

Untitled Document

Steve Ashba

UFC: 3/26/96

Brand: Shall we begin? Presiding office business, I just want to give you a very brief report on the legislative session. Much to a number of people's surprise, the legislature did what they said they were going to do and did not open the budget. In previous short sessions, the budget had been open giving the University an opportunity for particular capital projects, or some such. That did not happen this time, and so we were not successful in our first capital priority, which was the theater/Neal Marshall Center on the Bloomington campus. We did accomplish a few items of interest. We moved forward the dates on two projects, one in Indianapolis on the Law School and the second at IU-East, the date on that project. But other than that, we did not get additional capital projects, we did not ask for additional operating funds, so there was no change there. Though that was disappointing, what I thought was the best outcome for us in terms of the legislative session was our clear ability to bring forward a united front from the entire university to make our case well and to gain a level of communication and cooperation(021) absence. That puts us in excellent position for the longer session coming up next year and that session of course will determine our budget for the next two years. Some of that, some of the results we will see in the next session will depend significantly on who wins the gubernatorial election and whether the Republicans continue to hold the house. The state Republicans have a strong hold on the senate, 20 to 30, and I doubt we'll see many changes there. Incidentally, it was the Republican senate that insured the budget could not be opened, but the house is probably up for grabs, as is the gubernatorial election. So that will affect our ability to set a budget, to increment our operating funds, and to meet our goals on capital plans. Any questions or issues about that, about the legislative session? (Pause) I believe we continue for the very most part to have good support and appreciation of IU and higher education in this state. I believe that, if not unique, it's rather unusual to have that level of support and appreciation from a legislature for higher education in any state right now. Many states and state legislators throughout the United States are finding the road much more rocky than we are. So I am please with the position of the state on this, and I'm especially pleased about the level of appreciation. And one of the reasons for that is the continued close cooperation between IU and Purdue and indeed the other institutions of higher learning as well. We do not war amongst ourselves, though we may disagree, but we do not war amongst ourselves and we continue to not only communicate well, but to provide the state with very high quality educational services given the amount of money they give us. I think we can take great pride in that. We really do a good job, and that's fair to say, that's not just an exaggeration. I believe it's understood and appreciated. One example of the cooperation is right here on the IUPUI (group laughs) IUP-Fort Wayne campus, as well as on the IUPUI campus. Both of those enterprises are extremely unusual and I don't know of any two major research universities cooperating that well. Don't misinterpret me, I don't mean to say that everything is always perfect, but the level of cooperation and being able to work together is really quite remarkable. I'll turn now to the agenda committee business and call on Ed and Catherine.

Greenebaum: Thanks to Fort Wayne for their hospitality today and thank you all for coming, especially those from New Albany. I have very little my way of business. I want to call to your attention that you have already received via e-mail the agenda for our next meeting, which is two weeks from now. There are two action items on that agenda. One, the intellectual property policy. You've had a draft of that that was introduced at our last meeting. You'll be receiving a new draft of that with some modifications between now and two weeks from now. We want to act on the policy at the next meeting, so if there are issues that come up that you think will need addressing when you see the new draft, if you could let Fred Cate or us and we will forward the issues to him and his committee in advance. So that if there are any issues that you have on your minds that they can address, we would like to hear them. The other action item is the, amendments to the Student Code. Ellen Brantlinger brought copies of the latest draft of those revisions to our last meeting and for those who did not receive them, we'd be happy to distribute additional copies if you acknowledge you need one. Again, we hope to have action on that and it is a substantial document. We anticipate there may be issues. If you would let us know in advance of any amendments that you would expect to bring to the floor so that if there are such amendments, we can prepare an orderly debate and discussion, we would like to have that notice as well. Ellen, is there anything you want to say about the code?

Brantlinger: No, I did bring extra copies. If you'll raise your hand, I'll deliver to you right now. Did anyone not get it at the last University Faculty Council?

Greenebaum: And tell your colleagues that if any of them need them to send Ellen an e-mail and she'll be happy to put it in campus mail to them. I think that's my(088).

Brand: Moving on to item 3 on the agenda, are there any questions or comments any members would like to raise right now? (Pause) OK, I see none. Moving on to item 4, Clinical Ranks. Shall we begin with the report from either Professor Jackson or Spechler?

Jackson: This issue comes before us, again partly due to a vote last year to reconsider the issue this year. We now have a proposal on clinical ranks that's been prepared after considerable discussion by our two co-secretaries. It begins with a resolution on the purpose of the use of academic ranks, followed by a resolution on clinical ranks, how they are to be defined, the rights and privileges of people having those ranks, they way in which they're to be appointed in advance, and then protections for their academic freedom. This is all spelled out in circular U-1696, which is attached to the agenda. Since this was discussed at some length at the last meeting, I think I'll just stop right now and we'll see what kind of comments and other sort of discussion we have.

Brand: OK, we're going to have a general discussion. This is an action item. After our general discussion, I will entertain a motion to move this forward. Ed.

Greenebaum: I suppose I just might call the council's attention to the changes in the draft in this version as compared to the last draft that you all saw. I think Kathy can back me up if I miss anything along the way. I think there's nothing very significant in resolution 1 that I need to call your attention to. In resolution 2, right in the very beginning, in the first sentence, in the last phrases of it, it now reads "where their primary duties are teaching students and resident fellows and providing

professional service in the clinical setting...” What’s happened there is that the phrase “in the clinical setting,” which had followed “teaching students and resident fellows,” is now put at the end of the sentence so that it indicates that the duties of clinical faculty, generally not just their teaching duties, but their duties in general are to be primarily in the clinical setting. The other significant changes, the percentages have been changed. What was previously 51% requirement for full-time tenure track faculty is now increased to 60%, at the same time, that’s for the health disciplines, at the same time for other disciplines who work in a clinical setting, the permission to have clinical faculties have increased from 15% to 20% as compared to the last draft. One of the questions raised, one of the areas of issue raised in the last meeting related to the impact of these regulations on multi-campus schools. We have not altered the text of the resolution to address those issues directly, but we have added a paragraph to the comments about that and that is the paragraph that starts with the last two lines on page 3 and goes over to the top of page 4. The other place where we’ve made significant to the final draft is at the very end of the resolution where we make clear that reappointment for those beyond the probationary status may depend upon continuing staffing needs in the clinic for the particular types of clinical expertise that the particular faculty member has along the lines we discussed and indicated that we would adjust for when we were together last and the last 5 lines of the resolution adjusted in those ways.

Brand: Now (151) goes beyond those ending probation.

Greenebaum: Right.

Brand: OK, thank you.

Spechler: I think Elton is right that you don’t need extended discussion of the document. You’ve all had it for months and months. (155) entails or reflects many compromises that have been made and many agreements among schools. But I’d like to point out two things and answer 1 or 2 questions that have come up recently. The first has to do with smaller locations, smaller campuses or even remote locations which are not campuses. This document refers to schools. The percentages involved refer to schools and it’s the faculty of those schools which will determine what the maximum percentage will be. Now that means if the School of Nursing has a clinic in say Anderson, and I don’t know whether they do, but I passed Anderson on my way. Suppose they have a clinic in Anderson, that does not mean that they have to have 60% tenure faculty in Anderson, that’s up to the school or the tenured and tenure eligible faculty in the School of Nursing to decide how they will manage their operations in Anderson. And it might be that there would be 1 or 2 people there only, neither of whom would hold tenure. So that’s my understanding about the matter, it does not limit the flexibility of schools to manage small clinics or other facilities in this or that town, location in the State of Indiana. Secondly, I’d like to point out, while this body has considerable power, in the past our tradition has been to devolve as much of this power as possible to the schools and to allow as great flexibility as possible to the schools. I think that’s (176) wisdom, and we followed that in this instance. The actual percentage we would anticipate would vary, vary considerably between the School of Medicine, School of Nursing, and other schools. However, I was asked whether this would apply to the traditional liberal arts school. My understanding, and I believe Elton’s too, is that clinical ranks are entirely inappropriate for the traditional liberal arts units on this or any other campus. That might be a matter for future discussion, you might differ on that, but this piece of legislation

does not permit a French department, and Economics department, or any other department of the traditional liberal arts disciplines to set-up a clinic. Now I hold a clinic for my students in statistics. That doesn't mean we can have a clinical professor coming in and teaching that material. It has to be a bona fide clinic for patient service and I think we understand that that is limited. One final note, this is not the end of the road for guaranteeing academic freedom and getting organized on a better footing in this very complex university - it is not the end of the road. But I believe this is a step forward for those who have clinical ranks. It improves their economic situation. It improves their faculty governance position. It improves their protections for academic freedoms and we had nothing but support from those who would hold clinical rank positions throughout the system. We have been very encouraged by that and I believe we have a document here which has answered at one degree or another all the objections that have been brought to the faculty affairs committee, so Elton and I are recommending that you pass this document today.

Scherer: I don't know if it will be an actual problem, but I'm a little uneasy that there is still nothing in the document that prevents, and I'm not concerned about the (206) clinics that professors clinic where he mentions, but there is nothing in this document that prevents a system-wide school or multi-campus school where there is a program which is really complete on a local campus, such as South Bend or Fort Wayne, whatever, from having less than 50% tenured faculty.

Coffin: I'd like to our attention to a portion of the section on (214) which is on page 4. It says "Clinical ranked faculty are not eligible for academic administrative appointments and above the department chair level." It's currently the case at IU-Northwest and I believe at least one other campus, that there are people currently in such administrative, academic administrative positions who are clinical faculty and I think that it's important for us to understand how that situation is going to be treated under this new policy so that those of us who have that problem to deal with will know what the parameters are within which we're working.

Brand: Let me try to answer that if I might. The usual way to proceed in these matters when you're passing a new policy is to be respectful of those already in the position and doing a good job. And so, during the transitionary period as the policy takes place, it would be normal to allow those individuals to continue to function as they are. But when it comes time to replace them, to take into account new policies and regulations.

Bristow: Late yesterday, Myrtle Scott discovered to her regret that she would not be able to come today and she asked me if I would read on her behalf a statement which she would have made had she been able to be here. I agreed to do that not only as a favor to Myrtle, but because I agree with the position that she takes in this statement. I'm speaking here as Myrtle, no small task, but "I continue to be concerned about the proposal to convert up to 40% of faculty lines in some departments and/or schools to non-tenured lines. I believe this is the wrong way to solve what are clearly some substantial problems. I very much appreciate the work all our colleagues have done on this matter and I surely understand that many people are being worn down by it. This to me however is a very dangerous point in any legislative process. We must not let our fatigue seduce us into giving away the fundamental basis of the pursuit of a full academic life for our future colleagues. What we seem to have lost sight of is that it is not really tenure per se that we are discussing here. The important point of course is academic freedom. We absolutely, positively must not give up the

academic freedom of even one of us. If we do, then surely we give away an institution called a university. Research can surely continue to be done there as it is in other organizations where researchers are directed in their work. But it will no longer be a university. Research in universities is under the direction of the individual brain and creative thinking of the professor himself or herself. That is the fundamental difference between universities and other institutions and why many of us chose to work here, despite disadvantages as compared with other organizations, for example in salaries. The(258) is of course we have not found a mechanism to protect academic freedom except tenure. I think that if we do not protect the basic principal of academic freedom today, it simply gives away another small piece of the academic enterprise and these multiple emergencies and crises will continue to come at us and we will soon be unable to defend ourselves against them. If we give away 40% of some academic units to tenured lines, how can we hope to hold the line very much longer? What I would like to do is make two proposals. First I would like to make a substitute motion. This motion is intended to test the water to see if we might yet work out a better solution to the present problem without putting so many of our faculty lines in jeopardy. If that motion fails, although I hope it will not, I will then offer an amendment to the present proposal adding a sunset clause 3 years from now with an evaluation to proceed that date. The substitute motion...

Brand: Now are you going to raise this on the part, so this is your motion now, you're making the motion.

Bristow: I'll make the motion.

Brand: OK.

Bristow: I move that the Clinical Ranks Policy be considered immediately by the Faculty Affairs Committee as part of the larger issue of all non-tenured positions. A proposal for handling these positions, including clinical ranks, should be presented to the UFC at the very earliest possible date, in no case later than the fall semester of 1966 (Assume means 1996).

Brand: OK, now I'm going to interpret the following way: Are you ourParliamentarian? Who's our Parliamentarian? And interpret it the following way: Since this was a committee report, and needing no second, that this motion, the original motion is already on the floor, namely resolution 1 and 2. And now we have a substitute motion that has been recommended. Do I have a second for that? Did you read the substitute motion? Is there a second for that?

Downs: Second.

Brand: OK, so now we're back to a substitute motion of, what we need a motion to substitute, is that debatable?

(294) It is, let me check.

(295) (Multiple voices discussing debate issue)

Brand: OK, so it's debatable and do we need a majority?

(297): A plain majority.

Brand: OK, we're debating this and the motion on the floor now that we're talking about is the substitute motion, which in essence says let's send it back to committee, not the words but this is the sense of it, send it back to committee to be considered in a larger context, namely in the context of all non-tenure or tenurable faculty. Is that correct?

Bristow: Exactly.

Brand: OK, there we are. Martin.

Spechler: Well of course I'm opposed to this. I think it's completely unnecessary. We already are considering this matter in a broader context and those people who have read the many e-mail messages from our committee realize that we understand that this is a part of the broader matter and we promise you a suitably challenge for discussion on April 9th with respect to these broader questions. Now I yield to no one in my respect and affection for Myrtle Scott. And we have the same objectives, protecting academic freedom, raising standards at Indiana University, the same objectives. But I'm afraid that Myrtle's motion constantly assumes that we are back in a world where everybody that teaches at Indiana University is tenured or tenure eligible. This is hardly the case. Had she been a member of our committee, she would surely know that there are huge numbers of part-timers, volunteers, visitors, all kinds of non-faculty teaching and doing business at Indiana University. So we aimed to address that issue. Now if you take off from what is, rather than perhaps what ought to have been or what was 75 years ago, if you understand what the present situation is, you will realize that what we're trying to do is improve the situation of the clinical rank faculty from a situation in which they have no recognition, no protection for their academic freedom, no requirements for their economic security. They have no part in faculty government. We're giving them all these things and we're recognizing that they're quite important for the mission of many of our outstanding schools in the professional and clinical area. So we are trying to make a major improvement in the present situation. If it were an option at Indiana University to have a single system for all schools, I must say we would be in a rather different world and a rather different university than the one you can see at all of our campuses. So I urge you, I promise and, Myrtle and everyone in this room, that we will definitely discuss this and before next fall. I might mention, although some of you will consider it an advantage, that Elton Jackson and I will no longer be chair. We have worked on this together for two years and we have this proposal, we will have other proposals for you if all goes well, yet this year. I must say, in all respect to an excellent colleague, that the only affect of this substitute motion, would be yet more delay. And in my opinion, there is one thing that discredits faculty governments at Indiana University, it's failure to deal with major issues and constant delay. People have had months and months to bring their considerations to the committee and to the floor of this council, and yet I'm amazed to hear a responsible and respected colleague say once again, "Oh no, it's not time." Not time for what? What considerations have not been brought forth? It's time to act. We've postponed, we've postponed. If we're going to have any credibility, we have to act, yes or no.

Brand: Any other comments?

Kapoor (383) (Inaudible-too far from microphone)

Brand: Thank you, any other comments?

McGuire: My name is Lisa McGuire from the IUPUI School of Social Work and I am a staff person who would definitely be impacted by the substitute motion as well as the original motion because I'm one of the people eagerly awaiting to become a clinical faculty person. Right now my appointment is staff appointment and all of the situations that(379) described count for me in terms of my economic development, my educational development in this school, my opportunity to participate in the faculty governance, my opportunity to order a cap and gown on time and avoid the five-dollar late fee every year because I never get the announcement for the cap and gown, all those little things. This is very important to us in the School of Social Work. We've talked about this quite a bit and all of our positions are waiting until the university makes a decision on these things. It is important for us to let you all know that none of our tenure track positions will be impacted by this. What will be impacted are non-tenure track posts that we call teacher practitioners and folks like me that are in staff positions that really are dealing with faculty matters though. We just finished an accreditation report and I can tell you I knew more about our curriculum policies statement and have written as much of the document as anyone else. Those are expectations of my job, faculty responsibilities that have to do with curriculum. And yet my position remains at a staff position which puts me, and others like me in our school, at a great disadvantage.

Fineberg: I'm disappointed by the substitute motion, but not surprised. I think in every instance where we delay very important decisions, we lose control of our actions and this is yet one more example. There's no question in my mind that if we delay these actions,(406) the Medical School, the Medical School will have to act independently and we will lose a very important relationship with the University and I don't want to see that happen. I think in my field of life, the health care field, it's very clear that physicians failed to act to control the health care and now we've lost control. I think that if the University, the tenured faculty, wish to continue controlling their environment, they have to act and decide to act responsibly. I believe that this motion, this proposal, has been crafted very carefully taking into account all of the fears and concerns of the faculty, whether or not they're health care related, and I urge you to defeat the substitute motion and to vote on the motion at hand.

Bristow: To the issue of delay, were the substitute merely asking that we delay and come back to the same point that we are today and discuss the same motion, I would of course agree with the points that have been made. But the point of the substitute motion is to say that we need to look at this issue in its full context. I appreciate that Professor Spechler may have considerable information on this topic already, had done considerable investigation of it and has begun to share some of that investigation with others. But that beginning does not constitute a framework for a full understanding of all the tenure ineligible ranks at the University now, and that is what this motion asks for.

Downs: I understood the intention of the motion, being the delay, in hopes that a recommendation regarding this problem could be developed with Myrtle and myself as well as (443). If it is the wish of the committee that we vote yes or no today, without regard to those of us who still have some

reservations about the proposal, then I'm willing to vote "no" today. But if others join with me in sharing those reservations and hoping that we can have a proposal that addresses those problems within the entire context, I hope they will vote for the substitute motion. Just one additional point that I wanted to make, we heard the promise that it would be addressed in the future from someone who's not going to be the chair of the committee. I wonder if the promise is worth as much as it would be if he were going to continue to be the chair. I'm reminded of something that my father used to say quite often and that is "trust everybody, but cut the cards." A resolution calling for a report early on is stronger in my way of thinking than a promise made to me by the party chairman of the committee that proposed the original resolution.

Jackson: I want to speak against the substitute motion. Two points, first we had thought in the Faculty Affairs Committee, and I think the co-secretaries agreed with us, that the issue of clinical ranks was sufficiently different from that of other irregular tenure ineligible appointments, that we could consider the clinical issue by itself. I know Myrtle disagrees, but that's the viewpoint that we took. The second point is that we have had an awful lot of discussion about this. People from the Medical School and the other health related schools, the Dean of the IUPUI Law School for example at the last meeting, and many other constituencies have been consulted. I'm not perfectly happy with the motion of the co-secretaries, but I think one hallmark of a good motion is that everybody is a little unhappy with it, but that everybody can also live with it. So I plan to vote for the co-secretaries motion and I will vote against the substitute motion.

Greenebaum: I have just a couple of comments. I've been quite grateful to Myrtle(490), I have collaborated with on many projects and have (493) on the AAP Executive Committee, have been here for many years and both of them are on the UFC Agenda Committee with me this year, with Myrtle being on the UFC Agenda Committee. So we have had many opportunities to discuss this issue and I've been very grateful for them to have served my conferences and making(498) as I've gone forward with this project. I think myself, that it is not accurate to say, in this matter of clinical ranks, that we are giving up tenure track lines. I think those(507) are not ones in our current scheme who would be in clinical ranks excuse me, would be in tenure tracks, nor would tenured, in our current understanding of tenured faculty, tenured people fulfill the roles of the clinical ranks people fulfill. I know that there are several of us, including me, were we to create this world for ourselves would have preferred to go a route that would have involved a separate clinical track for clinical faculty. But I've been convinced that that is not something that would be achievable in the near future. Although I'm not convinced that maybe in the long run, that may not be a solution that will come about. But for the present, I don't think it's accurate for us to describe this as giving up tenure track lines to non-tenure track lines. I also think this is a specialized faculty role problem that is quite different in quite a lot of respects from the other tenure ineligible problems that we're going to be looking at when we look at the larger concepts. I think it is accurate to say that a great many tenure ineligible people do do teaching that might otherwise be done by tenured faculty. In any case, I think for myself, the clinical ranks is a specialized and relatively contained issue and I think that my judgment is that we will do a better job looking at the larger problem of tenure ineligible faculty without being driven in doing that by meeting to solve the clinical faculty problem. It is, the larger problem is a terribly difficult one, terribly complex. I doubt that we're going to solve it two weeks from now, even if we do some things that will make movement. I doubt that we can solve it by the

fall and I really don't want it to be driven by the clinical ranks problem and have a deadline on it that voting for the substitute motion would impose on it.

Brand: We've been around on the substitute motion for some time, so I'm going to ask that further comments interject new information into the discussion and not just merely reinforce other believers.

Spechler: Professor Downs, let me promise you that on April 9th, unless Fort Wayne is far more dangerous than I thought it was, I will still be co-chair with Elton Jackson of the committee and probably will hear me at that time, if my habits last until that time. Now can we promise you a resolution, or even a proposal this year, no, no we can't. I don't want to promise that because we haven't met yet with the committee. The issue is a major one for all American universities. To think that we could resolve this before May would be naive in the extreme. What we offer you is data, discussion, about the broader issues. Now it is true that Professor Downs and others have raised considerations not incorporated into this proposal. To remind you, it seems to me the most powerful of them was the idea raised in Richmond that clinical ranks be given tenure like professors. We have considered this, we haven't ignored it. It's simply impractical and unacceptable in most of the schools that would adopt clinical ranks. It's dead on arrival there and for very good reason that the clinical practice is moving far too fast to allow this. The practical affect of giving tenure to clinical ranks would mean that instead of hiring any clinical ranks, the deans would continue to hire part-timers and other non-tenure eligible ranks to staff these clinics. It would not solve the issue at all. So we did consider this matter and I want to say the proposal satisfies everybody (End of Tape 1 Side 1) to us, either in the committee or in this body.

Brand: OK, does someone want to raise the question now on the substitute motion? (Pause) OK, question has been called. All in favor of the substitute motion please raise your hands (pause) opposed (pause) OK, we're on to the next item, any additional business Professor Scherer on this one.

Scherer: I would like to move an amendment that would appear at the end of the third paragraph which would read as follows, "In no case, where all work for a degree is granted on a given campus, will the clinical rank faculty total more than 50% of the faculty on that campus in that program."

Brand: Third paragraph on what page.

Scherer: Circular U1696, bottom of the first page under Resolution 1, Definition and Use of Clinical Ranks, Limitation Numbers of Clinical Rank Appointees. Oh, OK, Resolution 2 I guess under Section 1.

Brand: OK, are the first words in that paragraph are the maximum number of...

Scherer: Right.

Brand: Would you repeat that once more so everyone can be clear.

Scherer: "In no case, where all work for a degree is granted on a given campus, will the clinical rank faculty in that program on that campus total more than 50%"

Brand: OK, campus specific independently to whatever university school is your point?

Scherer: Right.

Brand: Is there a second to that?

(020): Second.

Brand: OK. Any discussion, particularly from those involved in University schools.

Jackson: I'd like to have an explanation of the case that your wording is meant to be.

Scherer: On many campuses such as for example mine, you have a degree being offered in things such as Dental Hygiene or Nursing, other programs which fit under the health care provision. Under the given resolution, there's nothing preventing zero percent of the faculty on that campus to have tenure, to be tenurable. I'm saying at least 50% would have to be. Otherwise we have no protection in terms of campus situation because the whole school might have 60% tenure faculty, but our campus might have zero percent.

(028): Could someone from Nursing address, whether that's a problem for the School of Nursing.

Fulton: It would affect IU-East, but I can only speak for IU-East because there's just three of us that are tenured and there's twelve that are not tenured nor on tenure track. So it would limit this if you're going to say 50%.

Brand: You have only three on tenure track.

Fulton: Yes, three tenure track, three tenured, and twelve non-tenured, non-tenure track.

Brand: And 12 clinical?

Fulton: Well, they're lecturers. There's 3 on clinical.

Brand: Three on clinical and three on tenure track.

Fulton: Right, and there are more that want to get on clinical track.

Brand: On the clinical track?

Fulton: Yes.

Brand: And do you offer degrees on campus?

Fulton: Yes.

Brand: So then if this passes, those additional people will not be able to join the clinical track.

Fulton: Right.

Brand: So it's not inconsequential, there's at least one group that's affected. Anyone else.

Scherer: There's a question I don't know the answer to. If this is proposed, each campus gets separate accreditation for Nursing, does that become a moot point? Will the accrediting body allow the School of Nursing as a whole to count its total numbers or will indeed the accrediting body look at the number of faculty, tenured and non-tenured, on the campus?

Brand: Is the degree offered on East now an East degree or and IU Nursing School degree?

(046): School of Nursing degree.

Brand: University School of Nursing degree?

(047): Yes

Brand: There is no IU-East Nursing degree right now?

(047): That is correct.

Brand: So right now you would not be affected because there is no degree program on the campus. So what case would this apply in. So it doesn't apply in this case, what case would it apply.

Scherer: Well I think the language of the amendment is not whether the degree is offered on the campus, but whether all the coursework for the degree is offered on the campus, which is a more restrictive condition than whether the degree is offered on the campus.

Brand: I may have misunderstood, is that what the amendment says.

(053): That is correct.

(053): We're in a similar position at Northwest I believe in that all of our Dental Education faculty are clinical and at this point such a resolution would cause some upheaval in our Dental Ed program, whether we adopt the rest of the resolution or not. Simply that amendment create some difficulties in continuing to offer a program that we have offered for some time. The fact is the resolution, as it stands without the amendment, will offer those clinical people much greater protection than they have now and adopting the amendment might cost them their jobs.

(060): I guess I'm confused as to again, quite the purpose of the amendment. Again, looking at the East case, we have a significant number of our faculty who are lecturer appointments and not on clinical appointment. We have a few who are in fact tenurable. The results of this, it would seem to me, is to limit relatively arbitrarily the number of, percentage of one of those three components. So that would probably not affect us tremendously except in so far that we would continue to expand the tenure track or lecturer category. So if the point is to limit the number of non-tenure, tenure ineligible people on the faculty, this amendment will not do that. If the point is to address

specifically the question of the clinical faculty in these particular circumstances, then it will have minimal, no effect.

Brand: OK, one or two more comments if necessary, if not, we'll vote on this amendment. Please.

Scherer: My intention, I'm not certain this wording will achieve it or not, my intention is that I don't think it's desirable for a degree program on any campus to have a majority of faculty who are not on tenure track.

Brand: But if I understand that intention, would not that be considered in the broader context of non-tenure track faculty all total, not just clinical?

Scherer: I don't know because I'm not familiar enough with the situation on the campuses where the point's been raised. I just think that certainly, if the goal of this motion is to prevent a situation where a majority of the faculty are not on tenure track, is not being achieved in terms of campus specific situations. It protects you school-by-school, but not campus-by-campus.

Brand: But the earlier response was that since you're only covering one of several categories of non-tenurable faculty, what you're doing is depriving the opportunity for protections on the clinical faculty side, but not answering your full objection because you'll just wind up with more lecturers who are not yet protected.

Scherer: Well that question would be in advance because that supposedly is still coming up and I'm willing to defer on that, but I'm not willing to defer the idea that, aside from that issue, the clinical faculty might predominate vis-a-vie the tenured faculty.

Spechler: Well what Paul raises is a serious issue. At this proposal, as I pointed out before, refers to schools, independent units and not the campuses. But certainly a consideration of the balance on campus is a worthwhile concern which I think would be somewhat separate and if Paul would agree, we would promise to deal with this. I point out that in discussion, one colleague thinks this will have an enormous and adverse consequence. Another colleague thinks it will have no consequence at all. I think we're in a position of not having enough knowledge and what we ought to do is get a wording on this and go to the various deans, circulate it more broadly. So if Paul would agree to withdraw it, I would promise him it would be considered yet this year with his help or otherwise I would move to defer the amendment to committee.

Scherer: I am willing to refer it to committee.

Brand: OK, why don't you just accept that as a friendly amendment and you'll consider it. Any other amendments or changes to the original proposal.

Bristow: The amendment promised, threatened, in my earlier statement. I move that this policy be in force for three years. During the semester before its expiration, a report shall be prepared after consideration by each campuses governing body by the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee on the use of clinical ranks during this period. The UFC shall consider this report and act on it if appropriate.

Brand: OK, is there a second on that?

Bristow: If I could just make one comment about the motion to...This same motion has been made in other bodies this spring and the initial reasonable question is "What about the appointees during this three year period?" And I just point out that the President spoke to this issue in response to another question earlier today that my assumption is that we would honor any arrangements for appointees during this period.

Brand: Yes, I think it would be only fair not to disadvantage the individuals. Excuse me, is there a second for this.

Fineberg: I'll second it.

Spechler: I would have no objection to a review after three years. It is only prudent for a change of this sort and if we could agree to amend the proposal so it wouldn't terminate after three years, I guess there's no future chair to speak for this committee, so we who are the current chairs have to do that. I would see no difficulty about referring it in three years to the committee for review, as is often done with University legislation. But I do believe that a sense, or an expiration date, is going to project us back into this, maybe not us personally except maybe you Miles, back into this debate again and it's going to create a good deal of uncertainty in the schools and among the personnel affected.

Brand: Martin, is it fair to interpret your comment as an amendment to that?

Spechler: I'd like to amend it to say "Resolution is accepted with proposal that in three years Faculty Affairs Committee be requested to make a review of the working of this legislation.

Brand: Now that's an amendment to Ann's amendment, which is fine. Is there a second to Martin's?

(134): We're now addressing Martin's amendment to Ann's amendment before we go back to the original.

Bristow: That of course is not the purpose of the amendment as I stated it. I think we can assume that we will continue to review this policy as we review others. In fact, in our discussions, we have talked about an annual review of these kinds of appointments in the future. The entire point of the amendment as given is to force another form of consideration.

Brand: OK, I don't want to get too technical here, but if the amendment is contrary to the original proposal, we can't raise it as an amendment.

Bristow: Right.

Brand: Is it?

Patillo: I don't think so.

Brand: OK, we got a ruling from Parliamentarian. It's a legitimate amendment. We're talking about a revision of the amendment which would mean a formal review after three years coming back to this group.

Bristow: Forgive me, I would have thought, I would have been in agreement with your understanding of that in the sense I would simply be in the position of having to bring back my original.

Brand: That's good, it'll come back anyway.

Bristow: OK.

Coffin: Call the question.

Brand: OK, the question's been called. All in favor of the amendment that Martin offered to Ann Bristow's amendment please say I (multiple responses), opposed (multiple responses). Raise your hands, all in favor please raise your hands, Opposed. Well the nays were a little vocal, but they loose. OK, so that amendment passes, which means your motion is now on the floor, which is amended review in three years that comes back to this group. OK. Any discussion on that.

Jackson: Now my understanding is that what just happened was that the word "expiration" got taken out.

Brand: That's correct. That's where we are. The presumption is we will continue because the review might yield otherwise. We've changed the presumption. The original amendment was to presume sunset, now that's out, what's in is that there will be a review, what we're talking about, excuse me, is that there will be a review that comes back to this body in three years, without the presumption sense.

Scherer: I call the question.

Brand: Question has been called. All in favor say I (multiple responses), opposed (no audible responses). OK, that passes, so that's an amendment to the two resolutions you have in front of you now.

(165): (Multiple voices discussing which resolution it amends)

Brand: I assume it's both resolutions, is that right Martin, both resolutions or just Resolution 2.

Spechler: I'm sorry, I didn't understand what you said.

Brand: Was it both resolutions? What was the scope of your amendment.

Spechler: The amendment was to have a mandated review of the clinical ranks in three years.

Brand: Just Resolution 2. OK. So Resolution 2 now has a mandated review after three years, starting approximately one semester before and with consideration by this body. Other than that, it's as you see it on paper. Any additional comments.

Scherer: Call the question.

Brand: Question's been called. Shall we vote on both resolutions together? I will do so unless I hear a motion to separate the questions. (Pause) Hearing none, we'll vote on both. All in favor, please raise your hand. Opposed. The "I's" have it. OK, moving on to the interim report on the Mission and Structure of the School of Continuing Studies. Professor Wailes.

Wailes: The interim report was sent by electronic mail, yesterday I believe, to all members of the council. There are paper copies on that table there. If you did not receive the electronic text, you can pick-up one. This is an interim, or preliminary, report from our committee. The reason for making such a report is that this is quite a vast subject we are charged to look at when you say the mission and structure of an entire school of the university. We have narrowed it functionally in certain ways. We wanted to set before you some of our thinking and our recommendations as now formulated and see what you thought. The committee membership is at the top of our report. I should excuse Professor Mullin, Indianapolis campus, who joined the committee quite late and should not share in either praise or blame of the interim report. The only other member I think of the committee who could be here today is Professor Cornap of the Southeast campus who is here. So he will back me up in trying to respond to questions to make explanations. Our charge here is in the first paragraph and in subsequent paragraphs we addressed different elements of that charge. The first is a review of the missions of the school, specifically in light of the Strategic Directions Charter. The second paragraph tells you that we are happy with the consistency between the school's mission, of which there is a new statement adopted in 1994 and what we find in the Strategic Directions Charter explicitly connected to the school, one explicit connection what we can see, or implicitly connected to the school. We don't see a need for a study of the given mission by the school and we feel that the school and the charter have the future in mind with the school activities harmoniously. The question of relationships of other schools and campuses to the University School of Continuing Studies is obviously extremely complex. The experience of different campuses and the programs of different campuses in the area of continuing studies is quite divergent. There is no single model, one can't generalize easily, not even in terms of the campus committees active in the areas of extended studies and as overseeing the degree programs in general. (209) are in other ways as well. A part of the work of our committee has been simply to inform ourselves on activities on each of the campuses and try to find a common ground. Back in 1975, last paragraph on the first page, we cite this enabling document which attempted to sketch out the ways in which extended studies(215) organizationally. That's not a long time ago, 21 years, but in some ways that document's language lacks a little bit behind current realities. Nonetheless, I think we think it wisely mandated the formation of campus committees in the area and then derive from campus committees a university council for extended studies as policy bodies. One I'm sure deliberately vague area of the enabling document of 1975 is the absence of explicitly stated mandate for campus committees when what exactly they are to do. They are told not to overlap with the university council on extended studies. That's a mandate of negative(224). We think that there should be attention to the roles of the campus committees. We think there should be a uniform procedure for their formation that should

respect general principles of faculty governance. That is to say that these committees should be faculty committees and clear on what it is they are to do and then what they are to do should be consistent from campus to campus. The largest are of our discussion so far has been the question of faculty for the School of Continuing Studies. As you probably know, the school does not formulate most of the courses that are taught. for credit in the General Studies programs, but rather draws on the academic resources of individual campuses and schools. The School of Continuing Studies has actually a very small faculty, largely in the Division of Labor Studies, where colleagues are appointed within the School and promoted and tenured within the School. And, a few individuals with administrative responsibilities also have appointments to the School. The number is very small. Our committee believes it should be a broader, a larger, and properly constituted faculty of this university school. We think that possibly a model for the formation of that faculty can be provided by the University Graduate School. As you know, the University Graduate School derives its faculty from departments in the schools on individual campuses, or operating between campuses, through a process of nomination and scrutiny and approval by administrative officers and finally, I believe, by the Board of Trustees. The University Graduate School has a quite specific procedure for their creation. We think that might be a good model for the School of Continuing Studies as a university-wide school which draws its faculty and teachers in, from this from this faculty, from a variety of areas. Considering these matters, we came then to a set of five recommendations. The review of our own interim report by our membership suggested that number 5 of these recommendations should probably be placed first. I think that is a good idea. Number five is probably most important. It calls for the creation by formal appointment of a faculty for the School of Continuing Studies, representing all campuses and at least major academic disciplines. The question of whether or not these faculty appointments should be for limited term or without term is still a matter of discussion. Some prefer, as in the case of the graduate school I believe, appointments that are not for term. Others believe that since faculty members get involved in the school for a perhaps a mission lasting a few years and then their activity may cease, as individuals, these appointments should not be appointed. That is discussible. With a properly constituted school faculty, then committees and policy making bodies would follow formed from that faculty. The other recommendations, numbers one through four, are specific and concern the operations and details and structure of the school. This is, as I say, an interim, a preliminary report and we would appreciate comments and questions letting us know if there are things we have completely overlooked, points of view we have not taken into consideration at all, so that in the time remaining, before we file the final report, we can think those things through. Our hope is to complete our work this semester. Perhaps that means bringing and setting before the council our final report in two weeks at its final meeting perhaps on(274). If there are major things that we have to talk about, then we will continue to exist as a committee I suppose for the next academic year. So, we'd be appreciative of questions and comments.

Brand: Any comments or questions?

Forinash: Well Steve, I like the report and especially your explicit recognition that there might be a conflict with programs on campuses. And the thing that's bothered some of us on various campuses is the possibility that a student who dislikes the language requirement, who is reluctant to choose a major, or was put off by the growing general education program, which we have at IUPUI and a number of other campuses are developing, that such student will find a safe and easy haven in the School of Continuing Studies. Now I'm sure that the proposal for a faculty council for the school will

help alleviate that problem, but we should realize that language requirements are quite diverse across the University. Requirements for the major are diverse. And certainly general education aspirations are developing and are clearly diverse. Now I'm sure, knowing you and having served with you on various committees, that you also believe that we should try to raise the standards at Indiana University and not permit cheap degrees. That's not the purpose of the School of Continuing Studies, and you didn't say that and nobody said that. It's to accommodate students who can not get accommodated elsewhere. That's my understanding. So I'd like you to address the question of how we're going to make sure that an undergraduate gets what we generally recognize as required for an undergraduate degree from Indiana University, namely a major, in many cases a foreign language or mathematics, or other specialized requirement, and a competent general education basis for her or his understanding.

Wailles: I think that those concerns are genuinely shared throughout, as far as I can tell throughout, the school, the administration, and certainly by our committee. I believe that the best guarantee there is to establish a faculty in the school, with the integrity of the faculty of any other school naturally, and then to form campus committees which are very influential on degree requirements and on academic policies for programs on that campus and with representation then to the university council carrying that to it's full. I might ask Tom to comment here since I know you've been concerned with the same things.

Forinash: Yes, I think one of the things we would like to see (317) the campus committee is whether the students are actually doing a continuing degree on that campus, (320)

Vermette: I'm not sure if I understand the proposal very well. Are faculty going to be hired in their normal departments and have some of their time allocated to the School of Continuing Studies? Am I right in that?

Forinash: It will be a joint appointment.

Vermette: A joint appointment. How does that...

Brand: How does that differ from the present?

Vermette: Well no, my concern is, with RCM, which is everybody's favorite thing to talk about, the credits that will be offered in the School of Continuing Studies taught by let's say a colleague of mine in my department, does my department get credit for those credits, or do they go to the School of Continuing Studies? And how does this shake-out in the bottom when it comes to "goodies?"

Wailles: I don't think I could answer that question even descriptively right now. Perhaps one of my colleagues in administration can. I believe that the credit hours are approved to the unit in which the course exists. A course in Biology taught with population of students in general studies programs would be credited to Biology I believe. So at the moment, I don't believe there's a conflict along those lines.

Brand: Yes.

Peterson: I have some questions here related to the campus control. I, maybe I don't understand the School of Continuing Studies very well. This is a university school, is that correct? The degrees are not campus specific are they or are they university specific?

Brand: I believe they are university degrees.

Peterson: They're university degrees, so they're not campus. How does the campus, through these committees, have the control that Kyle was talking about a bit earlier? This also brings up the point of how does the faculty get approved through vice-president Gros Louis directed to the Board of Trustees? I don't think that's a normal course for a university school. It would presumably go from the school, the recommendations would go to the President and then to the Board of Trustees.

Brand: Vice President. He has a dual title.

Peterson: OK, his full title isn't there and that confused me.

Fulton: I'll make 3 points here, two of which I think need greater clarification and an observation. I agree, that absolutely there's a lack of clarity regarding the purpose of these committees and would be absolutely delighted, particularly when I have to appoint people to these committees, to actually know what it is that they're actually going to be doing when they're sitting there. That's been a(366) with me. I also think that the notion of tall high faculty members(367) is adequate simply to say it will be like Graduate School faculty. It's very different, so before we go too much further, I would hope that there would be some effort to define what that meant. And then I guess the observation is, the School of Continuing Studies seems to me it has always focused on the question of (372) rather than on academic structure. And that's the unique side of Continuing Studies and that's what it(375) definitely interested and concerned about. I would be absolutely delighted if I could gather together a group of faculty who were looking at different ways of packaging courses for them, not just on campus, but off campus, not just in sending through the mail, but through telecommunications, and figure out ways that we can meet the needs of varying populations. That's the real benefit it seems to me of the School of Continuing Studies and that should be one of the major factors in defining who should be qualified and what the purposes of the committee should be. We can't look at the School of Continuing Studies as traditional because it is not, but I think by habit, we still try to force it into a traditional aspect.

Wailles: Good comment, anyone else?

Baldwin: I was looking for a further explanation on why a joint appointment is good. Is it to give faculty a proprietary ownership of the school? These oversight committees, can't they just, if they're better defined, can't people with regular appointments serve on them, even more objectively than they can if they're part of the problem, i.e. part of the school? I didn't mean that the way it came out, but I just don't see any reason for assigning people to more and more units, which means more and more committees and more and more of this and that. And then, like was pointed out, the sharing up of the(397). Often times people appointed to the units are supposed to be teaching in that unit and then they're suddenly joint appointment somewhere else and then what happens with

the work that's supposed to be going in the home area? I think all the objectives can be achieved without the joint appointment of faculty members. I don't see any need for it.

Wailles: Well I want to ask Ed to comment on that. I believe we think there should be a faculty of this school because there is now a faculty of this school, but as I said, it's very small. It's in particular area's. It's associated with administration and with Labor Studies. There are appointments in the school, questions of tenure and promotion, salary policy arise, and what you mentioned, the question of ownership and proprietary interest in the academic programs, activities, authenticity of the activities of the school, we believe all of that would be benefited by a formally appointed faculty, despite the drawbacks that you mention.

Baldwin: Could I just ask for information, and I haven't been around the University long enough to know, why is Labor Studies in Continuing Studies (group laughter)?

Wailles: Well it takes some people with a good memory, it goes back a long way. It's currently under study. There is currently a review by the Division of Labor Studies of its relationship with the School and possible other sites existence. That is not to be concluded I believe until next month.

Baldwin: It just never made any sense to me.

Brand: It has a different kind of mission than some of the other academic units in working directly with people off campus, on site and providing for total training for (424) and some such. So it seemed more as an outreach type of activity than it does like an English department. Now whether that means that you continue in Continuing Studies, I don't know, but I wouldn't be surprised if that's the kind of reasoning that went into it.

Downs: Just an additional explanation to your explanation. I was active, not within but in cooperation with Labor Studies when the time came to collect small units and put them into larger homes, SPEA was suggested as an alternative, School of Business, which at some universities has a kind of relationship with Labor Studies. Both of those were exempted as alternatives. Education was presented as an alternative, and members of the Labor Studies program chose and petitioned to be included in Continuing Studies because they felt it would be least harmful to our image and least descriptive of them in carrying out their program. So that in addition to all of the logical reasons, there were political reasons as well.

Brand: That's quite understandable.

Fineberg: One of the problems that I perceive, is that the, if the (447) had a discipline which is particular discipline in general studies and doesn't have responsibility to a particular department, let's say Economics, then in fact if that faculty person exists alone in General Studies, in fact might run the risk of having a program decreased in quality and not having any coordination with programs going on in the other parts of the school. So I think it would be a bad idea to have faculty members participating in general education program unless they have in a fact a primary place in another department.

Greenebaum: I have a couple of things I'd like to say one in response to the point about appointments. I do think that it's important to keep in mind what's underneath that issue, and that is who has the authority to establish academic policy for the academic programs. In view of the traditional way, the way to get that kind of authority is through academic appointment in a school. It's not to say that if another form of getting that function established, could be devised, but it might not be possible. The underlying thing is having faculty members with authority over academic programs. The traditional way of doing that, of giving that authority, is by giving academic appointment. I want to address a question to Steve. A lot of what you address here when you talk about faculty and faculty roles, is it in regard to continuing education, function of the school, or are there also faculty issues in regard to distance education?

Wailles: Well I may have a faulty understanding of the term distance education, but there I think, I understand a mode of delivery, rather than content of the material delivered. The distinction that is drawn for us in consultation with the school is between credit and non-credit activities and there are many activities in the school that do not carry academic credits. The way we phrased a couple of the statements in here was to respect the distinction and to say the faculty and faculty governance was immediately relevant for credit activities, but we're holding back in saying that faculty should have within the (493) committees and councils, all activities of the school, even those that do not carry academic credit. So I'm not sure Ed that distance education right now is a different question from core credit activities.

Brand: May I ask if there's been good consultation with members of the school, with Kathy, or with the advisory committee of the school itself?

Wailles: We certainly found it very positive, responses and have been very positive. We have received materials from Dean Krandola that have been helpful and our impression is that the administration of the school is very supportive of efforts to make it structured and involve faculty bodies in ways comparable to other schools.

Brand: So they're supportive of having a faculty in the way you described?

Wailles: If they are not, they haven't shown that.

Brand: OK

Wailles: I think I can address that a little bit. I have the, on behalf of the council, the initial conversation with Dean Krandola about this issue and her enthusiasm for this project I think stemmed from the fact she would like the authority of a faculty behind her when she represents the school in the university more general. She recognizes that having the authority of a faculty means having the nuisance of a faculty as well, but she was quite enthusiastic about this project from the beginning.

Brand: Very good.

Spechler: Just a follow-up Steve. I think that number three is especially explicit, but I understand your answer to Dick Peterson and to me. If the faculty on a certain campus would decide that certain

general education guidelines are required for a degree on that campus, that that would be controlling for degrees offered by the School of Continuing Studies on that campus. Is that correct?

Wailles: I can't answer that. I'm not sure frankly.

Spechler: It's a really important matter for us to deal with because we are, on many campuses, trying to improve our standards and especially in the general education area, leaning to the Strategic Directions Charter and I think the School of Continuing Studies, which is a school on the rise, would want to participate in that.

Wailles: In the university bulletin statement on the School of Continuing Studies, General Studies degree, it gives general requirements and those, I assume, apply to all BGS degrees, regardless of where they're earned. I would think it possible, and(548) only knows, that within these general requirements, campus can structure things. But I think you're right. I think we ought to focus on that, that's very important.

Brand: That's a good interim report. I think you've gotten some feedback for other steps to take, to encourage you to complete that work in a timely fashion, as you said you would.

Wailles: Hopefully we will.

Brand: Let's move on now to the Teaching Capacity Report and I'll call on vice-president Kenneth Gros Louis to do that.

Gros Louis: Do all of you have copies of the report? Did anyone not receive a copy? You should have received an e-mail earlier the overview, the first four pages of what you now have in the full report. Let me give some background, some of it you're going to know, but just so everyone knows what this document is that you have in front of you. The roots of capacity model were the work of the joint committee on learning, teaching, and scholarship that was chaired by Trustee Mack and initiated about two years ago. There were several working groups as part of that joint committee. One of them in fact dealing with Associate Instructors and(571). But one of the working groups convened by Jerry Bepko was on accountability. After much discussion, that working group took two different directions. One was to look at the replacement of the means by which the University Budget Office was calculating teaching(578) on each campus and replacing it with a system used at the University of Wisconsin. The major difference being that the Wisconsin system made a distinction between those courses in which there were numbers of students and individual instruction so that faculty members still get credit for both. But previously, IU was counting individual instruction as a section, and therefore, you thought it was a section of 30, it was a section that could become one student in the section. The Wisconsin system is a way to differentiate that. The second direction of that sub-committee, the joint committee, was to look at mechanisms for sighting teaching in the context of administrative responsibilities. For that, we looked at a number of approaches being used on a number of campuses. I zeroed in on three, two being used in Indianapolis and one being used in both Indianapolis and Bloomington. I've heard reports from the deans of those three schools and they unanimously recommended the passing of the capacity model that was introduced to the College of Arts and Sciences on the Bloomington campus in the spring of

1994. Just to refresh your memories, the key features of the capacity models are that the department full-time equivalent is multiplied by the customary teaching load, which is assumed to be two courses per semester in most units on the Bloomington campus, three courses per semester in most units on the Indianapolis campus, and four courses per semester on the other campuses, to achieve a total capacity. So if there are 25 FTE, times 250, that's 375,(614). That allowance is made for that total capacity for departmental administration and other customary course releases. That then arrives at a capacity for the department so that the interest is not in the individual person's teaching assignment, but in the aggregate (End of Tape 1 Side 2) teaching assignment for the school. What that really focuses on, in the capacity model, are the reasons for reassigned time and indeed, if you look at the last paragraph of the introduction in the report in front of you, I make the observation that probably the most useful and important word of capacity model limitation committee was a review at each campus of the reasons for reassigned time and trying to make those, not consistent across campuses, but certainly consistent within a campus and to bring attention to a campus if they were inconsistent with other campuses. There was no attempt in saying the same at all campuses. One of the goals of the capacity model is to encourage departments to think of teaching in the larger context. That is, look at the aggregate teaching of the entire department rather than person-by-person, to shift resources over time to programs in demand. So for example, in the college on Bloomington, there are now Mathematics faculty members teaching Computer Science because of the demand in that second area. And it allows departments to introduce variable teaching loads where these might be appropriate. The Board of Trustees had a resolution introduced in December 1994 that was then tabled by the board until February 94 (Believe he meant '95) because the Faculty Affairs Committee of this council was reviewing both the proposal about the Wisconsin model and the recommendation of the capacity model. In February of '95, Marty Spechler, on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee made a report to this body and just to highlight a couple of points, and Marty can add as he wishes. First, the Faculty Affairs Committee recommended that while the Wisconsin model measures only a portion of the faculty members effort, even in teaching, nonetheless the committee did not see anything unacceptable about the document on the Wisconsin model. It's really just a different way of counting(023). Then with the capacity model, the Faculty Affairs Committee, to Marty, expressed five concerns. One, the need to maintain the quality of teaching, research, and service, no matter what. Secondly, that they not impose a(026) across campuses or across departments or across schools, the they be allowed some diversity in the adaptation of the capacity model. Third, that there be fairness in the implementation of the, if those who accept a different teaching load teach well, that they should be rewarded as much as a person who is for some reason having reassigned time(030). Fourth point of concern was that this be reversible, that is if at a stage of a person's career, he or she wants to teach more courses, that does not put the person in a teaching track for the rest of their career, indeed it can be reversed. And the fifth point that had to be recognized was that everyone needed to contribute if you look at the aggregate teaching load, particularly that administrators supplements rather than increases in base pay. And those concerns(036) the committee said it was prepared to propose, instead of a working group, propose (037) for representatives, deans, and trustees to (038) to insure a thorough fair and credible application of the model. And then it said by next academic year, the agreed document would be circulated on the various campuses and ratified by this body within one year. The committee, no, the Board of Trustees, at their meeting then at the end of February then took off the table the resolution that was introduced in December of 94 and resolved to follow the recommendations of the Faculty

Affairs Committee of this body in continuing to use the Wisconsin system for accounting for group and individual instruction in terms of sections and credit hours of faculty teaching. Second, to adopt a capacity model on all campuses. Third, directing the President to develop and implement a system of accountabilities tracking time, user research, and service. Fourth, setting up the working group composed of elected faculty representatives from each campus, administrators, and trustees to determine what exactly the Faculty Affairs Committee recommended, general procedures, and to insure a thorough, fair, and credible application of the capacity model, even if it's being implemented on a (050) basis. The committee, at its first meeting, May 30th, 1995, then subsequently on other occasions as described in the introduction which you have before you. Then each of the members, and this was very much a campus based process, each of the members was asked to submit for this final report that you have, a brief sketch of the campuses approach to implementing capacity modeling, the results that may occur as a result of the model, but only two campuses could do that. Only Bloomington and Indianapolis have been experimenting with the model long enough to have results. Third, to identify any significant new directions or policy changes as a result of the model's implementation. And also campuses were invited to submit copies of any forms they were used to determine reassignment. So what you have before you is our report of the committee. I think you'll see that, first there are significant backup materials if anyone is interested in seeing the complete reports for each campus. What you have is that summary of those four points, three points rather, that each of the faculty (064) was asked to submit to the committee, but there are significant backup materials for each of the campuses if any of you are interested. Second, as I said before, but I do emphasize, the results are only currently available for Bloomington and Indianapolis because they started counting with the capacity model earlier. The results are really quite dramatic and I think they're going to be less dramatic on other campuses simply because, in my view, Bloomington had, in the College in particular, identified reasons for reassigned time that were not appropriate and a number of those reasons have been altered. So as indicated, if you look at the Bloomington report, between 93, 3/93 to 3/95, there was an increase of over 200 faculty taught sections on the Bloomington campus. But only an increase of 80.8 FTE, new faculty, 8.8 new faculty were on campus in the spring 95 compared to spring 93. So it was the equivalent of adding 95 new faculty members. Adding 95 new faculty members would have cost 4 to 4.5 million dollars. Indianapolis has also had a dramatic increase. You see in the Indianapolis report an increase of 18 faculty, the figures from 91 to 95. So what you have before you is a report for each campus. The first is the Bloomington report, fairly short, though as I say, there are documents for each of the schools if anyone is interested in that. Then the Indianapolis report which is longer because Indianapolis is working on its total faculty effort and that's why, at Jerry Bepko's request, I've also tendered a memo from Bill Claytor to the faculty on that. And, at the request of several trustees, Indianapolis has also included its annual report format, which I think is quite similar to what you have on most of your campuses. And other reports follow from the other campuses excluding Fort Wayne. David Barton from South Bend was on the committee was going to be here, but he thought I would start this discussion about 2:30, so I hope he doesn't come. If he comes, let me start all over again, pretend we haven't talked about it. In any case, since he's not here, I wanted somebody who can explain what the process was. When I gave an interim report to the trustees at the end of February, John Kofas from Kokomo was there because he was a member of the committee and I might just summarize what he indicated had occurred at Kokomo, and some of you may have been involved in what occurred on your campuses and maybe you can add to what I say. The Kokomo Faculty Senate considered the capacity model, identified a series of principles that you see in the Kokomo report

and then endorsed the form for reassigned time away from the four courses per semester that you also see attached to the Kokomo report. Similar things occurred on the other campuses, but since I wasn't there I can't describe it. I don't know if any of you were involved on your campuses in the discussion, if so you may want to comment. That was the chairman's report for the Capacity Model Limitations Committee and I'll be happy to answer questions and, like I say, maybe people here who were on campus committees. We don't have to go through each of the reports, I don't think that's necessary if you read. If you do have questions, I'd be happy to respond when you've had a chance to look through this, to read it, either at the next meeting or just send me an e-mail.

Brand: Questions, comments? Good.

Spechler: I was really glad to see Ken that the schools report on the number of FTE's of faculty, tenured faculty, which have been released for the purpose of administration and for other purposes, and I'm sure that's going to provide a good baseline for consideration over the years. But I wondered, not having had a chance to read this all just now, whether you also have counted the number of FTE's of tenured faculty for faculty administration. I'm not asking this strictly as an academic question. It is my impression that on the Indianapolis campus, which I know best, a number of our most talented teachers have been pre-empted for simple administration and, just as Schools have to account for that, are we insisting that the campus administration also account for their use of these valuable resources in the administrative function.

Gros Louis: I'm not sure I understand the question Marty. If the question is is the department or school still responsible for meeting the teaching obligations of these reassigned, the answer is no.

Spechler: The report says that a (121) is released from 5 courses. That's fine, that tells you what the situation is. But what it doesn't say is what happens if a professor from a certain school is succumbed to simple administration and we've lost the teaching capacity of that individual entirely for a large department. I don't believe, I could be wrong, but I don't believe that the report gives us an idea of how much teaching capacity has been lost to campus administration. I know it's a sensitive issue, but it worries us, particularly because of the quality of the individuals who have been taken up in this way.

Gros Louis: Each campus does indicate the percent of reassigned time for the number of forces that a person receives if he or she becomes a dean or some other administrator. But there is not an accounting of that (133).

Brand: I might add, and of course I'm sure you realize that it's one of the best ways to promote chair governance, is by faculty becoming involved in administration and moving back and forth and for administrators to be teaching. But I think chair governance works both ways and that's important, that's the way you get university and campus administration to be aware first hand and participating in the issues and concerns that face faculty. So it has that side. I take your point, it doesn't directly address your point, I take your point seriously.

Spechler: I agree with that and I would say that will be even more effective if people who are moved into administration would make that a temporary move so that we would have in and out situation

rather than people who are basing the entire majors of their careers in administration. That's my personal opinion.

Brand: Let's not (144) those that move in and out or are there temporarily impure faculty like I heard before (group laughs).

Gros Louis: When I checked with Ed and Kathy about giving this report, they also suggested I also invite a member of the committee who is elected faculty representative from one of the campuses and David Barton of South Bend has arrived and I appreciate it. So if I can turn the floor to him and have him explain what the process was when South Bend implemented the model and you have before you South Bend, it's the next to last, Southeast is the last alphabetical, so the next to last report is South Bend's. David.

Barton: Well thank you. I apologize for wearing my sunglasses. I had them on when I was driving up and I forgot that I had them on, my notes, I can't see without them. South Bend had I think a fairly typical process in putting this in place, although we started out a little bit behind in some ways. We actually started in October of 94. We altered our faculty handbook to be more precise at the time. What was then unusual was the possibility that faculty at South Bend would teach 4 courses instead of 3, a typical pattern in South Bend. It turns out that we were anticipating what the trustees were going to expect of us and so that's what our capacity model(161). We prepared, our Academic Affairs Office, prepared a report on what the capacity model might look like as it applied to our campus. This was finished by September of last year and was circulated to the decision bodies of the campus and all through the fall, in the Faculty Senate at South Bend, we've had discussions of what the capacity model was, what it meant, how it would work and by the end of the fall semester of last year, last fall semester, the Executive Committee, plus a few more people on our campus, were charged with developing some sort of operation principles under which the capacity model would take effect on the South Bend campus. During December, that those principles were drafted and presented to our Faculty Senate in January and adopted by that body. What essentially is now the way that it works, actually has language, modified our local faculty handbook to describe our faculty work assignments and developed some operating principles which are the actual blueprints or procedures we will follow(178). Attached to our report are a whole bunch of forms. Those are still tentative. The operating principles and the workbook assignment language did get adopted by the Faculty, but the forms need to be worked out. And one of the things that we are engaging in at this point is a new(183) by the Academic Affairs Office of the whole question of reassigned time for service for chairmanships, program directors, and things like that. That process of moving, of how that will all work is still going on. What we've essentially fixed is how the faculties are going to request time reassigned from teaching and how that's going to be evaluated administratively. That's basically what we're trying to do. In the process, a lot of discussion, heated at times, there was some disappointment on our campus, to be very frank, that while our traditional mode of being which had been that most people taught three courses and their fourth assignment was research seemed to be somewhat(194). That created quite a bit of fuss on our campus, but I think on the whole, we came through that debate pretty positively in a way of operating that I think is pretty good(196). On the other campuses, like I said, I was on the committee, most of the campuses had a process similar to ours where the details of capacity model may in fact be slightly different. One of the encouraging things about this whole process was that we were committed to developing(200) procedures for

different (201) I think that was a very very good thing because it meant we could pick out of our own specific strengths. So if anyone has any questions about how we went about it or how it works, please ask.

Brand: Let me follow-up on that as a comment then weed into your questions for Ken. As I participated in the trustees discussion, I did not understand them as trying to move your campus or any other campuses off the research commitment, but rather to have a system in place for accountability of the research being done. And so I don't think it would be a fair interpretation of the intent of the trustees that they were unhappy with what South Bend, or the other campuses, were doing in their research commitment. Now that goes, let me weave that into a question for Ken. As you recall the trustee resolution, number 3 as you sighted it, talked about the research capacity of the campuses. I'm not sure I understand what's being requested here. Either in a way that's trivial and we've already done it by accounting for the teaching capacity and understanding when you get reassignment from teaching in terms of research or other activities and so it's already done, ipso facto, or there's something else lying behind it having something to do with the nature or quality of research and not the accountability in the same way we have for teaching. Where are we on that and how do you understand if Ken?

Gros Louis: My sense is that the ways in which (222) about this essentially, while it was not the intention of the capacity model by developing the kind of forms that they've described at South Bend, similar forms for Kokomo as well, and other campuses, that a system of accountability for reassigned time for research and for service is essentially in place. Now that doesn't speak to the quality of research or the quality of service, but it does suggest that there is in place an accountability of faculty time in research and time.

Brand: That's the way I understood the resolution and in fact I hope that's what the resolution says, although sometimes I get confused about it by other comments. If that's the case, has each campus provided sufficient information as a means of collecting the information so that the research activity can be accounted for.

Gros Louis: I think the answer is yes in two ways. Either the campus has a form for getting reassigned time away from whatever the presumed teaching assignment is per semester, but certainly all campuses have an annual report that are read not only by the chair, but by the dean, the Vice-Chancellor, the academic affairs chancellor, that do indicate what it is the individual has done that year in research, service, and in teaching. So that's the reason IUPUI campus included the forms so that if the trustees asked what, since Indianapolis did not have a form for getting reassigned time, the question was, how do you account for then time spent in research and in service? That's why Jerry wanted to include it in this report, unsure if the trustees would raise the question, the annual report form. But I think the annual report form is certainly similar in Bloomington and I would expect similar to most campuses.

Brand: So you are comfortable that that is accounted for?

Gros Louis: I think the annual report is. The annual report, I think, and I did this sort of in the sense of last year because the Faculty Affairs Committee commented on the draft resolution, the section

about the search,(253) because they had seen on the draft motion. So part 3 that you're referring to, Faculty Affairs(255) Faculty Affairs Committee finding the motion to develop a productivity model for research and service can be a complex matter with few precedents and models to draw upon and would be willing to meet with appropriate representatives from administration to exchange ideas and see (258). I think during the course of the capacity models committee's discussion, the annual report form is seen as providing that accountability. Recognize that this was reviewed by a number of people on each campus. If the trustees want to see a sample of the form, as they have now for IUPUI, if they want to do that for other campuses...

Brand: I think not looking at samples of the form, but I expect they'll want to be reassured that there is a review at the appropriate level, whether it's the dean or provost level, that that information is being looked at in the context of the teaching capacity model. We don't need to multiply forms, but the question is, will there be such a review and understanding? And again, if that's yes, we have satisfied the third part of the trustees resolution. Are you confident, and David too, are you confident the committee has so considered it and feels we have so satisfied the third part of the resolution.

Gros Louis: I believe so because my understanding is each campus does have an annual report form that the number of (274). the faculty representatives of the committee, the accountability...

Brand: But it's not merely filling out form. It's the accountability comes in the review. If there's a process in place, no doubt different on each campus, for that review.

Gros Louis: And those forms are frequently used to determine the current entries.

Peterson: I guess I have a question regarding capacity of, all along there's been a lot of questions raised at a variety of levels regarding this and I can see different capacity in teaching in one institution as opposed to another as opposed to a third class of institution if you want to put it that. What makes Bloomington so inferior to the other institutions in that they don't have the same capacity as somebody else I guess is the real question. I think what we should be talking about relative to this is total capacity if indeed that is what we're doing, whether than just teaching capacity or research capacity or whatever because indeed what we are making the assumption of is someone in Bloomington, apparently the assumption is, is spending 50% of their time doing research. Why do we have teaching capacity I guess, why don't we just say capacity and give everyone the same number.

Brand: I think that's a fair question and indeed respected. You just name(294) at the question and the way I'd like to look at it. Perhaps by introducing a different concept, total capacity, full work load of some such, that what's being asked for here is accountability. How those decisions are made and what division of labor within a full work load is is a campus specific issue based upon mission and history. But each faculty member, as I understand the trustees resolution is to be held accountable for that workload and to have it reported and reviewed. They picked on, for some reason, again perhaps a(303) if for no other reason because the college on the Bloomington campus began this exercise early on to focus on the teaching capacity. But it's really the entirety of the workload and the answer to the third part of the resolution is that if you got the other two parts right, you

automatically got the third part right. You know what the service load is and you know what the teaching load is, then you know what the research load is. As long as you can count for it in a systematic way. So I think your perspective is fair and not contrary, at least in my understanding, to the intent.

Greenebaum: I think it's, I think at least for ourselves that we need to declare that it was not the assignment of this task force to answer the question for that, that the assignment was to come up with a teaching capacity model and focus on questions of teaching capacity and that's what the council last year authorized the senate to participate in, so there's a bit of mission in what's being asked here, but still to the extent that in the process of doing what they've been assigned to do, it will generate some information that can be made use of. I think that's appropriate, but I don't think to judge the work of the commission saying you have to have an absolute answer to these questions,(326) sums it up.

Brand: But here's our choice. Do we set up another task force to look at the research capacity and then another one to look at the service capacity, or do we say, which I would to say, is that the work of this group was sufficient in terms of it's breadth and that we now have an answer to all three? I'd like to get to that point.

Greenebaum: I think we'd all like to have the (330) to that question.

Brand: Please.

Spechler: This is a question for Professor Barton. When the Faculty Affairs Committee recommended to this body that you, that each campus elect representatives, one of the intent of that was to be sensitive to kinds of discrimination or abuses that might arise with good general intentions and I'd like to ask you about one. It has to do with reverse(338). Concern of the committee was that someone might be at the role/rank of Associate Professor and have devoted many years to service and teaching within the department. These people would disproportionately be women, though not exclusively of course, and the concern was that in order to qualify for promotion to full rank, these people would have to show satisfactory research. But how could a person in such a situation teaching 4 courses per semester on a campus without full research facility, how could such a person reasonably qualify for such promotion to full rank. We were really worried about the possibility of abuse in this. If your campus is anything like ours, release from teaching, not a very good word, but one we use, release from teaching is based on what you've done for us lately. Well in this particular situation, which is not at all uncommon, little has been done for us lately in the research area, and yet these people are the workhorses in many departments that I know. So I wanted to ask Professor Barton since he's an elected representative how this thing has worked out in South Bend and generally through the system. Are we hearing any signs of legitimate complaint from people who find the path to promotion effectively barred?

Barton: Well I'm somewhat unique in answering that question. I've been teaching a 4 course load for 11 years by choice and I'm going up for promotion to full professor next year and I don't expect there to be any problem whatsoever with that particular position. And I say that, I don't, that actually that question never came up in my period at South Bend. It may have come up, but it wasn't

when I was around to hear anybody ask that question. There wasn't any sense that those few of us who had been unusual for our campus were in a situation that somehow we would be penalized in terms of promotion(378) was in fact to clarify the situation so people on unusual career tracks at South Bend would not be penalized. And I think we expect, rather I had been expected to continue, since I'm a devotee, to be creative, which I have been. But I have not been asked to submit my work unnecessarily through all the time and evaluations or expectations,(388). I can see where that could be an issue, but I don't think it was an issue at South Bend.

Brand: The Fort Wayne campus has something they call Option I and Option II which resemble something like you describe and maybe Professor Hollander can describe that for the group and I've heard, well I'd like to hear your explanation.

Hollander: It's available to faculty who have been tenured. It also has(401).

Brand: And if someone is an Associate Professor and chooses the second option, the one with 4 courses, are they eligible for promotion.

Hollander: Yes, and considering they would be evaluated on the basis of the work that they were expected to perform (409).

Brand: OK, great.

Mannheimer: I find all of this very informative. It doesn't mean that I'm not sort of a little angry I guess, which probably is because I was in the middle of eating my lunch when Dr. Vish came to pick me up and I didn't finish it, and I apologize. It's always, I keep forgetting up that, up at the Herron School of Art in Indianapolis that I'm teaching more than my colleagues down at the School of Fine Arts in Bloomington and I forget at my own peril because I may subsequently go out there and try to do things in research that I hope will equal what those exemplary folks are doing and delighted to hear Professor Hollander talk about Option I and Option II and maybe there'll be Option III and Option IV sometime also available. I don't begin to understand the full ramifications of all of this, although it surprises me and it reminds me in subtle ways of our discussions of the balanced case so many years ago and how somebody might teach more or perform more service or different kinds of research etc., etc. And I guess I would appreciate it if all of this gets enacted, although I'm not quite sure what is being proposed. If nothing else, if somebody could tell my Dean at the Herron School of Art, please remember you are teaching that much more than your colleagues down in Bloomington, please don't ask your faculty to produce comparable research, and that would be fine. And again, I apologize, I should have finished my lunch.

Coffin: An issue that comes up as I look through the report is that a number of campuses, including my own, have begun to develop a set of forms or documents which appear on the surface to be application forms for reassigned time for research with the apparent implication, unless one fills out such a form and applies for a time reassignment for research, that one will have a differential teaching load. There is also in some of the language in some of the reports an expectation that your research outcomes will be measured against the items that are on the requests for time reassignment with what appears to me to be a scary implication that if you change your mind after

you turn one of these things in and do something different, that someone is going to begin to ask if you can fulfill your research contract with the university. I find this a terribly troubling set of developments because it seems to me to raise a greater question about academic freedom than we were talking about earlier with respect to clinical ranking issues because if you are going to be evaluated after the fact, on the basis of a research plan that you submitted but changed your mind about because something else more interesting, more exciting, or more important came to your attention, then I think what we have done is create a system which is going to cause us severe problems down the road. I am, and like I said this to my own Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, I am terribly troubled by the notion we are going to start applying for time reassignments to research.

Brand: There are a number of issues playing around there. I see nothing in the trustees resolution that leads one to think of it in contractual terms that you're going to have to apply an amendment to the contract if you do something different. Any campus that follows that route is well off track.

Coffin: Let me simply say that if you look at some of the documents in here, it says when you report what you have done, you also attach the time reassignment application to it.

Brand: Well, but wait, because the question of your controlling your own research should not be an issue there and it isn't intended to be. If any application says that, it should be removed. Remember what's at issue here. What's at issue here is accountability and I think we should not argue for backing off accountability whether it's in teaching or research.

Coffin: I absolutely agree with that. My contention is the accountability is in terms of reporting what you have done and in terms of demonstrating through your productivity that your research activity has been of high enough quality and large enough volume to satisfy the interests of the university. I do not believe that it serves the interest of the university to start asking faculty members to fill out forms requesting reassigned time for research.

Vermette: Just as a comment on that from IUPUI's perspective, when we apply for a sabbatical leave, we have to fill out an application saying what we're doing for a research project. And yes indeed, some people do change their mind once they get into it or just before they go off on sabbatical and you have to submit a request to change the topic that they were going to be researching to the committee that assigns sabbatical leaves and I think maybe the same thing would be enacted for research leaves.

Coffin: But we're not talking research leaves, we're talking about normal reassigned time during your normal activities in research. A sabbatical leave is a contract, it is a very specific different arrangement than a normal, within regular assignments, research expectations and there is a form from South Bend, there is a form from I believe Kokomo, there is a form from Northwest, which are forms which you're supposed to fill out in order to get a reassigned time for research.

Vermette: We don't have to do that, but we have to negotiate that with our chair and our dean and they hold you to it. We have to make a report at the end of reassignment.

Coffin: Oh absolutely. But again, I'm not talking about a special reassignment, I'm talking about what's a part of your normal expected activities. OK. And, I'm talking about not justifying it after the fact.

Barton: We've been told at South Bend that our normal expected activities is four courses teaching per semester. Therefore, we have to apply for that one course to be reassigned.

Brand: That is the point that the trustees are making on all but two campuses. Be very clear about that. Now whether anyone wants to control how you use your time for research is a different question. I never heard that. But I did hear that you have to account for your time as opposed to having it controlled. But the point that David just made is right. The presumptive load for teaching on every campus but two is four courses, meaning that, I don't know if you want to call it an application or not, but under ordinary circumstances, by indicating how you're going to spend that time, and then pretty much accounting for how you spent it in the past will satisfy that demand. But that's a very important point that the trustees made. You may not like it, but that's the point that they made.

Lehnen: Could you address sort of where we go from here with these reports. I've heard some discussion about talking and developing a workload capacity model.

Brand: My hope is that, with this report from the Vice President for Academic Affairs, will draw this issue to an end and not have to appoint a task force to look at research capacity or anything of the kind. We'll probably need to go back in a few years to see whether its working or this is an adequate procedure, but I would hope this would bring the issue to closure.

Lehnen: Will this be applied to any of the other schools. I notice on the reports it was assigned to only some schools on the IUPUI campus.

Brand: No, every campus has this responsibility.

Gros Louis: That page by IUPUI is just meant to be examples. My understanding is all schools at IUPUI would also function under capacity model, although(573) some examples. As I said, there is backup materials of all schools.

Jeske: I would like to just make a couple comments of Professor Hollanders discussion on Options I and II (581) because it does work very well at IUPFW. (583) and that is that right now 01 and 02 categories that we have are voluntary. You make the decision whether you are going to teach 3 courses and have a research reduction, or teach 4 courses without the research reduction and at this point it is entirely voluntary and you can switch back and forth. What we are now waiting for is the other shoe to drop which is for somebody to start comparing 01 and 02 faculty and output in terms of research because there is at this point no hard and fast rule as to what constitutes an appropriate level of research for an 01 faculty versus and 02 faculty. Right now it's completely undefined. But in the not too distant future, most of us are expecting there to become some form of you must turn out so many articles in such a period of time to maintain this 01. It won't be long before the 02 is the mandatory situation for us with the 01 being something we will need to apply for. As it is right now, we're not specifically applying to be 01 or 02, but it will become so.

Brand: Other comments? Let's go on to the last issue on the agenda, Request for Proposals on Teaching Rewards.

Greenebaum: At the December meeting of the trustees University Policy Committee, trustee Richardson who is the chair of the committee put on the table for discussion (End of Tape 2 Side 1) dollars in years their teaching was evaluated as excellent. In the course of the ensuing discussion in the committee it was requested the campus Chancellor report to the UPC by March, tomorrow as it turns out, regarding how they would implement such a proposal. There's been a substantial amount of discussion on a number campuses in response to this initiative. You've seen some evidence of the product of those discussions in your e-mail and in preparation for the UPC meeting tomorrow and Gros Louis has collected documents that have arrived from the various campuses. So there's been quite a lot of interesting and productive discussion by that initiative. After hearing reports of this work, the Agenda Committee contemplated the possibility of offering a motion for this council's consideration today. The motion that we contemplated was in two parts. One of them would have been the effect that the council would welcome the trustees authorizing the use of a wide range of methods to support and reward excellent teaching, including, without limitations, our draft and grants to support teaching development, one-time bonuses for excellence in course development or delivery, and base salary increments targeted to reward excellent teaching. The second part then asks that the trustees should not mandate the use of any particular scheme to support and reward excellent teaching, nor mandate the campuses allocate specific portions of their resources to these purposes, but to leave these decisions in these matters to the university's regular governance processes. Because of subsequent developments and discussions, we decided not to move those matters and I'd like Miles to(028) the discussions that have gone forward from his point of view.

Brand: The process that was followed to bring the issue of one time teaching awards to the table was one that lacked appropriate consultation. I think it's better, and I believe we will have, although not yet in hand until tomorrow's trustees meeting, but I think we will have agreement by members of the University Policy Committee that we should step back and form a committee of faculty and others to review the work and ideas that have come forward from various campuses, some which are very creative and all of which speak to flexibility, to develop a teaching reward set of opportunities, again campus specific, that will address the goals to provide incentives and rewards to good teaching that were originally motivating this proposal. That committee would need to report back, that ad hoc committee would need to report back in September. Perhaps we can discuss it at the University Policies Committee to report back in October in order to get input from this group before it makes its final recommendation, with implementation second semester next year. I believe, given those considerations, it's a satisfactory resolution from where we started and I've asked the Agenda Committee to forward names of faculty members who could serve on this committee(046) one from each campus, and I hope those individuals who have been involved in that campus activity so they come in with a knowledge base of what the issues are.

Greenebaum: I would like to hear from the council with respect to those that have been close to these processes on the campuses what this (052) has been like from your points of views and what you would hope, where you would hope this project might go so that be informed by our thinking. I have been, I'd like to express my gratitude to those campuses and those groups that have been working very hard on the specifics and very productive(057) gratitude to those who have.

Brand: Anyone? Martin.

Spechler: Well I read everything that was on the e-mail and particularly the little (060) remark of my own. One thing, as someone who's been involved in faculty affairs for some time, actually wrote some compensation policies, the first thing I would like to insist on is that we remove the implication that teaching at Indiana University is not good enough, that it is somehow unsatisfactory and a bonus of say a thousand dollars a year is going to motivate us to improve teaching very significantly, that teaching is under-rewarded. We've actually had a survey at IUPUI and I dare say the results at IUPUI would be replicated elsewhere. That survey indicated students are highly satisfied, highly satisfied, with their classroom instruction. Now instruction outside the classroom may perhaps be problematic at a commuter school. I have the impression from people I meet here at the council and elsewhere, that teaching is no worse and maybe even better on other campuses. I think that having participated in a discussion with the trustees that they have picked up from somewhere the view that teaching at an American university has become worse, it's downgraded, that people don't like to do it, people are escaping it. This is definitely not the case at Indiana University and I don't think it's true of other fine universities around the country. I think it's a libel on us. I think our teaching demonstrably is better than it ever has been before. The teaching that we do, my colleagues do, is better than the teaching my teachers did at a pretty good university. I really think that's an undesirable thing. Also, in order to have these rewards, whether they have a cash form or some other form that's been suggested, travel money and so on, we're going to have to enter into comparisons of teaching which are going to be highly inaccurate, divisive, and ultimately I think destructive of moral and the worth of teaching around the university. I know that these resolutions are well intended, but I think they will have negative consequences for us. If I ever am allowed to return to talk to the trustees, I'll try to make that point. Teaching is rewarded at Indiana University and I don't think the case has been made that it's under-rewarded.

Brand: Martin, a number of comments in response to that. First of all, I agree with you that we teach well and that we should be proud of it and I don't see it problematic on any of our campuses. Maybe perhaps who you were addressing last time may have been reading too much of a popular to think otherwise and you do need to persuade them from that view. You're right about that, I couldn't agree with you more. There's a positive side to look at it. What's being offered is an opportunity to generate new revenue to reward excellence in teaching as well as incent good teaching by certain kinds of curriculum grants or what have you. I think frankly it would not be a good idea to turn down the idea to reward the already good teaching that's taking place or to use it for additional opportunities to improve one's teaching, whether it's teaching materials or something else you want to do. So I'd be real careful about saying no to this when it's additional new revenue. Second point, I do not agree with you that it would be divisive to make these decisions and the reason is, already decisions are being made on the basis of teaching comparisons at the department level when giving out salary increments. If you are not doing that at the departmental level, you are not doing what you are supposed to do, and I assume everyone is doing that. So there is not addition to the kinds of evaluation that are already being made, and if they aren't divisive in the past, they won't be in the future. To the extent that any meritorious commitments are divisive yes, but I see that as a non-incremental problem. Now, having made those comments, I saw some hands.

Coffin: I would like to suggest two things for the committee that's looking into how to move in this direction that I think are important parts of what they ought to look at. One is the question, which is a concern I share with Martin, that is the question of whether teaching is under-rewarded and one of the ways to get that is a charge to this committee to look at how the various campuses structure their reward systems. That is, is there an explicit notion of what weight is given to the various activities that people undertake in terms of annual merit increases. I think it would be extremely useful for us as an institution and for us externally to be able to say for example that in terms of doing our annual evaluations, 50% or 60% or whatever the wage is of the way that evaluation emphasizes teaching at the moment. So I think I would hope that that would be a part of this committee's charge. The second thing that I hope would be a part of this committee's charge is to make sure that, if we move in this direction, and I tend to agree that if we're being offered extra money, we probably shouldn't turn it down, that in addition to looking at rewards to people who have demonstrated excellence, we look at ways to reward people who are making serious and committed efforts to improve their teaching. The single greatest problem that I had with the initial proposal is that it created disincentives for people who were not already within reach of being in that top 25%, that it would send a signal to them that says "You're not good enough, you can't get good enough, don't bother." And I would seriously hope the committee would take seriously the charge to look at ways of rewarding and encouraging teaching improvement.

Brand: I think that point is well taken. What the charge the committee in general is going to be is to maximize flexibility including just the point you made in terms of ways to provide support. If necessary, I doubt if we need it, but motivation for improving teaching and being able to provide the wherewithal for that. So I agree with you entirely on that. Some of the work on your first point has already been done and the presentation, Martin was at that meeting. So many of the chancellors and others at that meeting made, collated that information, so it is available.

Scherer: I want to strongly reinforce that because I've always felt, at least at the South Bend campus and I suspect elsewhere, the most difficult place to get money, or the most difficult thing for which to get money almost is to get money for serious projects of faculty improvement in the area of teaching.

Brand: This will help.

Jackson: There's 2 senses in which teaching is systematically unrewarded at the university. The first is that many departments have an explicit salary policy that the work of the faculty shall be rated and weighted in some such scheme as 5 points for research, 3 points for teaching and 1 point for service, or three, two and one, or something like that. So many units explicitly weight research higher. The second sense is that one good way to get a healthy raise here at the university is to get an offer from the University of Chicago. The University of Chicago is rarely going to reach into IU and say "Here's a really excellent teacher, let's hire this person to be part of our Chemistry faculty." Whereas that will typically happen often on the basis of nationally recognized research. So I think if the trustees want to provide extra money to reward teaching, it would help to correct the current imbalance here.

Brand: Well, and again to mirror some of the comments that were made, we want to be able to do that in a way that is respectful of the diversity of the campus approaches and the school approaches on the campuses, and its respect for the broad range of activities that go into teaching, including teaching improvement. Now if we move in that direction with an appropriate proposal from this committee, I believe we will be making some progress.

Mannheimer: We're calling this extra money, who's printing it?

Brand: The trustees are considering raising tuition one time only by 0.5% to do that. When I say one time only, That means that you wouldn't continually raise the tuition point five each time to support it, but by raising the tuition point five and putting it in the base, and because this is given out in a non-base means, you have a continuing way to reassign that funding. That point five tuition would not be there unless a proposal like this passed. They have made that very clear.

Baldwin: Can I ask a question? Have the students been asked what they think of this?

Brand: Students express their view about tuition all the time and no matter what it goes up, they would prefer it not to. I think pretty soon on the Bloomington campus they're going to have a group that's petitioning for no tuition raise at all given that cost of living has actually cut. And I've hear groups of students argue there shouldn't be tuition anyway for anything.

Baldwin: No, but my point anyway was if we want to encourage faculty to devote more effort to teaching and getting better relations with students, asking the students to pay for that seems counterproductive.

Brand: Well, I don't know the answer. There's no other source and(183) with the students.

Baldwin: Well there are other sources. We could reallocate existing resources.

Brand: We could probably do that. I've heard complaints about that approach too.

Kapoor: I think it is an excellent idea, but (187). My concern is that this might produce a popularity contest and buddy system(190).

Mannheimer: Well I want to follow-up on Professor Peterson's comment that if this money is indeed released to spruce up our teaching or inspire greater teaching something or another that we concern ourselves with the Bloomington faculties in capacity and try to bring them up to speed with this money (group laughter).

Brand: I think with that, if I don't hear anymore comments, I'll see you.