

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

**Indiana University  
University Faculty Council  
Alumni Room  
Administration Building  
South Bend Campus  
April 14, 1998  
1:30 - 4:30 P.M.**

**Members Present:** Myles Brand, Robert Arno, Thomas Broadie, William Burgan, Richard Carr, Lewis Ciminillo, Paul Eisenberg, John Findling, Edwin Fineberg, Michael Foos, Richard French, Richard Heinz, Loren Henry, Sara Hook, Paul Joray, Jan Keffer, Thomas Mawhinney, Theodore Miller, Lloyd Orr, Victor Riemenschneider, Linda Rooda, Carl Rothe, William Schneider, Marion Wagner, Walter Wagor.

**Members Absent with Alternates:** Gerald Bepko; Richard Fredland.

**Members Absent without Alternates:** David Fulton, Kenneth Gros Louis, Erita Hill, Kenneth Perrin, Hilda Richards, F.c. Richardson, George Walker, Michael Wartell, Ellen Brantlinger, Patrick Brantlinger, Ann Bristow, Karen Cvobb, Michael Cochran, Donald Cummingham, Michael Downs, Bernd Fischer, Paul Galanti, Laura Genger, Stuaart Hart, Steven Hollander, Dolores Hoyt, Julieann Nilson, Richard Peterson, Dennis Senchuk, Richard Vaden, David Zaret, Thua Barlay, Steven Chiagouris, Thomas Mulcahy, David Orensten.

**Visitors:** David Frisby, Judith G. Palmer, Laura C. Nef, Peter Arlvonso (ACE Fellow), Donald Gray.

**Item #1 Agenda: Presiding Officer's Business**

**Myles Brand:** Let me first begin with the President's report. I have a few items I'd like to bring to your attention today. The first issue concerns resolutions that the trustees passed at their last trustee meeting concerning tuition and salary. The tuition proposal that was accepted by all the campuses was, for all the campuses, was 4 percent. I had originally made a proposal for 3 1/2 percent but the trustees twisted my arm and we wound up with a 4 percent tuition increase. The discussion was really quite interesting because the majority, although it was a slight majority, but the majority of the trustees argued quite correctly I believe that we needed additional revenues for quality enhancement. And so the extra half percentage in tuition which was not calculated into the original budgets prepared by the campuses is available to the campuses for quality enhancement and the Chancellors have been asked by June 1 to come back with a statement of how their own campus intends to use those funds. The only guideline being that it's not to fill holes or just solve existing problems but rather to be used to improve qualitatively the situation. Then we will compile those results and bring them to the trustees. I am very pleased about that. The effective to use Bloomington, which is what the media tends to focus in on, the effective rate given mandatory fees for a 4 percent tuition hike for resident undergraduates is 3 1/2 percent. The reason for that is the fees were not raised thereby increasing the budget but the tuition was raised 4 percent the result of which is the combined fee in tuition yields a 3 1/2 percent effective increase. Purdue doing this same period of time had a 4.9 percent tuition and they did increase their fees so their effective rate I think was 6.3. So our tuition went up giving us a little flexibility in quality and improvement and by comparison in the press we look very good. So that was a fortuitous set of circumstances for us. On the salary the trustees passed that each campus would have a final salary recommendation of 3 to 4 percent. Now not this past year but the few years before that, trustees were holding each campus to a very specific number, 3.5 percent +/- 1/10 and that's very difficult to manage to and it causes some problems in allocating the funds and getting the right amount to consultation between department heads and deans and so on. They are both flexible now and there's 3 to 4 percent. That number will change from campus to campus depending on the revenues available which means the enrollment available. Some campuses such as IUPUI have been experiencing modestly improving enrollments and so we will probably be closer to the higher number where as other campuses, the Gary campus for example, has been experiencing continuing enrollment declines and will need to be probably be close to the lower number. That 3 to 4 percent does not include promotions, does not include moneys that will be allocated for salaries, but for equity, gender and race in particular. Nor does it include the market adjustments, remember a while ago the trustees passed a rule saying that each campus would reach the 60th percentile of its peer group. One campus, Bloomington, has a natural peer group, mainly the Big Ten, and they are to reach that 60th percentile by the end of this salary period plus the next biennium. The chances in consultation appropriately on each campus have formulated a list of peers for each campus and that list will be taken for each campus, will be taken to the trustees at their next meeting and then there will be, if it's approved for each campus, then each campus will be charged with reaching the 60th percentile for that peer group. Again, within the same time frame as free salary periods. A couple of other things I should mention, there was, anything about that before I go on?

Miller: Just one minor thing, you mention the equity increases, (043) expect that there are equity increases outside of the minority women category, are those also outside of this?

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

Myles Brand: Yeah, we call those market.

Miller: Those are called market.

Myles Brand: That's the terminology we're using, equity meaning in terms of gender and race and whatever, federally recognized preferences there are, but to bring the campus up to the 60th percentile with respect to its peer group we are calling market and those market adjustments are also outside the (048).

Arnove: (049) education we found out that there is no systematic discrimination against women or minorities but the largest concentration of salary adjustments had to take place with white male senior faculty members, I'm not sure if that's market or just past policy decisions and a number of other things.

Myles Brand: You can call it what you like, but all those are outside the 3 to 4 percent. I'm frankly very pleased both that the trustees were willing to provide the extra, though small amount, the extra amount for quality enhancement as well as agreed with the principal that our faculty should be well compensated. We've been talking about salaries, actually the correct term in compensation because we need to be within the 60th percentile in terms of compensation and while that's not a major change it is what we've been looking at. Next let me talk a little bit about review promotion and tenure dossiers, someone had asked a question about what the process is and particularly what's the involvement of the president's office and the vice president for academic affairs office. The position of the vice president of academic affairs was about 3 1/2 years ago, that's a university wide position it's occupied by Ken Gros Louis who in addition is the chancellor of the Bloomington campus. What happens at my level is that Ken as academic vice president, identifies controversial cases, here's the definition of a controversial case: A case that has mixed votes from advisory committees. So it might be the department in school or college is voting one way and the upper division committees are voting another way. Or all the committees are very close in their votes, those are the controversial cases, occasionally there are some very special circumstances we didn't see any this year like that but sometimes there's some very special circumstances too. That's not as large a number as you think, it's a small number. Then Ken reads all those cases, I read all those cases, we discuss them. The chancellors are brought in and sometimes the recommendation that comes, the tentative recommendation that comes from the chancellor is changed. What proportion, it's hard to say. My guess is 10 percent of the cases that fall within the controversial area are changed. Sometimes pro and sometimes con, they go both ways. But there is involvement, at my request of the vice president of academic affairs in this issue. It was brought to my attention at the agenda committee meeting that at least our procedures don't so define the role of the vice president of academic affairs in the PNT process and perhaps we need to change that since that position was created since those procedures were put into effect. Any questions about that? One of the interesting consequences at this year's review is that there's some lack of consistency amongst the papers that's developed at each campus. The problem with that is that it puts a few candidates at a disadvantage. Some campuses are not putting the best foot forward for the candidate in the way the papers are brought together and the information detailed and indeed in some cases which information is collected. And so the AOC made up of the vice chancellors, academic vice chancellors of all the campuses are being asked to come forward with a consistent set of PNT papers, meaning what material is to be included, what order it should be included, and maybe a model of how that would be best

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

shown. The Bloomington campus papers are notably well done and all the information is readily available. So my suggestion was that to a greater rather than at a lesser extent the Bloomington papers become a model for the other campuses, and I think that's what will happen. That's already under discussion with the academic vice chancellors. The next issue that I want to bring to your attention, this is more of a question. How many of you have picked up your free Microsoft Software?

?: Rain check.

Brand: Rain check or at least try. Well, I would suggest, in the near future I would hope you would take advantage of this, I think this is a good opportunity for our students and our faculty without any additional cost to the university to have a very powerful set of software packages that will aid in communication so I'm very pleased about that deal, I know that there are some people that don't like Microsoft no more than they like Nike or any other corporate giant but the fact is, whatever reason Microsoft cut us a terrific deal and we need to take advantage of it and make sure our students in particular take advantage of it.

Keffer: Dr. Brand? Do we have any idea when, how soon the upgrades, I mean those of us that went out and bought Power Point on our own, when will we be notified or when will Microsoft allow any upgrade to go into our ?

Brand: I don't know. We are guaranteed by this agreement, upgrades for four years. Now when they start distributing them, I don't know. Did you look on the website at UTIS?

Keffer: No.

Brand: Look on the website, there might be information or at least there will be a place there to ask the question.

Brand: Finally I want to take this opportunity to make one other point. I think the university is doing very well right now. The states healthy economically, which always helps us I think our standing in the legislature is strong, for most of our campuses, our enrollment continues to increase. I think the trustees have been supportive and when all that good new happening I think to myself now what would keep me up at night? (Laughter) What threats are there out there? I begin to worry about that a little bit and let me share with you (124). There is a 800 pound gorilla out there, that is a very serious threat to us and our immediate future and that's called tax reform. Tax reform is going to dominate the next legislative session, it's going to focus particularly on property tax reform. There needs to be property tax reform in this state, that goes without saying. Even though the state is not a high tax state, I don't think our particular system of property taxes work. First of all the courts told us that it doesn't work, but even leaving that aside it's not a particularly good system. But I'm a firm believer in the first law of wing walking. The first law of wing walking is you don't let go with one hand until you got a grip with the other and what's happened in other states in property tax reform is that they've decreased property taxes without make appropriate adjustments. The result of which is that there is an extended period of time in which in which there is a lower tax base and then when that adjustment is made it looks like a tax hike rather than an adjustment and it's very hard to get through. One key example is Michigan, Michigan cut back it's property taxes but didn't adjust their sales taxes and

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

the universities in Michigan underwent some serious pain as a result. Now for those who know my history, I'm particularly sensitized to this issue because on the west coast property tax reform was much more severe you know what happened in California in prop 13. At Oregon where I was before this, that university lost 3/4 of its state funding in three years as a result of serious property tax reduction and no replacement. Now I don't expect that kind of level of cuts to happen in a conservative state like this but with a surplus and with a national movement to cut taxes rather than to rationalize taxes I think there is a threat out there so if I see anything on the horizon that keeps up at night, it's tax reform in the sense that there will be a move to cut taxes without compensating adjustments and that always in the past in other states has hurt higher education because when you cut property taxes what you do it you take money away from the schools and you can be sure that the state won't state for taking money away from the schools so they look for other means to replace it and the first place that they look is higher education. In part because we are doing well, so that's a serious concern of mine and we should all keep track of it remember to vote your conscious when you have a chance. But seriously keep track of it it's an issue in the next academic year, particularly in the next legislative session after the first of the year could be something that could become worrisome. Any questions or issues along those lines? OK, that's my report.

### **Item #2 Agenda: Agenda Committee Business**

Schneider: Let me mention a couple of things, first of all I am delighted to see so many people come here. I guess airplanes do work for a large number of you, for those who drove glad to see that you made it. I want to thank Victor Riemenschneider, president of the faculty here, and Chancellor Kenneth Perrin for providing the facilities. You know we met once each year at one of the regional campuses and we are very grateful for you taking care of this and the agenda committee was especially appreciative of having a little bit of lunch when we conducted our business this morning, so thank you very much Ken and Vic. Speaking of this immediate regional campuses next year one item of business that the agenda committee took care of was to accept the proposal from the IU northwest campus to hold the meeting next year at the IU northwest campus in the spring in April and our thanks to Linda Rooda and the faculty and the administrative, the whole campus there for offering to put up with us next spring. The UFC elections for next year should of taken place and have and I understand on most campuses except for a couple and by the end of the month we will be complete enough that we can, the agenda committee can structure the ballot for the election of next years agenda committee in May and once the new agenda committee is elected then the agenda committee will take a crack at trying to put together the standing committees. So for those of you that are going to be continuing on look for those ballots to come in the mail or electronically or however we'll distribute them. There's one other item that was reported on some length at the Agenda Committee meeting and I should mention it to you and it has to do with the trustees and proposals for family related partial leave. The trustees have not yet acted on that but it is still under discussion. Some revision, some questions being answered, it has not differed significantly from the way it was the last time I think we reported this to you. The trustees held an executive session on it, Ted and I were there as well as Myles to answer some questions and to see how things look. The ways things stand now is that actually Dottie Frapwell of the University Council is drafting some revisions which incorporate some of the things that we had proposed since last April. No real major changes beyond what I think we reported which was, I think we reported that it would be 50 percent rather than 65 percent of salary, clinical ranks will be spelled out as being covered specifically

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

and the other main thing is to put in a provision for three years explicitly, at which time it would be reviewed by the university faculty council as well as the administration before the trustees could extend it or make it more permanent. So we fully expect to have this version come before the trustees at their meeting May 7th or 8th at the Bloomington Campus. So if you are around you might want to stop in and see what happens, you'll know as soon as the rest of us, but that's the status of the family leave policy. If there are any questions about that I can answer them. Finally Laura Neff from the IUPUI campus has requested to be able to address the meeting and as is our in the constitution the agenda committee voted to allow that so at the appropriate time she's most interested in the part time faculty or the non-tenure track faculty discussion so I'll report that officially as well.

### **Item #3 Agenda: Question / Comment Period**

BRAND: Let me come back to the Presiding Officer's Business and just mention one other thing while it occurs to me. And that is what we are going to do in the next legislative session in terms of our request. We are going to ask for maintenance, cost of living, which will include a section that we hope will provide some additional support to the campuses for the market adjustments and the salaries as we said we would do in the resolutions passed by the trustees. The first priority which is a carry over from the last legislative session was the 2 percent for technology. We got it in cash and not part of the base budget. We're mildly optimistic that we'll get it, I think the chances are better than even we'll get it, but I don't count anything until I see it in the budget. But I think we should receive that, which will help obviously and at least part of it will become part of the base budget. In addition to that we are going to request 3 percent for quality enhancement and it's going to come in three categories. The main category is going to be scientific and technological infrastructure, very broadly conceived. A second category will be an additional request for market adjustments and salaries just in case we don't get all that we want from the cost of living increment and another small part will come from student protection. Whether we get into the quality enhancement issues at all will depend very much on how the technology money is treated. We're the last several (221) How many Judy have not received quality enhancement money?

PALMER: Actually we'd have to go back to, I think, probably about '93, there was a little bit of (223) It's been so long ago that it begins to fade from the memory but they did count the technology money as quality improvement last time even though it was not in the base.

BRAND: Well I think, as again as I mentioned earlier, the state's healthy right now and I think we should put our best foot forward and see what we can do. OK, I left that out of my earlier report.

ARNOVE: I believe (228) the university touring the (228) what are the implications of that?

BRAND: Very little. (Laughter) There was a push by the commission of higher education to join the Western Governor's University and that enterprise initiated when the western states realized that they were having significant numbers of people reaching 18 year olds, they were getting 10 to 20 percent additional 18 years olds per year and were concerned about building the new campuses that those states would need. It does not affect the mid-west states because our 18 year old population is almost flat for the next 10 to 15 years. But for those state it was a serious

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

matter and so some of the Governors thought that they could substitute education delivered through electronic means for building new campuses. Well they backed off from that because everyone realized that's a bad idea. But nonetheless, they are going forward with this enterprise of trying to provide distance education through a consortium, a national consortium. States outside this western region are being asked to join the consortium. Indiana elected to do so, the Commission paid the \$100,000 fee, it didn't come out of any of the university, the commission paid for that. That gives us a right to participate in the consortium to mount courses as well as receive courses if we want it. They're probably going to have less than 10,000 student for the next, I don't know how many years, nationally. So it's not very big, the students will be mostly concentrated in the associate level degree programs and selected master programs rather than the four year programs. The most interesting part about the Western Governor's University is that they are perceiving education in terms of a competency based approach rather than a credit hour approach. So they tend to test and measure students on a competency level to get credits. This is a highly controversial approach and it's not clear that the Western Governor's University will become accredited by the regional accrediting associations in this regard and it's under scrutiny right now. I was mildly in favor of joining the Western Governors University and it was a split vote amongst the Presidents but I took the favorable side and the reason for that is I think the experiment to see whether competency based education in certain selective fields makes sense. I'd rather be at the beginning of that and see if we can help participatory, a small participatory role in it. How will it affect us? (259) I would think that we would probably offer a small number of courses and we would get the revenues, it gives us access to students nationally, that we might not otherwise have. Would we accept courses? Right now that isn't even been talked about. Maybe in the future but no one's talking about right now, it doesn't seem likely.

FINEBERG: Just for the information (268) the Medical School has undergone curriculum revision process and in fact we have (270) competency based program(271). The origination of this program was really (271) University School of Medicine and they have not fully succeeded in implementing the program over several years now but we've just begun that process and it's a rather grand experiment. I don't think we all know how to do this.

BRAND: I think it's an experiment worth doing in a selective basis and the Western Governors University at least for the undergraduate (276) It gives us some opportunity to be involved in the experiments first hand. So that's probably the biggest payoff for us. Any other questions or issues? OK, let's go on to the next agenda item.

### **ITEM #4 AGENDA: Report on Salary and Retirement Studies**

PALMER: I don't believe there's much I can add to what President Brand has already indicated with regard to the progress that we are making on the salary issue from a competitive and an equity standpoint. As he mentioned we will be bringing forward a similar analysis for each campus as what is comparable for the Bloomington campus earlier in this academic year. Once the peer groups are established we'll be working at what it takes to get from a compensation standpoint on each campus and to the 60th percentile of their particular peer group and doing that on the basis of (288) rank across the campus and not on the basis of individual disciplines, which was one of the decision points that the president and trustees faced a few months ago when they adopted the resolution. So what I'd like to do unless there are other questions that you have on that is just briefly bring you up to date with what's happening with the benefits issue.

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

Specifically here I'm going to talk about the retirement issues and focusing on the 1820 program. If I could give you just a little bit of background so you can see what brought us to this point. All of you are quite familiar with the 1920 program, I trust. I think people sometimes aren't as familiar, although I'm sure this group is, that that is an unfunded program within the university. That means when the program was initiated many years ago now, the university did not at the same point start funding that for future retirees who would be participating in that program. It is not a program that has vested rights, so you're not eligible until you meet all the criteria for participation which includes the threshold of age 64, twenty years at Indiana University and 18 years participation in TIAA (303). Now for many years that wasn't a particular burden for the university because as retirement programs of that nature are established you don't have very many people who meet that criteria. Well, then is now for us and as we look ahead for the university over the next 12 years we are going to ramp up very, very quickly in terms of the number of people who are eligible to participate in the program. In fact, the peak year based upon an actual (310) study using information from our university that shows what our retention rate is, or looking at the other way what the (312) rate might be, the experience levels we have in people actually opting for the 1820 program. In factoring all that in, we're going to hit a peak in about the year 2011 and at that point we estimate our costs on the 1820 program in terms of present dollars, not even looking ahead to future dollars, is going to more than double where we are right now. Now when we look at that in the context of budgets, that's a tremendous pressure on all of the operating budgets across the university. One could build a scenario that says most of the additional or incremental income that would be available will be absorbed in paying benefit programs. One could even take more frightening prospects that we don't have that much in incremental income coming in and that we're actually having to reallocate to pay those costs. Now in 1988 this body along with others across the university studied this issue and made some changes. One of the changes was to in effect terminate new membership or new employees who would be eligible for the 1820 program. An institute a new retirement program called IU SERP, Supplemental Early Retirement Program. Now what happened from a financial standpoint, and that went into effect on January 1. But if you look at what the spending levels are associated with those two plans, if you will, the pre January 1 of 89 and the post January 1 of 89. There's not a lot of difference when you look at what the current costs are of those programs when looked at a percent and let me back up and explain that for just a minute. Under the pre 89 program, the recipients or those who were eligible for that program received a 15 percent benefit paid by the university the TIAA (338) and they were eligible for the 1820. Now it is true post January 1 of 1989 faculty and eligible staff only received a 12 percent payment to TIAA (340) but at the same point the university was contributing 2.4 percent to the IU SERP program. So 15 percent versus 14.4, so financially it was not a significant difference. Now there is a difference when we look at the two programs because 1820 is a defined benefit program and the IUSERP is a defined contribution program. So we know that we are not building any kind of liability with the IUSERP program because what goes in is what you are eligible to take out from the program and there are a number of other differences. One of the main differences is the fact that the IUSERP program is a funded program. Now in order to affect those changes the university had to take all of the information to the IRS because one of the critical aspects of the 1820 program is that's not all a taxable event at the time the recipient turns 64 and what we wanted to be sure in 1989 that we preserve the integrity of that program and that these changes would not in any way cause us to dismantle that program and it would be the IRS that would be making that determination, so they did give us an approval. But there was a very strong indication that that was the last change. So we've been very careful no to make any further changes in the 1820



## IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98

program. But recognizing the concerns on the financial side, the President ask us to prepare information about what the growth in the retirement programs would be, what the financial burden that would place on the university and after reviewing that and discussions with the trustees the President then established a task force to look at how we fund 1820 into the future. The task force was appointed, he ask me to chair the task force and it has been meeting now for several months and Dick Heinz, sitting across the room from me, is a very active member and I'm going to come to that in just a few minutes. But let me just say that the President gave us one key requirement and that is we cannot change the 1820 program. So any ideas that we come up with on future financing options has to preserve the integrity of the 1820 program. Now, that begins to limit rather quickly what you are able to do in terms of financing. So when the task force came together we concluded that there were probably three areas that needed to be explored. One involved future retirement benefits, not for current eligible employees but looking ahead to faculty and staff that would be hired in the future at Indiana University and what would be an appropriate benefit program in the sense of retirement only to offer recognizing that we have this huge cost already built up. Second set of issues involved is there a way, because if you look at how this peaks out, we've charted it in terms of a graph, you can see that you ramp up very quickly with those expenditures to about the year 2012 and then you begin to cross over the peak and you start down. Now it's not a one year drop but it's a pretty sudden drop until you get out to about the year 2031 when the last person who was eligible will be off the program if they stay to completion of the program. So we've been looking at then on the financing side, what kind of options do we have to smooth that line out, recognizing we're going to have to pay more, it's a question of whether or not we can find a creative way to finance some of those costs so that we can begin to fill in the back end of that line rather than have this steep ramp in the next ten years. The third area and the third subcommittee that we have working is looking at what is reasonable to expect within the budget. We know that there will have to be growth, unquestionably that's going to be the case but we've challenged our budget people to come back with their best ideas about how much growth is a reasonable level. And are there some budgeting techniques involving money that could be used in order to offset the burden that we are seeing in the immediate future. Now this may sound like it's way off in the future and maybe some of you are tempted around the room to say I won't be here, I won't have to worry much about that, but I think what we are trying to do here is set a course for the next several years and decades that will serve Indiana University from a fiscal standpoint that we will be able not to have all of our income being absorbed by retirement costs and therefore risking advancements in quality on the other hand, so it's a balancing strategy. Dick Heinz agreed to chair the benefits committee and has just been doing a spectacular job with that. They've had to be very careful, they've used outside consultants both legal as well as (411) benefit side to explore what would be possible, what would be legal, what would not in any way cast any shadow on the 1820 program. That task force has been as I said very active and we're very pleased. Yesterday we had a meeting of the full task force and we're very pleased with what we are seeing come forward in the sense of some ideas, recommendations that that group is developing. Now the other two task force in part have been sort of waiting to see what Dick's task force is doing because, or his sub committee, because they don't know exactly how big their job is depending on how much could be done with future benefits and one option of course is to look ahead and say that with enough lead time that we know when we are doing recruitment's and searches, but to reduce the amount of retirement benefit that would be available for future faculty and employees. Now that isn't as harsh as it sounds when you look at it in terms of where Indiana University is right now, because if you look at what kind of a percent we are paying, we are at the top of the Big Ten. We're at

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

20.6 if you don't include the 1820 benefit, if you look at just what we have would be the IU SERP, we'd look at the 12 percent TIAA (430) and we would look at social security. The average when we look at just the average across the Big Ten it's closer to 16. So we're already at that high end. Now that shows up in our numbers of faculty compensation when we do the analysis on the salary and compensation issues because the AAUP includes that in their reporting of faculty compensation. So we always look better on the compensation side than we do on the faculty side and from what I understand that was actually a judgment that was made at the university. Now AAUP doesn't include 1820 either, so if you were to add that in then we really are in the sense much richer on the retirement side than any other institution that we've been able to identify. On the financing side of this we have a lot of obstacles to try to finance and many of you around the room are aware of these. We have been given higher education, public higher education has been given a mechanism from the state where we are able to bond for capital projects, it's sort of a (447) reasoning technique to get around the states prohibition against public debt and borrowing by public institutions and agencies. It's only really been applied in the capital area. Local government has some short term flexibility called tax anticipation warrants to borrow for operating expenses, but those are short term within a twelve month period. It's really just to get to the next property tax installment. So we're quite limited from being able to borrow for operating purposes, but that isn't precluding the subcommittee at looking at what it would take to get us some flexibility, now there may be reasons not to do that. Or where it would just take too long. But they're exploring exactly what are the limitations there. Second issue though is the possibility of finding mechanisms where we could invest some dollars currently in a mechanism that would earn a better rate of return than what we get as a public institution would be a guaranteed investment contract type arrangement. To try to build some dollars now through some investments and have those available later on to help support the 1820 pay out costs. Obviously that takes money up front. Now this year in the budget we have been able to set aside some money for that purpose because the expected benefit costs for 1820 did not go up as much next year as what campuses and schools were planning for so we actually held them constant to what the plan was and set that money aside because we wanted to see what the recommendations would be from this group and what the President and the trustees might accept so that if this concept of some future financing through some sort of guaranteed investment vehicle was available we'd have a little bit of capital to invest in that. The budget people are working and they are working with some ranges of growth that seem doable within the budget making certain projective income assumptions and this will all come together and we're scheduled to turn our report in to the President by June 1 of this year so at that point, these are just recommendations, this committee is not (480) decisions about anything except outlining a series of steps and options that might be possible. One of the things we will do because we've looked at these and these separate pieces, is bring them all together and attempt to do a couple of models of "what if" we were able to combine benefit changes, financing techniques, and some budget assumptions just to see what that would look like.

BRAND: Good. This is serious business. If we take into account inflation 1820 will require over 3 billion dollars of additional resources during its lifetime that would otherwise be used for something else. 3 billion dollars. That's a lot of money for an institution like this. Two billion?

PALMER: Two billion. But it's (493) (laughter) I believe that's with inflation. Two billion with . . .

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

HEINZ: (495) funding of the IU SERP which (496) the situation because we are investing the IU SERP people as we hire them and we're trying to catch up with the 1820 (498)

BRAND: So we would have to have, during this period of time, incremental funding in excess of 2 billion dollars before we realize any funds for quality improvement or to put it another way future people will be paying so much for old benefits that the university in future will be stalled and that's not good management even though most of us will not be on staff at the time, we can't burden the institution. So we need to figure out a way to level those curves and it's quite a serious matter. But we want to do it in a way that leaves wholly intact the 1820 plan and there's enough warning from the IRS that if in any way we would touch the 1820 plan we'd put it at risk and we will not put it at risk. So the task force really has a difficult job to do. The constraints on the solution are really quite serious. There are some options that creative thinking is developing. Things that we would not ordinarily be able to do directly as a public entity, we might be able to do indirectly as a public entity and that's being explored.

PALMER: I would just like to close by, unless you have questions, just acknowledging the recommendations that were received by Ted and Bill for the committee and to publicly thank Dick Heinz for all of his work that he is doing on this because I know he's spending a great deal of time as are other members of the task force recommended by the UFC.

BRAND: Dick, do you want to add anything?

HEINZ: (523) thorough report.

BRAND: We'll keep you informed on that, the recommendations from the task force will go forward to me and I will share them with the trustees, receive their reaction and if there are any changes that will be made in future benefit plans or some such, not affecting current employees affecting future employees, we will bring that to the proper consulting bodies before any action has been taken. But right now it's just work in progress.

ROODA: I'm an 1820 boomer and I just wondered are one of the options, I'm just wondering if IRS rules and regulations would preclude creative ideas like (534) kinds of things that occur and in industry and that sort of thing?

PALMER: Dick, would you like to comment on that?

HEINZ: By buyout do you mean buying out your rights to 1820? If that's offered to all people who are currently ultimately (538) it's our understanding that that probably would not succeed but we would have to go to the IRS for a ruling but we decided not to try that. There's another possibility where once you become a (541) for 1820 you're giving an incentive in your salary, not to take it, and if that's offered to all people when they reach age 64 that would, we think, violate IRS rules because in effect it embellishes the current 1820 program. So an idea that Lloyd Orr had which is being considered is that there can be on a (548) basis, some faculty who are still quite productive at age 64 (550) members that maybe they can be enticed to stay by some budgetary rearrangement which could include the quality (553) the university and greatly reduce the (554)

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

BRAND: So Linda, there's no systematic buyout program in the offering for 1820 right now.

KEFFER: Well not to be facetious here, but our children are thinking of creating ways to handle our retirements. They are suggesting that we take up in line skating, hand gliding, bungee jumping while smoking a cigarette and holding a martini. (Laughter) And eating french fries, so that would be a rather creative, facetious way to handle our retirement (laughter).

BRAND: I don't know if the task force has taken that one, you may want to write that up as a proposal.

PALMER: No thank you. (Laughter)

CARR: I have a very naive question Judy. You were talking about the (570) do you have any idea of the percentage of people eligible for 1820 (573) decide to take it?

PALMER: I believe we have about 5% that don't, so 95% opt for it. The program has worked very well, I mean the way, the purposes it was conceived for, it has been quite successful, I mean it was at a time when Indiana University did not feel it could be competitive for salaries, at least that's what the history tells me and this was a way to do it without incurring additional costs and it worked quite well, it did entice people to stay, but now we're paying the cost of that as people are eligible. There are about 2200 people that continue to be eligible for that program.

BRAND: Judy is quite right, it was conceived as a way to retain faculty members in a highly competitive market. Chancellor Wells developed the program and it has done exactly what was expected but it's define benefit plan, meaning that you pay at the back end, we're the back end. (Laughter)

MILLER: I have a question Judy, if you take the group of faculty that were hired closest to 1989, those that are youngest that are eligible for 1820, do you have any sense of how many of those people we could realistically expect to retire at Indiana? I mean it seems to me there would be some variability in our expectations about this as older people probably will stay, younger people maybe won't, do you have any sense of how that might come into play?

PALMER: Actually some of that was certainly taken into account as Dan Reeves and his staff (604) at the (605) performance of the group. We wanted to be sure though because obviously a lot of the pencil pushing here has been inside the institutions so we did engage outside (609) and benefit expertise to look at that. They didn't suggest significant changes, they did suggest that our turnover rate looked a little lower but based upon what they were looking at in more of an industry view versus what we have in higher education I think your subcommittee still felt comfortable with the projections that you had on that.

HEINZ: Right, the largest discrepancy between the outside consultants and internal people (618) these mortality people and it turns out that educators do live longer and we have a lower mortality rate so Dan Reeves and his people used the lower mortality rate (622) it was the right way to go. At first that was criticized but then it seemed like it was the right choice.

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

ORR: The more detail is in fact the numbers that we were given kind of a worse case scenario that assumes that everybody (626)

HEINZ: (628)

ORR: (629)

ROODA: It could be worse, right?

ARNOVE: So we're not talking just about mortality rate, people may leave and go to other institutions, right? But the point is that you've got a very good benefits package that (634) but provides a secure working environment (636) in efficiency. So you have to (638) as well that (639)

BRAND: The historical basis for people leaving and staying and I assume that's what was used in the historical basis.

PALMER: Yes, the turnover.

?: (642) when a young person is hired he or she is more interested in salary (644)

?: If I am understanding this correctly then the persons who were hired (648) who stay until the year 2031 would have to of been about 21 when they were (649) Does this include some staff members as well or is this exclusive to faculty?

HEINZ: Just one person, it's one particular person obviously. It could be a staff person, I don't know which person it is, it's one person.

PALMER: One person was 21.

HEINZ: There was one person who could go to 2031, that would be the end of the five year (657)

PALMER: But maybe to answer your question specifically yes there are a few staff members that are included in the 1820 program, not a large number but there are some, so it is both faculty and staff. Predominantly faculty.

FINDBERG: I presume since you haven't mentioned otherwise that simply lowering the age at which one can jump into 1820 which would save you money (666) change on the program and whether it would offend the IRS?

PALMER: Yes.

ROTHER: (668) to our cost next year, the next budget year for (670)

PALMER: Don't hold me to the exact number but it's about 25 million this year that we are experiencing and I believe it will go up I want to say somewhere in the range of about 30 to 31

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

but that includes that hold back amount that we are sequestering as capital reserve fund that we're building now. So we thought there'd be about a 5 million dollar growth, it looks like it won't grow quite that quickly so we're going to capture that money to use for future investment if that's a recommendation that's accepted.

ROTHE: The numbers bother me a bit when you say there's 2200 that are eligible and you multiply that by a million dollars each, that's 22.2 million.

PALMER: OK, the President was using future dollars, we compound that at 5% a year until the year 2031 because it grows with the salaries. So that's where you get, the compounding affect is what's the billion dollars very, very quickly.

BRAND: Correct me if I'm wrong Judy, I think if you use present value I think it's under a billion.

PALMER: Yes.

FRENCH: Just out of curiosity was there any unexpected changes of market for the employment of PhD's at the associate or full professor rank, in other words a more active or a less active market or was it considered constant?

PALMER: I think it was considered pretty constant because if you track that over a period of years and hear we're really planning for 4 decades, there's sort of a leveling out that occurs so you will have peak times when there is more competition and other times, so I don't think they try to tinker with that particular factor too much because they weren't sure what (706)

SCHNEIDER: Let me ask what might be a final question which has to do with assuming the report comes in on June 1 one of the reasons we wanted to have Judy here was that if the report came in and we were in session we would at least have somebody (710) what was coming. If I understood you correctly you think you might implement it fairly quickly or do you anticipate some lengthy discussion that will

**Tape one Side two**

BRAND: . (000) and we've started early enough in the process so that we have that ability, I would hope by the end of next academic year everything would be set and we would be (002) but we certainly have time to give it our most thoughtful consideration and we did that on purpose because it is a serious matter. Any other issues or questions, we will hear more about this obviously as time goes on.

PALMER: And if you have ideas or thoughts please email them to any of us that are serving on the task force.

BRAND: Thank you Judy.

**Item #5 Agenda: Discussion of the Implementation of TERA to Date**

BRAND: We are due for a serious review of TERA, Teaching Excellence Awards next year, but there was a discussion at the Board of Trustees when we held our last meeting in Kokomo. Some of the campuses are implementing TERA assuming a certain level of flexibility in the rules that might not have been there given the perception of some of our trustees. (Laughter) Deb (013) who oversaw the initial committee that made recommendations to the trustees about the implementation rules will go back and try to research what the regulations are really were and to see that at least the campuses are in compliance with those regulations and that may involve or may not some minor changes on some of the campuses. We're not yet in a position to evaluate TERA, I would suggest we are still in the start up stages. Some campuses may find implementation a little easier as time goes on. Though we are not in the evaluative phase of this yet, I should mention that I am hearing mixed reports. I hear from some campuses and some individuals on campuses that the program is very well received. Similarly, I hear from some campuses and individuals on some campuses that the program is very ill received. So we have a kind of (022) distribution about the program right now. Some of that may be growing pains and some of it may not. When we undertake a review next year we'll know better. I think it was a quarter percent as I recall of the budget funding which was 1/2 percent, which was a tuition increase that pays for TERA. Trustees believe that the money was ear marked for that purpose. If it turns out that the report shows that TERA is something we don't believe in our best judgment should continue I do not know what will happen to that 1/2 percent. Whether the trustees will permit reallocation for other purposes or will subtract it from any future tuition raise. I can't predict right now, nor can I predict how the evaluation for TERA would go but as I said right now I'm hearing (032) distribution. Any questions or issues you want to bring up on that?

SCHNEIDER: While the trustees were receiving information about how TERA was implemented the UFC Gender Committee received (034) a couple of campuses (034) about how it was going at other campuses with some specific problems suggested at those campuses. Actually at the last trustees meeting as part of the UFC report we suggested to the trustees that we would bring it up at our meeting here to see what we could find out at least to try in a sense a little bit of a discussion from the campuses how things have been going. If not for a definitive report at least to let people know this is coming next year but in fact one of the campuses we actually got a written communication from was the IU East Campus. Walter I think you signed

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

the letter, so maybe, other people probably have some things to suggest as well but perhaps you might give us some idea of some of the problems.

WAGOR: Actually, I'll share the floor with my colleague Michael Foos. The faculty at the Richmond Campus did ask that we communicate with the UFC and asking them about what experiences were on the other campuses as it pertains to TERA over the last two years. We knew what our experiences were, some of those experiences are undoubtedly late to the particular ways in which it was implemented on our campus but we also felt there was some things that perhaps are broader than the particular ways in which we were implementing it on our campus that had to do with TERA. And it was either to think about is there something that maybe need to be changed for next year, that was one suggestion from some of our faculty. Or least making us aware when it comes time to evaluate TERA, or if (049) perhaps real issues that we need to be looking at. As our campus looked and discussed TERA, certainly one of the issues that came up again and again was the issue of divisiveness and we're not sure if that's particular to our procedures or to the process in general that the board of trustees had put together. In preparing, Mike and I talked about some other things and as I said I was going to share the floor, he served on our Faculty Affairs Committee which spent a considerable amount of time talking about issues of TERA and so I wanted to allow him to present a few points that we have talked about.

FOOS: As Walter said one of the reasons that we wanted to ask other campuses was trying to find out whether our problems were unique to us or whether they were among all of the campuses. Two of our faculty senate committees talked at some length about TERA and at one time were inclined to just try not to participate at all this year. The program has I think more (058) effects that positive among a number of faculty on campus and has done two things that I would like to mention or I think might be important to mention at least on our campus and that is to create from our annual report, annual dossiers, knowing that these have to go forward if an individual is to participate in TERA. The annual reports have become thicker and thicker just in case and after putting the initial time in preparing long annual review dossiers, people who aren't selected become very disappointed and since there is a quota systems that says a certain number of faculty can be selected for TERA it appears that it's more of a prize or a merit or a reward. I think that also leads to a feeling of (065) or that's something (066) on our campus, we were curious about whether that is widespread or whether it's unique to us.

BURGAN: (067) . . . about \$500 that (068) for me or how it improved instruction at the departmental level or at the school level. The most argued (069) was some collective (069) and through the instruction and (070) I was thinking of the strategic directions initiative, because I had a chance to review the strategic directions (071) campuses and a number of the initiatives were related to some form of institutional (072). So at the teaching resource center or some upgrading of technology or (073) faculty of instructional technology it seems to me that that kind of focus (074) is going to get more of an impact than just individual rewards with this type of device these school awards (075). So I guess it's a question of (076) is there going to be an evaluation of the (077) that would look at maybe what impact those funded projects (078)

BRAND: We are going to look at that maybe not as detailed as you would hope (079) measurements very hard but to the extent that we could do it during this summer and early fall. We are looking at those, and if it turns out there's some programs that are very successful and I know some already that are working better than others and are quite successful, maybe an



**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

argument could be made that that's where the investment should be and not in this approach. Remember there were two motivations for this approach according to the trustees who drove the effort. One was to reward teaching excellence and I think it was well intentioned. Another was to try and experiment to see if it makes sense to give one time salary increases, bonuses if you like, different trustees had different motivations. Some of it might be good, some of it might be bad. So I think we need to pay serious attention to the review next year and to see what works. Please Bill.

BOSCHMANN: Well I'd just like to second Bob's point, in saying that there was a provision in the peril resolution that was passed last year for a fund, a proportion of that money although where the funding came from is something else, but it was part of that package and the idea was that this was to be for faculty development. I was on the committee that read the proposals that were submitted at Bloomington and I want to say that both they were extremely interesting and useful purposes being proposed for that money and I have never heard any criticism of that phase of TERA. It is distinctly unlike the other phases of TERA, which of course the major phase as far as the amount of funding goes. But I've never heard anyone suggest that it's not a good idea and my personal contact with it strongly reinforced that anything that could be done to expand that phase of the project would probably be wholesome for the university.

BRAND: Good, that's a helpful comment. The funding did not come from the 1/2 percent tuition, it came from STC funds, I forgot what it was 15 to 25 percent of the fund, 10 percent was it? Frankly, it wasn't very much money but seemed to have gone very far but that came directly out of the STC availability funds.

ARNOVE: I would (101) the use of TERA funding (101) a group funding, I think there's an awful lot of (102) On our campus on IUPUI we've had an experiment with the peer review teaching, which is an initial effort of having teaching brought into the same level as researchers (104) and I think if we used TERA money towards a group funding, like a department or a disciplinary group (105) I think that would make a lot of sense. People would talk about (106) loaning us a group instead of individually, making efforts. I'll endorse that idea.

BRAND: Good point. Bob.

: (108) what concerns me though is what's called the sustainability reason, because I think a lot of these things aren't going (112) depend on some type of funding after you (112) and I think there should be some kind of mechanism (113)

BRAND: Oh, I agree with that entirely. Part of the process, you may remember Bob, was that we asked the Deans to say how would you sustain the programs because we were worried about the same things you (115) and they're all guaranteed they'd be sustained. Which means some of them will be. (Laughter) But there may be some good ones that we need to find other ways to sustain, I think it's (117)

KEFFER: As Bob, as one to receive TERA for the second time and I didn't even apply for it this time it made me embarrassed because there were I felt people in our school that possibly could have deserved it and here I got it a second time. Now I didn't mean I was going to turn the money back, but I'm with Erv and also Bob with thinking that faculty development. I would of much

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

rather possibly had this to attend a conference, to help my teaching, than just a flat. I think that would of helped me be a better professor. And it still is kind of embarrassing because I've got a colleague just across the hall that it's hurt very badly because she is an excellent teacher.

ARNOVE: (128) One of the things that concerns me really is that we're creating all these chairs and I've talked about that in a world class institution without the world class instructives but they (130) students. My concern is that we don't have enough money (132) endowment funds or whatever to compete in getting students and you know if you get them here their first year with chancellors scholarships, the burden then falls on the department (133) and I do think that we, this is (134) continuation of the theme is that we need to look for more funds for (135)

BRAND: There's a lot to be said on that topic and it gets complicated quickly as I am sure you understand. Maybe we should not take that up now. But it is a topic for future discussion of a serious nature I think and I want the Dean of the Graduate School to be here and so on, because there are some activities, some of which you may know about and some of which you may not that are trying to deal with that very question. Anything else on TERA.

NEFF: I wasn't cleared to speak on TERA but I would like to speak. My name is Laura Neff and I am the Associate Faculty Coordinator for IUPUI and I want to relate to the council some antidotal evidence that it may not be working well. I understand that TERA was to be extended to part time faculty or associate faculty to encourage to develop and to participate in faculty development and enhancement. The part time faculty that have reported to me that they have received TERA did not apply for it nor did they understand why they received it. They felt like they may have been the only person that the administration knew and thus received it for that reason because they were visible at this school. And the other is that even with the recipients that deserve the award there is no sharing of the teaching methods or the teaching accomplishments amongst the faculty so the modeling that is supposed to occur with TERA and the reward that is supposed to generate interesting enthusiasm doesn't happen because you never get to see why the person won the award and I think I would support Dr. Arnove's suggestion that the money be put to group use where there is some modeling occurring especially for part time faculty.

BRAND: Good, this is a good intermediate discussion we will have a thorough review and get survey data and if there's a better way to do things we'll make such recommendations. Any final comments?

MILLER: Just one thing. One of the reasons that we wanted to have this discussion today and I think, I hope that the University Faculty Council will continue to focus on this subject as we get into next year. I think it's very important that the faculty voice be heard in the evaluation process and so one of the things that I think we will do, I hope we will be able to do next year is as we get closer to this to the review of TERA to have more formal consideration of this in the university faculty council. Because I think the trustees will I think appreciate getting information about this program from different sources, different perspectives on it because they are the people that are going to have to decide what to do about this. I think we can help them if we produce the information that (169)

BRAND: We'll also try and get in addition to the faculty perspective see if we can get a perspective to the extent possible that an objective evaluation based upon data and I think that

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

will be the strongest (172) I don't mean and I'm sure you agree with the Ted we should not attempt in advocacy for one side or the other but rather provide a balanced objective voice.

MILLER: We need to make sure that all perspectives (174)

RIEMENSCHNEIDER: I have just a few comments. One, a couple early comments that the process is involving more faculty time in preparing the annual reports and the docieres for this. And secondly, it is requiring more faculty time in particularly our campus, and I don't know how it is organized by others. But we have divisional committees and an all-campus committee, and I'm seeing as more initiatives come from the trustees that it is involving more faculty time. And I'm beginning to wonder what this is doing on the overall productivity of the university. We need to think about this aspect.

BRAND: That's a very good point. And sometimes I wonder about what it's doing to the administration. Not just Riley's programs, we're providing all the data that is being (185).

RIEMENSCHNEIDER: (185) think about a way to cure the 1820 plan. [Laughter].

BRAND: This is a fair point.

RIEMENSCHNEIDER: I have one other point. And that is maybe a criticism of ourselves. And I find one of the uniform comments I've received back from the other committees, the divisional committees, is that the different quality of the application (190) gift for this award. And most of them have not been willing to make the decision on the basis of the annual report alone, that they've wanted supplemental documentation. And my response there is that if we have been criticizing our department chairs for not granting or getting more salary emphasis on basis of the annual report. If we ourselves are not willing to make decisions on the basis of that, then maybe we should rethink what we're doing.

BRAND: Good point.

ORR: Well, (198) this discussion, and I'm sure the (199) valuation, is that the people who actually won this award are saying this is not the way to do it, we obviously (200).

BRAND: I thin that's right. We have a conversation going here in which we're making negative comments about TERA. I've been in other conversations where people who had positive comments would have spoken up more. So for this, and it's reflecting a wider group of faculty, no doubt, is presenting one point of view. And in a rather uniform way, as I listen. But I have heard other comments too, unsolicited from faculty members. For example, at the Kokomo Trustee meeting during a faculty/trustee meeting, there were some people who spoke up in favor of TERA. And I don't know (207). So there is a mixture of comments. This group, now, is falling on one side of the issue. But going back to Ted's important point. We need to have an objective well-planned, well-executed review of this in the next year. And we'll make sure we do that. But I think it's important we need to do that, and we'll see where we stand. Let's move on to the next question, which is the status of the policy on full-time non-tenure track faculty. And Sara, or Bill, would either of you care to speak.

**AGENDA ITEM #6: STATUS OF POLICY ON FULL-TIME, NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

BURGAN: Thank you. Our main item, as far as our tenure-track faculty, today, is concerned is this proposal that you have in front of you in the form of a memorandum, to Chancellor Gros Louis from Dean Plater. And it concerns a change in nomenclature for clinical faculty at the Medical School. The faculty affairs committee was simply asked to offer a comment, a kind of advice on this topic, and then get some discussion today. Because it hasn't yet been voted on by the IUPUI Council. And the intent is to have a vote at IUPUI and then early in the fall have the UFC vote on it. And the problem, as presented, is one of discriminating, having names that make a clear distinction between full-time clinical faculty and volunteer courtesy faculty at the medical school. I'm not going to comment at length on the rationale, which you have before you. And we also have professor Fineberg here, who can state more fully the reasoning behind this. Our feeling on the committee was that the one thing we were concerned about was that the faculty member and the university should both be quite clear on the status of persons who are hired under this arrangement. And as a practical matter, some rewording of the Academic Handbook will have to be done. And we thought that a simple suggestion might be that when this is presented to the IUPUI Council, you might include a possible footnote that would be appended to the part of the handbook that talks about clinical ranks. Which would point out that in some cases, the adjective clinical precedes the department, rather than the rank. But in any case, the provisions in the handbook apply to all persons whose rank is qualified by that adjective. My meaning there, obviously, is wherever the adjective comes, still these people come under the provisions in the academic handbook. So we had that suggestion to make, and for the reason that I just mentioned. And we'd be glad to have discussion.

BRAND: Please.

FINEBERG: I want to call your attention to the back page of this document. This, of course, was the result of four or five committee members, to come up with this wording. And it points out a real need. And that is that we are the School (248) uses a very large number of volunteer and courtesy faculty. And also we have a fairly large number of people who are engaged in fairly clinical and teaching, and not research activities. And it's been customary in most medical schools to discriminate among these different types of faculty. And we have a great many faculty, who are in fact now used to using particular titles. And we felt that we could not deviate from the titles that we had already used in any significant way. And I might call your attention to the last sentence of this document before the word "submitted." And basically, if I could read it to you. "It would be appropriate to defines these terms in the Faculty Handbook and request that faculty members use these terms in c.v.'s, talks, and other places of public notices." In fact, I've anticipated that, our committee anticipated, that we would want these terms recognized and defined in the faculty handbook. And that we would request that we couldn't demand that when people go out and give talks or they present these c.v.'s that term be applied (265).

BURGAN: I just want to respond that we noticed that. It was pointed out that there are clinical ranks elsewhere and our idea was to try to find an expedient that would not necessitate changes across the map in order to make this change possible. But we do take into account what you just said.

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

SCHNEIDER: Just a small point. That's really the main reason for the discussion at this time, at this place. So that we can see, not just outside the School of Medicine, but outside of IUPUI, where this particular change might have repercussions. So we can incorporate them into the proposal (273) act on at IUPUI.

KEFFER: Based on our conversation and the proposed document, I took it back to our Dean, Angela McBride, in the School of Nursing. And I know Linda Rudder, you received also a memo from her. A year ago or two years ago, we changed our policy for IUPUI in the School of Nursing to commit up to 40% of faculty be non-tenured clinical rank, clinical assistant professors, associate professor, lecturer, or whatever. And the faculty mixes work very well. In graduate education, particularly, very similarly to medical education, we rely on clinicians who remain in the clinical area and remain very expert in their field, where our students can precept with them. And, the ones that I place anyway, are unpaid preceptors. We try and do some continuing education for them. But that's what they receive from us. In terms of clinical assistant or associate professors, again they have maybe a 50% position in the School of Nursing. And the rest of the time, they are clinicians. And our students, particularly our master students, rely, and we rely, as full-time faculty, on the fact that they have clinical ability and clinical expertise that we can't possibly, being a full-time professor, and just one day a week as a clinician, keep up with the changes that we need to. So we could not support, from what I understand, any policy that would hinder us from doing what we're doing in terms of clinical right now.

BRAND: Paul.

ARNOVE: If you use the (298) designation of (298) possibility of voting rights for people in this category, I know that I think a vote is going to be turned out before the different academic units of the university about whether or not to (301) voting rights to these people. Do these people have voting rights? Could they have voting rights?

KEFFER: Yes, absolutely.

SCHNEIDER: (303-305). We left that to be a local decision, basically.

FINEBERG: If I could answer that specifically for the School of Medicine. Our clinical staff can vote within the School of Medicine. But they are not free to vote within IUPUI Faculty Governance.

KEFFER: I think that's a better way of putting it, yes.

BRAND: Any other comments on this change? Bill and Sara, you got some feedback on that now.

SCHNEIDER: I just have one question. And maybe I'm missing something. Is the proposed change, its seems to being (311) by volunteer courtesy faculty. Are they all part-time in their faculty designation, or?

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

FINEBERG: They're often part-time, or volunteer. Most of them are not paid anything whatsoever.

WAGOR: What's the problem with using a term like "adjunct clinical associate" or that sort of thing. I mean, they're part-time faculty. And adjunct is a term we're trying to standardize. We're referring to something other than full-time, that sort of stuff. It just sounds like we're adding another term referring to part-time faculty.

FINEBERG: The problem is current usage. That we have a considerable body of (320) that are used to using particular titles, that I believe were not regular, if you will. We're trying to tweak the system essentially where it can differentiate these individuals in making as little change as possible in their title. And that was the compromise that we came up with. As you know, there are a whole variety of titles that are used everywhere. And we tried to come up with some kind of uniformity and not deviate too much from what we've already been using.

WAGOR: The volunteer faculty, in particular, should not be put in an awkward position, I think.

ROTHER: Would you just clarify, Ed. The current title for a volunteer is clinical assistant professor. And the change will be to give the full-time clinical faculty, have them assistant professor of the clinical department.

FINEBERG: Right. I think that's the way it's worded. I get it confused.

ROTHER: (331-333).

What percentage of the full-time clinical faculty do they spend teaching? And what percentage is their full-time equivalent do they spend in clinical faculty?

FINEBERG: Most of the people in the, we're talking about the full-time faculty. We're talking probably they do the preponderance of their work in the service sector, of seeing patients and then the way that it works in Medical School most of the time, (338) in a preceptor kind of relationship. So it's very difficult to pull this apart. So you have a group of residents, you have a group of medical students, who are in fact engaging in clinical practice with you. And you're teaching by example and by precepting, if you will. So it's very difficult for me to pull that apart easily.

BRAND: Any other comments?

NEFF: I just had a question. I didn't receive this until late at the end of last week. What is the difference in the roles between the full-time clinicians and the part-time clinicians, other than just the hours dedicated to it.

FINEBERG: The full-time clinicians have discreet obligated duties. Volunteer faculty volunteer to have duties, but in fact are not otherwise obligated. That's the difference. Basically, one is, it's not necessarily contractual but it's mutually agreed upon fixed kind of duties. And the other is that someone comes into clinic and says I'll work for an hour every other month, or something like that. And it's the kind of person that you'd love to have around but you can't depend on. So

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

they're coming there, so basically should you ask them to do it because they want to do it. But they don't want to do it. The people who are full-time clinical faculty have to do it. That's part of the job.

BROADIE: One comment. The full-time clinical faculty are basically non-tenure track members of the faculty. They're salary (363) in the clinical arena do the members of the tenure-track faculty.

NEFF: So the full-time have pretty much the same duties as the tenure track faculty, although they're not awarded tenure because of?

BROADIE: They have chosen not to (366).

NEFF: For whatever reason they choose not to (367).

FINEBERG: There's one big difference. And that is that they are not evaluated on the basis of the obligation to research, to do creative work, basically. And that's the big difference. IN fact, it's mandated in the handbook, as well as someplace in this document I think. That they are not evaluated on the basis of creative work. They're evaluated on the basis of service and teaching only. And in fact our promotion committees are forbidden to, in fact, evaluate these individuals on the basis of any research contribution.

NEFF: The courtesy faculty are evaluated at the department level. And they are not evaluated on research either. So is the distinction here that one will be called a professor of clinical medicine and the other will be an assistant clinician? Is that what we're headed towards?

SCHNEIDER: Clinical professor.

FINEBERG; Well, they could be a professor of clinical medicine. Or they could be a clinical professor of medicine, depending on which category they fall in. And the promotion obviously obligates us to create a promotion mechanism for our full-time people.

BRAND: Some of this is very subtle. [Laughter]. Any other questions, Bill or Sara, about the policy? No. Okay, moving on to the Status of Policies on Post-Tenure Faculty Review. Again, I'll call on you, Sara.

**AGENDA ITEM #7: STATUS OF POLICIES ON POST-TENURE FACULTY REVIEW**

HOOK: On the IUPUI policy is in revision state. We did gather all the comments and concerns of people through a variety of quorums throughout the past few months. Also I'll add that the IUPUI library faculty looked at the document and added some librarian language so that it would fit and that both groups could use the same policy. That was extremely helpful. The subcommittee, again, convened, went over the document again, revised it, as I said, taking into consideration all the input we had gotten. And now the document is again before the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee. Most of the changes, I will say, were not substantive changes. The spirit and most of the guiding principles and procedures in the document remain in tact. What we seem to be adding, however, is clarifying. And more further explaining a few of the

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

considerations in the document. We have one more meeting of the committee next week. As far as the meeting went yesterday, there seemed to be quite a bit of support for the document. Plus the changes. So I'm anticipating bringing that forward to the IU Faculty Council in our May 7th meeting.

BRAND: Ted, do you care to comment on the Bloomington?

MILLER: Yes. The documents that underlie our discussions in Bloomington are available on the BFC web site. I think all of you have gotten emails including the web page addresses and such. So those documents are available to you. The Bloomington Faculty, I think, began with an idea that they did not want to support a new review mechanism that would apply to all faculty. Actually, that was a decision that was made about five years ago, when there was a proposal to create such a review for all faculty. And it was voted down by the BFC. We have now come to a somewhat different approach to this question. And it's kind of a two-part approach. Some people, the president for example, has volunteered that the first part was kind of a "gimme." That may be so. But it serves, I think, an important role in what we're trying to do here. And the first part was called "annual merit evaluation policy." A fairly short policy. In (427) all it does is to require that each faculty member each year undergo a merit review. And the way this ultimately was phrased is it's in contact with our salary policy, which of course also requires an annual merit review. But in this document, what we're trying to do is to say to whoever might be interested that on the Bloomington campus, every faculty member is required to undergo this review. That policy, I'm happy to say, was approved by the Council several weeks ago. Now, beyond that we are currently in the discussion of a document that is entitled Faculty Review of Misconduct. This, the premise of this document, is that as these annual merit reviews unfold over the years, that it is possible that a faculty member might be determined to be having problems of various kinds. The Faculty Review of Misconduct Policy essentially would allow for the Dean of a school to forward the case of such a faculty member to a faculty committee for review. Now, in this regard, our policy here is not, to my way of thinking, totally divorced from what is happening or what the IUPUI (453) says. The main difference, I think, is that our approach to this is going to be to structure a committee at the campus level. We are going to try to remove these considerations from the unit level. Several reasons for doing that. One is that we're concerned about what might happen in the units. We're trying very hard to protect the idea of academic freedom with this policy, and we're quite concerned with what might happen if we turn the units loose to review their own faculty. So we're going to try to have this review conducted at the campus-level by elected faculty committee that really parallels in structure the faculty board of review. The second reason for doing this is that we believe that there are not very many cases that will fall into this category. And we feel that having a central committee will be adequate for the purpose. So I would really like to emphasize here the point of contact between what Bloomington and Indianapolis are doing, rather than the dissimilarities. Although I do say that there are some dissimilarities. The fundamental purpose of this policy. Maybe it would be best if I read you the paragraph that we have. It's not exactly the latest version. There are a couple of words that we changed at the last Faculty Council meeting. But it will give you a sense of the approach we're taking. This is Section 1, Scope and Definition. "This document provides procedures to review complaints against faculty members of substantial or chronic incompetence or misconduct. Limited to violations of formal rules of the university, such as violations of the Code of Academic Ethics." So that's one part, and it focused on the Code of Academic Ethics, which is part of the Academic Handbook, is something that we're trying to elevate to a position of greater importance in the way we think about these matters. Fully



## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

recognizing that this code may well need to be reviewed and possibly revised as we go forward with this. So we have this one purpose to focus on violations of formal rules. Or failure to meet generally understood and accepted standards of professional conduct. Now, there are, I think, a variety of views about what that phrase means. And this document does not necessarily try to pin down precisely what that means. But we are trying to set up a mechanism by where the faculty can review itself particularly to respect to matters that are viewed as being problematic in the units. Cases of alleged research misconduct shall be dealt with by procedures for responding to allegations of research misconduct. This is the policy we talked about earlier this year at the UFC. Communication and action protected by principles of academic freedom may not be judged as misconduct. Some cases falling within the scope of this policy are better described as examples of incompetence, rather than misconduct, because they are a result of impairabilities, rather than willful negligence or abuse. But the common feature in all cases addressed here is unacceptable conduct, whatever its cause might be. So we're trying to structure an approach which focuses on the conduct of faculty, the actions that they're taking. And to the extent that there are problems in the faculty along these lines, we're trying to structure a review mechanism to assess whether these cases are cases that deserve some sanction or not. With regard to the recommendations that the committee might make. Included in the list is a recommendation for remediation or development. And in that regard, it seems to me that we're trying to make contact with the IUPUI approach, which focuses very heavily on the idea of faculty development. And that, you see, is part of this. In addition, however, the committee could recommend that some sanctions be imposed on the faculty member. And then there are four or five graded levels, what we view as graded levels of sanctions. And ultimately the committee could recommend that the formal dismissal proceedings be initiated with regard to the faculty. This policy is, as I say, under discussion by the BFC. If things go as the Agenda Committee hopes, we will vote on this next Tuesday. There is an accompanying document that is now under development that focuses more on detailed procedures that would kind of govern the work of this committee. Due process issues and so forth that are certainly an important part of this. And I'm not sure if we'll be able to approve that next week or not. If we don't, then this committee will not begin its operations until those procedures are in place. One of the sources of confusion in this has been over just who can initiate these proceedings. And the policy makes it very clear that the Dean of a faculty member's school is the person who would initiate the proceedings. They would submit the case to the campus committee for review. If the Dean of the school doesn't submit the case, nothing will happen.

BRAND: Good. Thank you. That's helpful.

SCHNEIDER: Let me make one more comment before we have some discussion about this. IN case you're wondering why we have this on the agenda. And you may recall that at the beginning of the year we set for ourselves the task of looking at the possible policy that the UFC might recommend for the system-wide, that would look at the question of reviewing faculties, otherwise known as post-tenure review, or going by various other names. We had a very specific proposal that had come out of IUPUI which was distributed. And the various campuses have looked at it and made comments. Or, in the case of Bloomington, proceeded to discuss something that Actually turns out to be in some ways similar, in some different It's obvious that we have not yet come to the point where there's a proposal before the table for UFC to see if there are guidelines for the purposes of voting on, that we can adopt for this particular matter. But the fact that at least two campuses have very specific proposals that would be before their

## **IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

councils for action certainly shows that there is some process. And it will mean that if this body wants to continue in the beginning of next year to adopt language for a system-wide policy, we probably would be pretty far along, given that the two largest campuses now. Some of the regional campuses have made more and some have made less comment on it. But they certainly will be affected by a kind of overall document. So I think it's relevant for everyone to know where things stand for purposes of their own individual campuses, as well as for a broader policy. So that may be stating the obvious, but I wanted to make sure we knew where we were.

**ROTHE:** It seems to me that there is a spectrum of major potential problems with (589). And (591) for dismissal (592) much more (592) than having a faculty member request (593). It bothers me because it seems the role we have in the policy that you have before you from IUPUI has helped us to maintain and improve our performance. We have separate policies. We have already misconduct, incompetence, and financial (599). And your program pits the two together, it seems like, in Bloomington. And you have a very serious (599) something you can lead to dismissal. (600) something that is performance that has dwindled with time and needs to have some help to improve. And it seems to me they need to be kept separately.

**MILLER:** Well, I guess the Bloomington Faculty sees what we're talking about here something that we don't have now. Now you may have it at IUPUI, but it is the view of the faculty Affairs Committee in Bloomington that we do not have something like this at the present.

**BRAND:** Was there another question?

**FINEBERG:** Yes, I think it would be helpful if we had a bit of a road map that we were (616). We've been working on mechanisms at IUPUI, setting up committee structures to examine many of the same concerns that Professor Miller has. I think I'd like to see us put down on paper just a flow chart of where we would go, given the certain problems, how they would be handled. And perhaps to have the corresponding flow chart of what you propose to do in Bloomington, so that we could understand a bit better. I think this is one case where, in fact, a complicated subject as to what happens in sequence.

**BRAND:** I've read both documents recently. Although the language is different, thinking is very similar. So, for example, the IUPUI document puts a lot of stress of professional development, and if you prefer remedial actions. But one of the key aspects of the Bloomington document, one of the sanctions (that may be the wrong word). But clearly this committee could recommend professional development, remedial action, steps along those lines. It wouldn't automatically move into the more serious sanctions. So again the language is a bit different, but I think the thinking is rather similar. Which brings me back to Bill's point that this group, next academic year, will have to face the question of some general guidelines. And the language could be different, it could be campus-specific, but there probably needs to be some general guidelines. And I don't think the two large campuses that far apart.

**EISENBERG;** Well, your last point is basically what I was going to say. Which I (648) the UFC passing for the university guidelines efficiently general, (650) discrepancies as there might be next year. For example, between the Bloomington campus and IUPUI campus. While it might be allowed to remain, it sounded at first that (652) ironed out some way. Some kind of

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

compromise had to be reached. And (654) that is necessary. It might be desirable, but if that doesn't work out that will be okay too.

BRAND: I think we'll have to examine the issues, whether there are any substantial differences. Right now it doesn't appear that way. But there might be a merge into discussion.

CAMILLA: To pick up on that one issue that was raised a minute ago, about the line of who handles what, and so on. What happens to issue that come in via, let's say, through the police department or the president or chancellor? Would they be precluded from taking actions such as appointing a committee? Or would it have to go to the dean of that particular school for action, or what?

ARNOVE: (665) case of that in Bloomington (667).

Laughter.

BRAND: (668).

ARNOVE: (669).

BRAND: The serious answer to that is that in the dismissal part of the Bloomington (674) academic. IUPUI already has dismissal for any range of misconduct in incompetence.

ARNOVE: There are rules for handling those particular cases.

SCHNEIDER (678).

BRAND: What I understood this to be saying was that if a department had, or even a colleague, has a concern to express, it must come through the Dean. That person can't bring it to the committee directly.

SCHNEIDER: Academic.

BRAND: Academic. But that would remove, I think, some of the personal conflict that might be involved. And provide some regularity and some oppressments that would be very helpful. There are other mechanisms in the university that if something comes through the police or the chancellors' office, or so on. Those remain in place and are independent to this.

MILLER: My (700) is that this policy is meant to deal with cases that, at present, are simply not being dealt with. To the extent that there are mechanisms available to deal with cases, mechanisms that work, to deal with other cases, there would be no reason whatsoever to involve this committee.

BRAND: I think that's exactly right.

ARNOVE: Just as a general (697). We're operating under the assumption of as a professional group we're self-regulating and this would (700) to take control of some cases where there's

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

some incompetence or misconduct. But I had a question. Before I came to this meeting, I received a number of documents from the BFC office circulated to us about the (705) south Bend policies. And I am just wondering where they fall. And I notice something that was sent out with. One of the recommendations was for demotion of ranks. So I would (710).

BRAND: Lloyd can (710).

ORR: Just part of the discussion that came up, something that Bob brought up, that's a self-regulating group. That if we don't do it, somebody's going to do it for us. The other (714) discussion, it's very clear, and you can (715) by saying where it (716). But that is that these are not pieces of minor, even if sustained over some period of time, they are handled within a unit, the department of whatever. These are cases that have really risen to the limit on what a department might do, and therefore begin to go into these process. And when they're that serious, it (723) dismissal at least becomes an option.

BRAND: I think, that's at least the way I read the document. And that makes sense to me.

**TAPE 2: SIDE A**

ARNOVE: (001) some reason or another, if he had not lived up to the level of (002) associate or full professor, and therefore are no longer deserving of that rank. And I don't know what reason specifically, because I was not a party to their discussion. But it will be continued (005).

MAWHINNEY: (005) being somewhat (06). Maybe it's the altitude. But (006) below assistance. [Laughter].

BRAND: Okay, any other comments on this please?

WAGOR: There's a question more for Sara. I know one of the things that the Faculty Affairs Committee had been doing over the year was gathering information from the individual campuses about what, if any, general principles might be. Do we have any kind of (011). I'm thinking specifically for a campus like Richmond. We haven't started the process of trying to draft our own document that deal with the issues that both Bloomington and IUPUI are doing. And part of the reason was we were waiting to see what might be those principles that would govern whatever policies we might want to develop. And so I was wondering, is there any report on any progress on what those overriding policies might be?

HOOK: Well, if you'll recall that in November, the Faculty Affairs Committee of UFC was charged with drafting a cover memo to go with the IUPUI policy to all the regional campuses, as well as Bloomington, and that was done soliciting any feedback, posing the main question of should there, can there be overreaching university-wide policies that everyone can use in much the same fashion that we have other policies? And then flowing under that more specific policies and procedures for each of the campuses. The feedback on that from most of the campuses was essentially non-existent. In the meantime, Bloomington went on with their alternative track, as did the South Bend campus. Now that I've seen what South Bend has done, and I'm particularly struck by what Bloomington has done, and I agree with the comment that we're very very similar in many of the philosophies is taking a slightly different track. But, in fact, some of the language is exactly the same. So I'm struck by the fact that particularly, too, with Bloomington on the, perhaps verge of voting in theirs, and our campus, perhaps voting in ours. That by the fall we should be able to combine those two. Because, again, they are very very similar. The philosophies are the same. And coming up with some overall guidelines. So I guess my view would be for campuses to proceed with looking at specific procedures that they might need to implement on their campus. But also referring to IUPUI and Bloomington kind of guiding introductory statements about the philosophy of post-tenure review/misconduct type policies.

BURGAN: Just a brief comment. Professor Fineberg pointed out a few minutes ago that it would be a lot easier if you had something in front of you. It certainly would. And what I want to stress is why there isn't. It's been a terrifically intense debate over all this matter in Bloomington for several Faculty Council meetings over wording down to very fine parts of which part of a phrase gets left in or how it gets modified. It hasn't been passed yet. And I think everything that Ted did was admirably cogent, and I certainly hope that it's going to pass next time. It's not yet quite in shape where anything can be put down on paper and circulating, and that's why it's not there.

## IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98

RIEMENSCHNEIDER: I'd like to comment, I think, on South Bend. It was not that we were trying to develop a policy at that point. But our special meeting of our (039) in January was the discussion of the IUPUI document. And we were responding to trying to get some feedback about how our faculty felt to the committee so that they could use that in drafting guidelines for the UFC. I don't think that was the last word. We were trying to point out that we were concerned about one campus setting up guidelines that may not apply to every campus, so were very emphatic that we wanted campuses (046). And secondly we're concerned about the amount of faculty time spent on committees. So we saw that in these documents and in some of the proposals were that every faculty member be reviewed. And we began to look at the time that this was going to (050) the faculty, and we objected to that kind of proposal. We wanted to be something that use the present evaluation system as a mechanism. If there's going to be something use, to use this mechanism for triggering it. At that point, I think we were waiting to see responses by the other groups. And hopefully the guidelines that would be developed, so that when we develop something we are not wasting our (055) time developing something that turns out is not within the guidelines or something else. So I think a major purpose of that was to contribute to the development of these guidelines.

FINEBERG: One piece that I think would be very useful for those of us that are not directly involved in the development of these guidelines is some concrete data about how commonly the problems you anticipate a solution for occurred. I don't think we know that. How commonly, for example, does the problem arise where you need to go through the structure that you proposed? How commonly, for example, suppose that what we know is that the event for which (065) occurs perhaps once every five years. And yet the more common problem is the need for remediation and (067) performance, which is what it would be. Perhaps it is more important to have ad hoc mechanisms (068) once in every five years. And, in fact, have a very strong and (069) mechanism for the more common problem that occurs ten times a year.

ARNOVE: Well, I think, for example. Departments generally know where there's a place of chronic misconduct. But sometimes what we consider chronic misconduct, like alcoholism, would be (073) are really covered by the (073) disabilities act. So you can't consider that And then (074-075). Some of the (074) complaining about cases where maybe they felt discrimination or harassment, and is there any (075) for example. And I know from experience with different sources that some people may complain to the Dean of Faculties. Other people may complain to the Dean of Women's Affairs. Or they may complain to the Dean of Students. So what happens is, and I raised this issue in the last BFC meeting, is that get those (079) and come up with sort of social facts. There's a need for some coordinating body to begin to accumulate because complaints about one person may be in three or four different offices So I think Debbie Freund had mentioned that they are now beginning to make an effort to at least gather this information and have some central coordination. So in order to know those facts, there has to be mechanisms to gather and coordinate. So I don't think at this point, say, do we have those facts? No, I don't think so. (083) think that may be facts may be cases of a disability that may not be (085).

BOSCHMANN: There is a group that is now forming within AAHE that has to do with this particular issue. And I think the person's name is Christine McCanna. And I would encourage the people (086) to stay in touch with her in her office. I think it's new branch of AAHE that is looking at this nationally. There may be some data coming through that. AAHE. American Association of Higher Educations.

## IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98

BRAND: Find it on the web. [Laughter].

FRENCH: From the perspective of a regional campus, I also want to reiterate that we've been looking for some guidelines so that we could proceed on with developing the policies at the individual campus level. But prior to that, we're a little bit concerned about moving forward.

BRAND: If I were to give any advice to the regional campuses who haven't moved as quickly as the larger campuses, I would suggest that you wait until the fall and when you've seen these general guidelines and that these documents themselves continue to undergo review until they reach final form. There's not so much of a rush that you should try and fit it in before that happens. It will make your job a little easier. So if you haven't done much now, I would suggest that you hold off. Nothing will go wrong.

MAWHINNEY: One of the things that Ivy Tech (098). In our discussions was the feeling that we have already moved, that we have in place not only the annual reviews, but also a teaching capacity model which each professor is asked to justify, for any particular year, what they intend to do. Maybe justifies is the wrong word, but at least make clear what their goals are. And those goals are then (102) put in the records. And in the following year, it is the chairs' duty to sit with the faculty and reflect upon progress towards those goals. So at least in terms of the merit that review process, it is not so much the misconduct process, we feel as though we have been proactive. And when people have fallen substandard in that process, there are a number of procedures that (107) in review of that. And I think I'm reflecting the remarks of the Dean of Arts and Sciences, who is very articulate on this, without being specific as to names. But these things have been (109). So I'm hoping, and I think our faculty is hoping, that with regard to the merit review suggestions and (110), that that will allow the incorporation of something that has already been hammered out with some considerable effort (112).

BRAND: I think that's fair. Let me make a comment, if I might. Most of the cases that we are talking about, the (113) cases. I think we have mechanisms in place for handling those. It's actually the very rare but troublesome case that we're dealing with. And I was department head for a dozen years or so. And occasionally, very occasionally, and maybe in my career I only ran across two such people, who were really recalcitrant faculty members who weren't showing up for class, who were acrimonious in department meetings, and there didn't seem to be alcoholism or anything like that. They just had another life that they were leading. And decided to do something else with their life. But they just sort of hung out at the university once in awhile. But as a department head, I was absolutely powerless to deal with that. And I would go to the dean, and the dean would look at me. And I would get no results. And it made everyone in the department very uncomfortable and very unhappy about it. And there was just no mechanism. And I think all universities face that. That's a rare case, and it's this kind of rare case we're worried about. And I hope they are very rare, but there are a few of them. And this is an assistance to the faculty and department who are living with these conditions, to department chairs, and eventually the deans, to deal with it. That's why the comments about reviewing everyone doesn't make sense to me. It's not that kind of issue. This has to be clearly a triggered issue for exceptional cases that we have not been able to deal with in the normal case of affairs. And you're talking about the normal course of affairs. And we're in good shape on getting better

**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

on that. So this is not, I wouldn't want to see those kinds of cases come before a committee like this. Bob is mentioning that we're moving on. He wants to go home.

BURGAN: Well, you (130).

BRAND: Well, this is an important issue in part because it has a lot of visibility. Bill, you distributed a sheet on faculty numbers. This was just for information only?

BURGAN: This was simply to share numbers that I reported numbers on at the last meeting, but nobody had available. Becky pointed out to me at the beginning of the meeting that there is a typo, and I think everyone would probably see it. But on Line H, total Faculty should be G plus E. These were updated figures that we had to date of the last faculty meeting, and we wanted to make sure everyone had them.

WAGOR: At IUPUI, why is the medical school not there?

BURGAN: That was probably their request. And I don't really know. Bill should probably comment on that.

SCHNEIDER: It was just too hard. We wanted to get the information quicker rather than take the time to get them sorted out. And as we have seen in today's meeting, the medical school just in terms of defining ranks let alone counting them, has some problems. So it seemed much simpler just to set it aside. Most of the clinical ranks are in there as well, so it seemed a simple solution to try to do something with what we had.

WAGOR: (142).

BRAND: Finally, before we break, I'd like to call on Ted.

MILLER: As many of you no doubt know, this is Bill Schneider's (145) with the University Faculty Council. And I thought it would be appropriate to give him a gift in recognition of his service to UFC. Now, as a person whose primary interests fall into the areas of statistical analysis, it is very dangerous for me to try to go out and find something appropriate for a historian. But none-the-less, (150) and I went out to the Barnes and Nobles bookstore, which is in Bloomington, and of course they have a broad array of things. And I thought, what, however can I decide, knowing nothing about history or (153). So I decided to buy the biggest book that they had.

Laughter

MILLER: Bill probably knows this book. It is called the "History of the Modern World." And actually I was quite attracted to the simplicity of the cover. It looked like a very attractive book to me. And as I looked at the description of this, it turns out that these two people, the authors' conception of the modern world is really focused on Europe. So this "History of the Modern World" is really sort of a European history. And Bill's specialty happens to be European history. And one of these people at least is described as someone who is really quite expert in French



**IU University Faculty Council: 4/14/98**

history. Which I know is Bill's special interest. So this rule, finding the biggest book, actually led me to a book that may actually be of some interest to Bill. I really hope it will be.

Laughter.

MILLER: Due to the lateness of the hour, I really haven't done anything with this. But it struck me as something we may all do here before we leave is maybe autograph a page or so, so Bill will have a memento of his colleagues.

SCHNEIDER: Different pages from different people?

Laughter.

MILLER: I hope that this will be of some value to you. And it certainly expresses our appreciation for your fine services.

Applause.

SCHNEIDER: I'm sure the choice of history books was bigger than the choice of statistics books. (172) So I thank you very much. I won't say the pleasure has been mine. But the honor has been mine. With all of you. At the end of these meetings, I go away shaking my head marveling my head at all the time and thought people have put in on these things. And I mean that sincerely that it has been my pleasure to have had the chance to work with you. And I may see you again. Thank you.

BRAND: And we stand adjourned.