision that I simply cannot be out of town this much and do what I need to do as President of the BFC, so I also will be stepping down and Herb Terry has graciously agreed to step in for the second year of my presidency. He and I absolutely split the vote last year down to a single vote difference resulting in my being the President, so it actually works quite nicely that the will of the faculty – they'll get both of us.

MCROBBIE: Two for the price of one.

PRATT: Two for the price of one, exactly, which also means that next year Herb in addition will serve as the senior co-Secretary of the UFC. This works quite well, because Herb is a long term and very active participant in faculty governance both in Bloomington and in the broader university community. He has over the past couple of months on more occasions than I'd like to admit when I was either at the Jet Propulsion Lab or in D.C. Herb has handled meetings for me,

dealt with lots of complex and difficult issues and I think it is a wonderful solution to the dilemma that he is willing to step in and do the second year, and Herb I thank you so much for that help.

MCROBBIE: Let me comment that firstly I've known Bart a long time and been a great admirer of all he's done for the university and this campus and I'll be delighted to, even temporarily, welcome him to the ranks of the Deans of the university. I'm sure he will do an outstanding job, and Lisa's reputation -- as an exobiologist, I guess you would be called at least in some quarters? -- of course is well known to many of us. Her standing scientifically is extraordinary and I think it's testimony to her that she should be asked by NASA to take on responsibilities of this magnitude and I fully understand and it's commendable, I guess, that she's putting her scientific needs and career top priority which I think is ultimately very good for the university as well. And Herb I've known a long time and I've worked with in previous capacities, too, and I will welcome him into his new role and look forward to continuing our fairly lengthy relationship as well. So thank you to all three of you for services past and future.

AGENDA ITEM #5 QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: Okay, we move on to Agenda Item 5 which is Questions and Comments Period. Are there any questions any member of the UFC has for myself or the two co-Secretaries. Okay, there are no questions let's move on to Agenda Item 6.

AGENDA ITEM #6 PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW FOR FACULTY ON THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES

MCROBBIE: Let me open this discussion with a proposal that's followed discussion that I've had with the Chancellors, with Bart and Lisa and number of other people. I think that the discussion that was prompted through issues that came out of Chancellor Bantz's office on the regional campuses about promotion and tenure guidelines has raised a series of issues that I think are worthy of further consideration. It seems to me a lot of the discussion [comments inaudible] a joint working group of faculty from the campuses and from the administration, look at the issues raised, some of the issues raised, [comments inaudible] the question of what should the baseline be for procedures for promotion here at Indiana University at all the campuses and that this committee would have a substantial period to consider these issues and then surely they could reach some kind of recommendations as to what the baseline should be, that those recommendations should then go to the relevant campus faculty councils for them to consider for adoption on their campuses. Some campuses may come to the conclusion that they're already doing everything that would be in such recommendations, and of course, the recommendations are purely there to build on and expand in any way that the campuses would see fit. So what I'm proposing jointly with Bart and Lisa, we would jointly form this committee, have it get under way very soon and probably give it to the end of the calendar year to come with the results of its operations. So that's how I propose to move forward on this particular issue. We had a discussion with the Agenda Committee about this and we will work on this and refine how this will actually work in practice. That's how I would like to open the discussion. Are there any comments or any questions that people would like to raise about the proposal for how to do this? Martin?

SPECHLER: Well reading between the lines, Michael, of what you said, I think it's wise what you're proposing; is that somehow in promotion and tenure there might be a standard, sort of, technical procedure, because after all, all of these things eventually go to the President and the Trustees, so the materials ought to have some standardization. I think that's what David Malik, one of the things he was driving at, that's one thing. And when you talk about a baseline, I understand it as, well, at least they should have some recognition of scholarship, some recognition of teaching ability, experience, and so forth, but that you would envision and welcome some differentiations, because after all, tenure is campus specific, and I take it that you would welcome it. So the idea that say, South Bend, which raised this issue, might want to say, 'On our campus teaching is more important to the mission than is research, at least at this time, and that therefore we might not be able to get so many letters testifying to the research, but we will put a lot more emphasis on teaching ability and experience. And if I understand you right, I think that's...

MCROBBIE: Yes, that's exactly right. I mean to give a sort of simple-minded example; there's the sort of the letters controversy and going back and there's been a lot of scholarship done on what President Ehrlich did or didn't say, and I think I'm convinced by the arguments from some of the regional campuses that say that six is probably too many, but then that raises the question well, what is the right number? I mean surely it can't be one, et cetera... so what might the baseline then be? But then that's the baseline that any campus could then expand on if they want to and Bloomington already has eight, so other campuses may decide 'we'll make this six or we'll make this seven or four or five,' or whatever the basic figure is. So that's the idea, to set what are the agreed baseline principles that we all think should form part of determining excellence which is ultimately what this is about. And then campuses with respect to their missions could build and elaborate on that in any way they think is appropriate.

SPECHLER: If I may just back this up. Getting letters about one's scholarship, there are a variety of limitations about where such letters may come from and previous relationships between the candidate and the recommender which limit the number of letters; then when you consider that we typically do not pay an honorarium for these letters which other universities do, that proves to be quite difficult and delays us a lot sometimes in getting a sufficient number of reputable letters and I think that's really unfair to the candidate. So I would support the idea that the minimum number of letters on the research side with these limitations, perhaps two or three, would be reasonable, and your committee will probably hit on a good compromise.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, and this is an opportunity to bring all these issues out on the table frankly for this discussion. Bill was next, then Mary.

SCHNEIDER: Before we get too much into doing the work of the group here, I want to ask a procedural question. You call this a "working group?"

MCROBBIE: The name is...

SCHNEIDER: My main question is who will name it and to whom will it report? And you can understand why I'm interested, it's really a question of jurisdiction and of all the matters that

faculty are concerned with promotion and tenure is probably the one that's of greatest concern, and so I would hope that UFC would be probably the body, but Bart perhaps you've already thought of this.

NG: Yes. Just to answer your question, Bill. In fact, it started out that we have a Faculty Affairs Committee of the UFC which consists of all the presidents or the faculty governance leaders on the various campuses and the academic affairs chairs from Bloomington and Indianapolis. At the same time, because there are really issues that the university -- if a certain procedure can expose the university to legal liability, for example. So it's very good to have the people from the administrative side look at whatever could be proposed. Now, at the end this committee, this joint committee, joint governance and administrative committee, will make recommendations back to the University Faculty Council. We will then take the recommendations and look at them and vote on them. Now if everything works out, the hope is that by the time it gets to this body, all the issues will have been resolved on the campus level as well as looked at from the university point of view to make sure that the process is defended from a legal point of view. So this is in no way that we're giving any of our legislative responsibility.

MCROBBIE: Mary?

FISHER: I was just going to comment that it is not always just on the regional campuses that we have issues in relationship to being able to get the peer reviews. In some disciplines on IUPUI and I'm sure this may possibly be true of Bloomington, as well. In some subspecialties of my field, it is very, very difficult especially going up to the professor rank to even have that many in the country in this particular discipline that are at the professor rank, and so it's very difficult to find. I mean we submit and then we re-submit and I have one person in my department right now, we've submitted a third time for names because we can't get to the six. And so I think we need to have some flexibility to recognize that it may be beyond difficult in some ways and in those disciplines where it's difficult maybe we need to start offering an honorarium for it, because, you know, now I'm being asked to do these for other universities. I only do two a year. So whoever gets reimbursed, you know, we're all...

MCROBBIE: Well, I made a note of that after Martin said it. I think the idea of an honorarium is something that this group should look at. I mean I don't believe we do that on any campus, so I think it's probably something if others are starting to do it regularly, we should be looking into doing it as well. Other questions or comments? Yes?

DE TIENNE: I am Andre De Tienne, I'm on the Faculty Affairs Committee, but clarify how the Faculty Affairs Committee is going to work with that new committee, is it with or is it on the side or is it...?

NG: Well, you know I always believed that the Faculty Affairs Committee can do whatever it chooses to do, and you know there are issues, for example, simple issues, that can be discussed among faculty. Now the committee the President and the co-Secretaries of the UFC will appoint will ultimately be responsible with coming forward with recommendations on how do we manage the process of promotion and tenure. In this case, I am assuming the President will preserve the current structure that this will come through Executive Vice President Bantz's office

so that is the procedure that we're looking at. Now it does not preclude the Faculty Affairs Committee to talk among themselves about some issues. Do whatever you need to do to manage the process. I think the charge is sufficiently broad and with enough flexibility. You know I don't think that would create a problem, but if you think that there are issues involved, that you want to get back to with us that we did not anticipate, we can always talk about that.

MCROBBIE: Bill?

SCHNEIDER: Just a quick point. If the matter is going to come to the UFC, it would seem logical to have the UFC get advice on the recommendations brought back from the Faculty Affairs Committee, so it could actually go through that committee to come here. And since a number of members will probably serve on it that might be the best way to...

NG: In fact this bigger committee will contain Faculty Affairs.

SCHNEIDER: Oh?

NG: Oh yeah, absolutely.

MCROBBIE: We considered that that would be the best way to go actually, yeah. It's the simplest way to go probably. Any other questions or comments from anybody? Anybody on the telephone?

POMPER: Can you hear us at all?

MCROBBIE: Yes, I can hear you now.

POMPER: Ah! Could we possibly go back to the Question and Answer Period?

MCROBBIE: Well, we're on an Agenda Item, I don't mind doing that if you weren't connected before, but let's finish this discussion first and then go back to that. Any other comments on this issue so we can finalize this issue? Okay, well thanks very much. Okay, let us return to Agenda Item 5 the Question/Comment Period. Is that Markus, I think?

POMPER: Yeah.

MCROBBIE: Did you have a question, Markus?

POMPER: I did, and the question is, you had announced that you were going to start the Chancellor's search for IU East, but I haven't heard anything since that announcement in Richmond, if you will...

MCROBBIE: I've been somewhat distracted the last couple weeks, and it's going to get full attention [laughter] full attention pretty soon, Markus. It's definitely going to happen, as soon as I get to it. Any other questions from anybody on the phone. Bill?

SCHNEIDER: Could you comment on the status of, I believe, the review of Chancellor Bantz? Does it start this year?

MCROBBIE: That will be started as well. It's just a matter of getting to that as well. So we'll start that over summer. That will be the goal for that as well. Yes? All of a sudden there's this efflorescence of questions! [laughter]

BLACKWELL: Sometimes when you come from class you're a little drained, so sometimes when you finish class before coming to the meeting you make a transition. I'm wide awake again. [laughter] I have a question about the task force that Chancellor Bantz and the Provost from Bloomington about the core campus. I know that the Deans have received a survey, do you have any information to share with us?

MCROBBIE: Well I've mentioned before that I know they've already met once and they've got another couple meetings coming up, but I'm not aware of any developments that are meant to be reported. Does anybody...?

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: That's right.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, I'm not aware. I think they're just meeting and working away as I requested them to do.

BLACKWELL: So the deadline is May for them to come back with a report to us?

MCROBBIE: I'm embarrassed. I've forgotten when it was, but I think it's the end of the semester, yes.

BLACKWELL: Okay.

MCROBBIE: End of the semester, alright, which is mid-May roughly. So this return to the Agenda Item 5, any other questions? Right. Well we're finished with Agenda Item 5, Agenda Item 7, Credit Transfer, John are you taking this?

CARINI: Yes, Kathy's here as well.

MCROBBIE: Okay, right.

CARINI: Can people hear me out there?

SPECHLER: If they can't, they can't answer. [laughter]

CARINI: Kathy and I are co-Chairs of the University Educational Policies Committee, so what you have in front of you is the revised version of what we looked at last time. After our last meeting, Herb Terry suggested re-structuring the resolution for more resembling a resolution and then a policy statement that could be in a format that would be compatible with the Academic Handbook and that's what you see before you. The other significant change in what we had

presented before is in the exception one where we're discussing how to basically grandfather current students who are pursuing Associate's Degrees that are articulated to Indiana University degrees; how to treat, I think Herb had requested that we consider some sort of time limit on that process and we've decided to leave it to the individual campuses and schools to determine how long any credit hours earned from the Associate's Degree can be applied to an Indiana University degree. So those are really the two major changes that we have made here. Kathy hasn't had a chance to talk about this to the Faculty Council. Maybe you can provide a little background.

MARRS: Well the main points are still there that it would set a limit on the number of transfer credit hours that would come from an Associate's granting university, so a university that's primarily a two-year degree granting university and that would be system wide. All the meetings that we've had so far we've discussed this with every campus in the system. I think we have all the exceptions that we discussed, all the possible exceptions.

MCROBBIE: Comments or questions? Because I believe this is an Action Item which means I guess we need a motion to adopt it. Martin?

SPECHLER: Kathy I have a question about this required time period, I take it as the main change. Most schools have a time limit for people who enter a program until they complete it, Ph.D.'s and others, are you referring to that or to a special time limit for those who come into the program with, say, 64 credits? Is that a shorter period or are you referring to the general time limit that applies to new students?

MARRS: So do you mean in point one there?

SPECHLER: Yes.

MARRS: Yeah, I think that is left to the individual campus or school and it's generally no more than a ten-year period from when they first started in the program.

SPECHLER: I see.

MARRS: Does that answer your question?

SPECHLER: So a school could say, 'You come in with 64 credits from an Associate's Degree institution, you must earn your Bachelors Degree within ten years?'

MARRS: MmHm.

CARINI: I don't know if all schools have such a requirement, but if they want to impose one they should still honor the...

SPECHLER: But John, could a school a school say, 'Yes we have a general ten-year requirement for Ph.D.'s,' say, 'but for students who are coming in,' in say, 'fast-moving health

specialties, they must complete their degree within three years, or their B.A. in three years, notwithstanding the general limit of ten-years.' Do you understand?

MARRS: Oh yeah, I think that schools could do that, sure. If they have accreditation requirements where you would need to be, you know, progressing at a certain rate through their degree program, yes, I think they have that flexibility.

SPECHLER: Okay, so schools have to be notified that this is a possibility of setting especially short limit for transfer students of this sort, if they wish.

MARRS: Yeah.

CARINI: I knew we considered a specific date and we couldn't come up with...

SPECHLER: I understand, that's okay, that's okay. But my point is that the general time limit is usually pretty prolonged for many degrees, but I wouldn't like a student to read this in the Academic Handbook and say, 'Well, I have to get a degree within ten years, so I can take it easy, because that's what the Handbook says.'

CARINI: I don't think the Handbook has any general statement like that.

SPECHLER: No, but aren't you going to put this in the Handbook?

CARINI: Right, but we don't...

MARRS: ...but this doesn't have that either. This doesn't have a specific time period in it.

SPECHLER: Well, I hope schools will take note of the possibility of setting a shorter period for these special kinds of students as they feel is appropriate.

MARRS: Yeah.

MCROBBIE: Other questions? Herb?

TERRY: I would just comment that we should remember that this applies only to the articulation agreements that we've already entered into prior to today assuming that we adopt this thing, and I favor the somewhat nebulous language because the more I looked into it, the more I discovered that these dates would vary a lot by school, by program, by accrediting body, by everything else this is just simply, I think, a way of putting both the school and the perspective transfer student on notice that you came in under a grandfathered provision and there is a time frame within which you must finish. I would hope the obligation would be on the schools that notify these students once they get this that they face a timeframe.

MCROBBIE: Other comments? Can I have a motion to adopt these recommendations? I think that's the next step. Motion by Martin, and seconded by Lloyd. Any further discussion? All those in favor please signify by saying 'aye.' [Aye] Against? It's carried unanimously.

MARRS: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: That is done, and we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 1:04PM