

## **FACULTY ORGANIZATION**



# **April 17, 1998**



## Call to Order/Approval of the Minutes of the March meeting

Linda Rooda, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. The <u>March minutes</u> were approved as distributed.

### **Chancellor's Business**

- **A. Promotion and Tenure** luncheon was held today. The Chancellor congratulated those members of the faculty who were promoted and/or tenured.
- **B.** Schererville Site. There will be a ribbon cutting ceremony and open house today.
- **C. Faculty and Staff Recognition** Luncheon was held this week honoring service to the University. The honorees represented a combined total of 870 years of service.
- **D. Graduation**. Chancellor looks forward to seeing the faculty as this important event.

#### 1. Vice Chancellor's Business

- **A. Computer Services**. A team from <u>Bloomington</u> will be on campus next week to conduct interviews regarding computer services operations.
- **B. Peer Institution Study**. The list of peer institutions has been narrowed to twelve (12) and will be submitted to President Brand for approval. VC Kroepfl explained how the institutions were chosen. The Chancellor expressed her thanks to VC Kroepfl.
- C. Microsoft Deal. IU's deal with Microsoft will be heavily promoted on campus. Watch for further information.

## 2. Chair's Business

- **A. Committee Preferences**. The committee preferences list has been distributed; please respond by the deadline.
- B. UFC Report

**Promotion and Tenure**. The President expressed his concern over tenure only decisions.

<u>Family Leave Policy</u>. The policy has been sent to the <u>Board of Trustees</u> for approval. If approved, the policy applies to release from teaching responsibilities only, not release from

research and service activities.

**18/20 Retirement Plan**. Still trying to find a solution on funding, however the President reassured the future of the program.

**TERA Awards**. The awards will probably be renewed.

**Post Tenure Review**. There has been no agreement on the issue. There is informal agreement that each faculty member on each campus undergo an annual review.

- C. Faculty Organization Meeting Time. A brief discussion ensued. It was agreed to continue the practice of alternating meeting times between mornings and afternoons.
- **D. President's Task Force for Internal Review-**-Don Coffin. The committee has been charged to identify challenges and opportunities facing the campus, largely to help inform the search for a new Chancellor and build consensus about challenges and opportunities. An outside consultant has been provided. A draft is due in May and will be shared upon completion. Currently, the committee is attempting to obtain information from student surveys. You will be kept informed and are invited to attend the committee's meetings on Friday mornings at 8 a.m.

## 3. Committee Reports

• **A. Faculty Board of Review**--K. Vinodogopal. One case came before the Review Committee and, as a result of reviewing the case, we had some questions regarding the role of ad hoc committees in this process. To address the issue, we present <u>two resolutions</u>, which come moved and seconded as Committee reports:

It was moved, seconded and agreed to discuss each resolution separately. Editorial changes were suggested and accepted. The following represents the spirit of the discussion:

Fac: the line of administrative action doesn't specify where the issue can be raised

Chan: that's correct

Fac: why do we need this motion, when it basically says to consult the <u>Academic Handbook</u>?

Vinodogopal: to reemphasize the process as described in the Handbook

Fac: if this resolution is addressed to the administration, then it should come from the Committee to the administration. The faculty doesn't have enough information on this matter to vote on the resolution.

Vinodogopal: yes, the details can not be discussed, but the purpose of the resolution is to make sure the Handbook is followed

Fac: the handbook doesn't rule out ad hoc committees, so resolution one seems irrelevant. The issue is really interpretation of the Handbook, which is addressed in the second resolution.

Fac: I agree that resolution one serves no useful purpose and its introduction implies that the Handbook was not followed.

A motion to table Resolution One was moved, seconded, and passed.

The following is the spirit of the discussion on <u>Resolution Two</u>:

The following amendment was proposed, seconded, discussed, and passed: add a sentence to the end of Resolution Two stating:

The Executive Committee shall refer the question of developing a policy on this matter to the appropriate standing or, if necessary, ad hoc committee during 1998/99 to report by February 1999.

Discussion on the amended resolution:

Fac: this has come up before and was the subject of lengthy <u>discussion by the Executive</u> Committee. A committee was appointed, but there were many questions which needed answering.

Fac: there would be cause for concern if the administration had not followed the handbook

Fac: we can not exclude ourselves from this process. We must try and come up with a policy

Vinodogopal: there are dangers in an ad hoc committee, namely there's no opportunity for the Review Board or the accused to approach the ad hoc committee.

Fac: the resolution doesn't clarify ad hoc versus anonymous committee

Chan: this particular ad hoc committee had been confidential, but that's probably not how we'd do it in the future

Coffin: it's important to note that these ad hoc committees did not make decisions; decision making resided with the administration. These committees were not juries, not decision making bodies

Fac: if this passes, does it mean that if a case occurs between now and the adoption of a formal policy the faculty would have no input?

Fac: this restricts the ability of the Executive Committee or Chair to appoint or participate in the formation of an ad hoc committee

Fac: what we had in this case was an ad hoc committee appointed by faculty at the request of administration that didn't answer to the Board of Review when requested.

Fac: from the administration's point of view, an ad hoc committee is advisable for faculty input, however creating a committee also covers the administration because administration can say the decision was made by faculty.

Fac: according to the Handbook, the administration doesn't need to consult faculty. Was the administration told by an attorney to consult the faculty?

Chan: I can't recall being told by an attorney that I "had to" consult the faculty; it was recommended.

Fac: the administration can ask for advise at any time and to suggest that these committees be made public is extreme

Chan: the administration needs the ability to get consultation between now and the adoption of a formal policy. It is appropriate to get faculty involved.

Fac: what if we add "anonymous" in front of "ad hoc"

Vinodogopal: that's acceptable, but I'm still not sure we're addressing all the rights of the accused.

Fac: why does the Review Board need to know about the constitution and deliberations of the ad hoc committee? It would seem to sacrifice the Board's neutrality.

Vinodogopal: it would be important for the Board to understand how a decision was made; it gives the Board a fuller investigation.

Fac: the ad hoc committee was a valid attempt to give faculty input and now it's turning into something negative. Whatever decisions are made remain the responsibility of the administration

Fac: the resolution says nothing about the Board of Review

Vinodogopal: this attempts to provide guarantees to the accused and that's the issue here. It is an attempt to fill the gap until a policy can be adopted.

Fac: the issue really seems to be a question of who would appoint an ad hoc committee, faculty or administration.

Fac: just because faculty were on the committee doesn't make it a faculty committee, but an administratively created committee with faculty input.

Fac: who was consulted is irrelevant. The bottom line is the evidence submitted to the Board

Fac: there's nothing in the resolution that prevents administration from forming an ad hoc committee, only from the Executive Committee participating in the formation

Chan: these are serious situations which should have limited details exposed. But it is appropriate to involve the faculty and consulting the Executive Committee is a neutral way to get input

Fac: what's the point of the Review Board if it can't uncover all the facts?

Chan: there will never be another anonymous ad hoc committee

The question was called and the resolution passed as follows:

The Chairperson of the Faculty Organization and the Executive Committee shall refrain from appointing or suggesting names to administrators for anonymous Ad-Hoc Faculty Committees dealing with alleged faculty misconduct of any type until a procedure for handling these types of cases has been approved by the Faculty Organization. The Executive Committee shall refer the question of developing a policy on this matter to the appropriate standing or, if necessary, ad hoc committee during 1998/99 to report by February 1999.

## • B. Salary Committee--K. Vinodogopal

The <u>Resolution</u> comes moved and seconded as a committee report. Discussion followed:

Fac: a <u>similar resolution</u> was passed in October 1997.

Fac: historically, IUN underpays administrators compared to <u>IUSB</u> and <u>IUSE</u>. The implication of this resolution is that by creating separate salaries, the administrative supplements will get larger to remain competitive

Fac: does IUSB or IUSE administrators make more or less the IUN's?

Fac: the other campuses are higher

Fac: the Arts and Sciences Council unanimously supports the resolution

Chan: it should be noted that supplements carry no benefits. I think this disadvantages our administrators versus other I campuses. I will appoint an ad hoc committee of faculty to find out what the rest of the university does regarding this issue

The question was called and the resolution was passed.

• C. Budgetary Affairs

The <u>Resolution</u> comes moved and seconded as a committee report. There being no discussion, the resolution was passed.

### 4. Old Business

A. Rominger on behalf of the Constitution Committee presented a <u>resolution</u> to amend the bylaws with regard to replacing elected officials. **The resolution was passed**.

#### 5. New Business

• **A. Constitution Committee--**A. Rominger read a <u>proposed resolution</u> to change the bylaws, which will be voted upon in September 1998.

Fac: as a word of advise, be sure that the resolution doesn't contradict the <u>Academic Handbook</u>

*Fac:* what about the issue of discovery for one party?

Rominger: that's a good point; I've made a note on it. Please forward additional comments to the Committee

- **B. Web Pages-**-K. Horvath passed around copies of the campus calendar and encouraged everyone to use this resource. She noted that the web page is prepared to receive minutes from all Faculty Organization Committees, and encouraged the group to contact her if interested.
- C. Tamarack Lounge. The question of the furniture in the Lounge was discussed.
- 6. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Submitted by: Ellen Bosman, Secretary



## 219-980-6500 888-YOUR IUN

(1-888-968-7486)

Comments: Faculty Organization Secretary

Last updated: 18 April 122

http://www.iun.edu/~facorg/meeting98/fom4-98.htm

Copyright 1997 - 2022, The Trustees of Indiana University

Copyright Complaints to Privacy Statement