Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
Presidents Hall – Franklin Hall
November 5, 2019
2:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.

Members Present: Heather Akou, Karen Allen, Iman Alramadan, Alan Bender, Jonathan Brauer, Daniel Bullock, Barbara Cherry, Paul Coats, Judah Cohen, Rachel Cohen, David Daleke, Kenneth Dau-Schmidt, K. Allen Davis, Lori Dekydtspotter, Constantine Deliayannis, Erika Dowell, Denvil Duncan, J Duncan, Jane Dutton, Ann Elsner, Lynn Gilman, Anthony Giordano, Stacy Giroux, Dennis Groth, Lucia Guerra-Reyes, Nandini Gupta, Diane Henshel, Brandon Howell, Colin Johnson, Kari Johnson, Peter Kloosterman, Shanker Krishnan, Bradley Levinson, Moira Marsh, Jane McLeod, Isabel Mishkin, Meg Meiman, Heather Milam, Sam Obeng, Daniel O'Donnell, Courtney Olcott, Eliza Pavalko, Linda Pisano, Catherine Reck, Lauren Richerme, Lauren Robel, Leslie Rutkowski, Thomas Schoenenmann, Jim Sherman, Patrick Shih, Micol Seigal, Marietta Simpson, Paul Sokol, Geoffrey Sprinkle, Matt Stein, Lisa Thomassen, Aaron Travers, Jonathan Trinidad, John Walkbridge, Christie Walton

Members Absent: Lucas Adams, Roxie Barnes, Joanna Chromik, Frank Diaz, Philip Ford, Lessie Frazier, Linda Gales, Colin Johnson, Bradley Levinson, Jeffrey Zaleski

Guests: Dan Myers (alternate)

AGENDA

1. **Approval of Minutes of October 15, 2019**

2. **Memorial Resolution for Richard Canada**

3. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
   Diane Henshel, Faculty President

4. **Presiding Officer's Report** (10 minutes)
   Lauren Robel, Provost

5. **Question/Comment Period**
   Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President Henshel by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu.

6. **Proposed Credit for Prior Learning policy** (5 minutes)
   J Duncan, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
   Meg Meiman, Co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee
   [Second Reading - Action Item]

B9-2020 Proposed Credit for Prior Learning policy

7. **Questions/Comments on the proposed Credit for Prior Learning policy** (10 minutes)

8. **Proposed revisions to evaluative criteria for promotion and tenure** (20 minutes)
   Jane McLeod, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee
   Israel Herrera, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee
   Kim Geeslin, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs [First Reading - Discussion Item]
   Current Indiana University Bloomington Principles and Policies on Tenure and Promotion B11-2020
   Proposed revisions to evaluative criteria for promotion and tenure B12-2020
   Proposed revisions to evaluative criteria for promotion and tenure (tracked changes)

9. **Proposed revisions to evaluative criteria for promotion and tenure** (45 minutes)

TRANSCRIPT:

ROBEL: Well, welcome everybody. Bloomington, Indiana, and Indiana University looks like they've been sprinkled with fairy dust, it's so beautiful out there.

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 15, 2019

ROBEL: I will begin, as always, by asking for a motion for approval of the minutes of October 15th. May I have a motion?

Good. Thank you, Jay.

A second? Jane, you want to be the second?

Great. All in favor?

Opposed?

Looks great.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR RICHARD CANADA

ROBEL: Let me turn to Eliza Pavalko for a memorial resolution for Richard Canada.

PAVALKO: Dick Canada, beloved senior lecturer at the Kelley School of Business, died July 11, 2018, at the age of 73.

Born April 4, 1945, Professor Canada attended Butler University, earning a degree in political science and philosophy in 1967. He did postgraduate work at Indiana University in journalism and education, and years later, studied strategic marketing at Dartmouth College.

After completing his education, Dick began his sales career with Procter and Gamble, but the majority of his career was at Xerox Corporation. Over twenty years, he held positions as major account sales manager, senior national account manager, and manager of training and development. He founded The Dartmouth Group, targeting companies involved in complex sales, and specializing in the development of sales models and productivity improvement. Canada was nominated twice for the Heartland Entrepreneur of the Year Award for his work at Dartmouth.

Dick's career in academia began when he became an adjunct professor at IUPUI for eight years, beginning in 1985. He then taught in that same role at Butler for another five years before joining the Kelley school faculty in 1994 as a lecturer. Promoted to senior lecturer in 2008, Dick served in that capacity for another nine years, through the spring 2018 semester.

Dick Canada (DC or Coach) loved his work. A great story teller, DC imparted many fundamental lessons for being successful in life. His most recent book, *Coach's Top Ten Life Lessons: Navigating the Real World* captured many of his key beliefs.

DC was synonymous with professional sales at Kelley. He joined the faculty in 1994 and founded the Center for Global Sales Leadership in 1996. In 2002 he founded the Global Sales Leadership Society, known today as Global Sales Workshop (GSW), one of the key experiential learning platforms at the Kelley School of Business.

He has won many teaching excellence awards over the years for his classroom facilitation, including the Student Choice Award for one of the top three professors on the Indiana University campus. Recently, the Global Sales Workshop honored DC by naming the annual award for most outstanding student "the Founders Award."

He has coached the IU sales teams at national competitions since 2002 and is recognized as one of the country's thought leaders in improving the sales and marketing performance.

Over the course of his thirty-three year career, Dick amassed a number of nominations and teaching awards for his prowess and popularity. These included the Herman B. Wells Special Recognition Award, the Schuyler Otteson Teaching Excellence Award, The Trustee Teaching Award, and Student Choice Award.

He published numerous magazine and newspaper articles on sales and sales management, and also produced an audio-learning program focused on sales management development principles and social styles.

Professor Canada was recognized as one of the country's leading experts in sales skill development. Among his many accomplishments, Dick was most proud of having helped to establish one of the nation's first collegiate facilities dedicated to research, study, and skill-building of sales professions.

Today, the Center for Global Sales Leadership supports faculty research, alumni outreach, sales competitions, and recruiting at the Kelley School. Largely as a result of the popularity of Dick's classes, there was a steady increase in interest, recruiting, and job offers for sales positions, so much so, that, in the spring of 2014, professional sales was officially designated as a marketing major. Today, more than 300 students each semester are taking sales classes and participating in the Global Sales Workshop and Sales Club at the Kelley School of Business.

For students who sought careers in sales, Dick was the expert, as evidenced by his book, *The 24 Sales Traps and How to Avoid Them: Recognizing the Pitfalls that Mislead Even the Best Performers*, which was chosen as one of the top 25 business book reads by the executive council of The National Chamber of Commerce.

Dick was dedicated to providing pragmatic, practical instruction and skill-building of sales fundamentals to all of his students. He was renowned, however, for his interest in, and support of students as individuals. He coached the Kelley School of Business sales teams that routinely placed in the top 2 in the nation in sales competitions. Coach Canada's final book reflected his fondness for imparting knowledge and inspiration. *Coach's Top Ten Life Lessons: Navigating the Real World* was published in 2016.

One of the students in Dick's inaugural class in Professional Sales, said this of him: "Coach was a fantastic professor and an even better man. He genuinely was invested in me. I trusted him with my future, and took every class I could from him, including independent study. His genius was effortless magnetism. I learned 'bumfuddling' from Dick. He made an art of his method of 'breaking the ice' and 'making meaningful connections.' This was one of the most valuable things we learned from him."

We request that this memorial tribute to Richard Canada be presented to members of the Bloomington Faculty Council, that it be preserved in its minutes and archive, and that after its presentation copies be sent to his family.

Ann Irene Bastianelli
Senior Lecturer
Kelley School of Business
Indiana University Bloomington

Thank you very much.

ROBEL: Please stand.

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM THREE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

ROBEL: Turn now to our president for executive committee business.

HENSHEL: Hi and welcome to a beautiful fall day, and I'm so glad you're joining me inside. I'm turning my 10 minutes over to Jane McLeod for summarizing the report that the consensual relations Task Force has developed, and the recommendations for policy.

What we are asking for is some initial questions, concerns, just comments, and we'll probably come back to us later with more requests or comment.

MCLEOD: Thank you, Diane. Selene Carter chaired the UFC task force of five faculty that was charged with reviewing IU's current policy regarding consensual relationships between faculty and students, and recommending changes or not in that policy.

The charge directed us in particular to consider recent changes that the University of Michigan had made to its policy, which instituted a ban on romantic, sexual, or amorous relationships between faculty and undergraduate students, and a ban on such relationships between faculty and graduate students when the faculty member has or could be expected to have academic or supervisory authority.

Selene was not able to attend today's BFC meeting, and I will do my best to represent the committee in her absence.

So the members of the committee were Selene, myself, Chad Snow from IU Southeast, Deb Stiffler from IUPY, and Shadia Jalal from the IU School of Medicine, and I'd like to thank all the task force members for their efforts.

The current IU policy as described in the code of Academic Ethics states that, "A faculty member should not have an amorous or sexual relationship, consensual or otherwise with a student who is enrolled in a course being taught by the faculty member or whose performance is being supervised or evaluated by the faculty member.

That a faculty member should be careful to distance himself or herself from any decisions that may reward or penalize a student with whom he or she has or has had an amorous or sexual relationship even outside the instructional context, especially when the faculty member and the student are in the same academic units."

The task force reviewed the changes that the University of Michigan made to its policy, as well as the policies at other Big Ten Academic Alliance and other comparator institutions. We met with the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, the Director ofthe Office of Institutional Equity, as well as a representative from human resources.

The revisions to the policy that we suggested included a statement strongly discouraging all amorous romantic, intimate, or sexual relationships between faculty and students, noting the fundamentally asymmetric nature of those relationships, and the potential for conflict of interest and exploitation, and assigned the faculty member responsibility for disclosing any such relationships with failure to disclose grounds for administrative action which could include dismissal.

The disclosure procedures are quite rigorous and run through the unit had and must be given in the presence of all involved parties. The outcome of the disclosure is a plan for managing the relationship so as to resolve conflicts of interest and prevent abuses of power.

So there are, I think, two potentially controversial points to our recommendations that I'll highlight here because I believe what Diane would like is an initial kind of temperature reading from this group that she can then take to the UFC for their conversations there.

So our task force did not recommend an outright ban for all such relationships. We felt that although statements that relationships are banned have symbolic importance, they don't necessarily stop relationships from developing, and we felt further that the reporting requirements allow us to better monitor the situation and support students.

We also did not set write separate policies for graduate and undergraduate students under the reasoning that all students risk marginalization and exploitation in these relationships, regardless of age or enrollment status.

ROBEL: Questions or comments?

Yeah?

BULLOCK: Am I correct in understanding that the rationale for not actually outright formally outlawing is that it wouldn't work?

MCLEOD: Well, I think our feeling was that the most important thing to do was to set up a series of procedures by which the relationships would be disclosed.

So I think the policy that we have with these reporting requirements and with strong discouragement is consistent with the policies at most of our Big Ten Academic Alliance comparator institutions.

ROBEL: Other questions? Comments?

ELSNER: Well, if we do this route then what assurance do we have that strict confidentiality will be maintained for both the student and the faculty member? Because we do need to be aware of the students' academic record, and our usual FERPA, etc.

MCLEOD: I'm sorry can you clarify the relevance of FERPA in the student's academic records? I must not understand your question.

ELSNER: Well, if the student is meant to report something to somebody, then how is this information safeguarded?

MCLEOD: Well, the policy that we have recommended would place the responsibility on the faculty member for disclosing the relationship although there would be consultation with the student to ensure that the students shares the same understanding of the relationship as being

consensual, and does of course indicate that there are whoever is involved in accepting the reports would be obligated to maintain strict confidentiality of that information.

So these reports would usually go through the chair of our department if there were such a person or other unit head.

MARSH: Thank you. So Jane, two quick questions.

One is, it's my understanding that this is a report at this point and it will be a discussion item at the upcoming UFC in a week or two, correct?

MCLEOD: That is my understanding.

MARSH: So that if individuals would like to comment on the report, they can send those comments to you or to Selene or presumably to Diane, and so for any of you UFC representatives?

MCLEOD: That's correct. I'm not a member of the UFC, but Diane is. Is Selene a member of the UFC?

MARSH: No.

MCLEOD: Okay. So would you prefer that comments be sent to you then Diane?

HENSHEL: That's fine. Yeah.

MARSH: My other question. So what would be the sanction, if any, for a failure to report?

MCLEOD: So the sanctions could go up to the level of dismissal and the sanctions would be determined.

To be honest, I have to look back at the policy and remember ever exactly the thought. But I think the sanctioning procedures would follow a similar practices that are followed in sexual misconduct cases in terms of the chain of command if you will.

ROBEL: Yes?

GUERRA-REYES: So a question on graduate student and undergraduate relationships. So for the effects of relationships between graduate students and undergraduates, are graduate students considered faculty if they are teaching?

MCLEOD: Our policy does not cover relationships between graduate students and their students as I understand it given the scope of what we were asked to do.

ROBEL: Okay. Ann?

ELSNER: Do we think it's the best way to report this within the academic unit as opposed to some independent body whereas the would not necessarily be any impact on promotion and tenure, and or the students travels through their academic life in that unit?

MCLEOD: Well, that's a good question. What independent body are you imagining would be the most appropriate place for the reports? Something like the VPFAA or?

ELSNER: That's one. There's also academic fairness committees and things of that sort. But I feel a little bit uncomfortable about reporting through someone you know. People will talk.

ROBEL: Can I go to Eliza for low clarification because we do management. I don't know what to call them, contracts, right when there are consensual relationships of other kinds, and we'd start with the department because the places where you need to be concerned about adverse impacts are exactly within the department.

But maybe Eliza can expand on it.

PAVALKO: Yes.

So the current process whenever people have a close personal relationship is the really the nepotism policy, and they work with unit heads, but it would go through the compliance office and they produce one of those, and then they have alternate reporting and various safeguards.

So it might make sense to just reinforce that same process. I'm also going to go back to the earlier question on graduate students. So if a graduate student is in their role as an instructor then they'd be considered an academic appointee, so the code of academic ethics would apply to them if they had a relationship with an undergraduate.

ROBEL: Yeah?

BULLOCK: So you mentioned that there was some mechanism of conferral with student as well, and you indicated that a specific individual would do that.

Conceivably, could that person be a coworker or someone else in the department that the faculty member has associations with and therefore might be predisposed to be biased in that fashion?

MCLEOD: I suppose that's conceivable, but I believe that chairs would take their responsibility as chairs or rest other unit heads seriously in that regard.

So I guess, I'm not sure—so your concern would be that a student would be consulted, but that the student's view of the situation would not be honored.

Is that what I understand?

BULLOCK: In some sense, I'm concerned that difference would be given to the faculty member given that someone else in the same department might have a longer career with that individual, and so they'd be more disposed to preserve their relationship with that individual than the student who might be seen as in some sense disposable.

MCLEOD: Well, I think that this is a good comment then that the UFC could consider in terms of whether it would want to revise some of these reporting procedures. So I appreciate the comment.

ROBEL: Great. Well, that's our time for this, but I think you've all been invited to look at the policy that goes to the UFC and send comments on that policy to our president.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: I just have two short things to say, but they're both delightful.

The first is congratulations to the Luddy school. That is, it is wonderful to be able first off to shorten the name of the School of Informatics Computing and Engineering to the Luddy school. I know everybody is happy about that.

Secondly, the $60 million gift to the Luddy school from Fred Luddy will provide support for students, faculty support, and a major initiative in AI, and I think that this is something really to celebrate.

So I wanted to celebrate it.

I had the honor of being at the evening this gift was announced with Fred Luddy. He is a delightful person, you may have heard him speak before at graduation—he was our graduation speaker a couple of years ago.

If you are interested in learning more about him, I would recommend you go back and watch that graduation speech.

I know asking faculty members to voluntarily watch a graduation speech is probably not crowd-pleaser, but he really is a lovely human being.

So that's the first thing.

The second is, I really want to celebrate the fact that the Eskenazi Museum is opening back up this week.

I had the opportunity to do a tour of it last Friday and it is wonderful, it was worth the wait. There's so many old friends there that you will see in a whole new way because of the way in

which the galleries have been reconfigured, and relit, and re-imagined. Different things are in conversation with each other now.

This Thursday is First Thursdays and if you have an opportunity to go to First Thursday, you will have an opportunity to go into the Eskenazi Museum. So I strongly recommend you take that opportunity and also on First Thursday, to take an opportunity to go into the Lilly Library.

I think we may get inclement weather and so people will be directed inside it to a number of places, but the Lilly, as you know, closes for its renovation on December 6th. I took the opportunity last Friday also to say goodbye to dear friends at the Lilly—by that I'm talking about Thomas Jefferson's copy of the 1789 Judiciary Act.

I know that having waited such a long time to reopen the Eskenazi, I'm really glad that we're doing that right before the Lilly closes. So take a chance to say goodbye to your old friends there for a little while.

Then, if you get the chance, Liz Shay in theater drama and contemporary dance, has a wonderful performance that will take place in the Eskenazi museum called Ascension.

I saw her dancers rehearsing for that and those vertiginous stairs that go up and down, these dancers go up and down in the most heart-stopping and beautiful ways.

So that will be happening all weekend and I really encourage you to take that opportunity.

Those are all my remarks.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: QUESTIONS/COMMENT PERIOD

ROBEL: We had one question but it came in late and it's going to take me a little while to figure out the answer to it. So I'll report next time on that.

Are there any other questions from the council? Yeah?

GUERRA-REYES: I bring a question from Academic Council of the School of Public Health. They have received, from Dean Gibson, a workforce, tenure and promotion guidelines are updated to include teaching professor guidelines but also to include specific required items that clarify excellent, very good, effective, etc. for tenure and non-tenure ranks.

Academic Council and School of Public Health is concerned that the timeline to vote on these, which is December, is very, very short, and so seeks clarification as to where both of these items are required to be voted on in December.

The main concern is these new required items that have been listed as part of the criteria for excellent, etc.

So they've asked me to come ask that.

ROBEL: Eliza?

PAVALKO: My understanding is the School of Public Health document, the promotion and tenure document for all ranks, is in the same document.

Certainly, as we encourage every school to revise their promotion and tenure criteria or review them, I think that's what the school has been doing in addition to looking at the teaching professor criteria.

So the only campus requirement for having that done is the teaching professor piece.

The other, the promotion and tenure piece, many schools may be doing that after this body is done with our work. But that does not have the same timeline.

Since it's the same document, it may mean if the group looks at one piece of it, the teaching professor piece, but doesn't finish the other, it's still important to have the teaching professor piece in place.

So I could imagine a two-stage review and assessment of that. But because it's one document, it's, I think, coming to you all at the same time.

The deadline requirement for the teaching professor is very important because people will be looking to come up the following fall and they need to have criteria in place, so they know what that dossier would look like.

GUERRA-REYES: Clarification. I'm sorry. So the deadline requirement for the excellent or the criteria for evaluation, when is that?

PAVALKO: There is no deadline from our standpoint. That's a school process, and every school hopefully reviews their P & T dossiers, add those documents occasionally. So the School of Public Health is doing that now.

ROBEL: Jim.

SHERMAN: Yeah. I wanted to remind the people of this, which is the open enrollment booklet. Open enrollment is from November 11th to the 22nd. I would suggest that you all be familiar with it and let me just say a couple of things about it.

Number 1, there are very few changes in it that are significant. One aspect that has been changed, that is to the good, is that there is now a significant coverage of hearing aids for the first time.

So some of us older folks will benefit significantly from that.

The fact that there are a few changes means that if you do nothing, you will be on the same plan as last year and that may sound like a good thing 'cause I don't have to do anything.

If you do that, you will lose your tobacco benefit of $25 to $50 a month. So, even if you want to stay the same, do that.

The other thing that I would say is that I hope that you all are if you're not, I hope that you will be completely familiar with and educated about your health savings account. This is, if you use it correctly, likely to be the best retirement plan you will ever have.

So learn about it, use it correctly. If you want to talk about it or meet with me, I'm happy to do that. Especially, for young folks, from now until you retire, it will make a huge difference if used correctly.

So get to know that.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Jim.

Are there any other comments from members of the council or questions?

HERRERA: I have a question. I learned that the city council approve the new location for issue in housing where Motel 6 is located. This is a far place from the campus.

I'm just wondering about the location, Jogi's place, what was formerly Yogi's place.

Is that place aiming to be something else like a student housing?

Why not use that space for dorms or anything?

ROBEL: Are you talking about the city's uniform development ordinance to allow off-campus housing. Or are you—?

HERRERA: Yeah. This is the city.

ROBEL: So the city's plans and hopes about where they would like our students to live are not something we have an enormous amount of influence over.

I think what the city has done, I'm not speaking from deep knowledge of this, but tried to place multi-person-student housing in a compact area.

They're not talking about our residence halls. They're not talking about housing controlled by IU. They're talking about private developers where they will be permitted to put student housing.

So if you have concerns about that, you should address them to the city.

HERRERA: Right.

The question is also about the Jogi's place. Is there any potential like Indiana and then that's an IU.

ROBEL: Oh, Yogi's.

HERRERA: Right. Yeah.

ROBEL: Yeah. I don't actually know what's going to happen with that.

The next residence hall we're going to build is the North Residence Hall. It's on the North side as it sounds. It's on the North side of the campus, over in an area where we already have quite a few residence halls.

So that'll be our next development.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: PROPOSED CREDIT FOR PRIOR LEARNING POLICY

ROBEL: Well, let me turn then back to Jay Duncan and Meg Meiman for the second reading of the proposed credit for prior learning policy and I think this is an action item today.

MEIMAN: So this is the policy that asks each department on campus to come up with their own policy for ways of assessing prior learning for students who come in with prior learning.

Just very quickly, the scope of the policy: covers all units on the Bloomington campus.

The statement: the interdepartmental faculty shall have a policy clearly defining the criteria, procedures, and maximum credit awarded for prior learning experience.

A reason for the policy: to be compliant with the higher learning commission assumed practices.

On terms of the procedures for this policy: units shall submit their unit approved policies to the campus curriculum committee.

In terms of the definitions for the policy: prior learning experience is any learning experience outside the university for which no transferable credit from other institutions can be awarded.

J. DUNCAN: Just a little bit of a reminder, while this is a compliance situation where we're trying to be in compliant with a higher learning commission, there are a lot of really excellent reasons why your units should be having these conversations.

If the outcome of your units conversation is we don't want to do this, then that's your choice, but please, put it in a policy.

You do not want to have a situation where all this is being done ad hoc. It's going to create conflicts with students who don't understand, "Could I potentially enroll in your program and get a little leg up from things I've done previously?"

There are a lot of opportunities here to bring students to the table that might look at your program and be more inclined to say yes, absolutely. As long as they know that their prior experience will get a fair consideration and that they'll be able to take some portion of that, whatever your unit feels is appropriate into their classroom experience at your program.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CREDIT FOR PRIOR LEARNING POLICY

ROBEL: Terrific. Is there further discussion of this policy by the council?

All right. All in favor?

Opposed?

Fantastic, congratulations to the committee.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

ROBEL: We'll move on to the proposed revisions to evaluative criteria for promotion and tenure, and the co-chairs Jane McLeod and Israel Herrera will present, and Kim Geeslin from the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

GEESLIN: My role is to help you understand the process and how this came to be in front of us today, and then I'll turn it over to Jane and Israel to talk about the policy itself.

Starting with the president's directive that each campus asserts its tenure and promotion criteria for teaching, the Bloomington campus began the process of a multilevel assessment of our own criteria.

The earliest steps were first, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, requested reviews from each school and asked that they look at their own criteria for teaching.

Simultaneously, we convened a small committee who was comprised of faculty that had experience either as members of the campus committees or chairs to reflect on their experience in using the criteria to evaluate a variety of cases.

With these two different processes, there were several conclusions reached.

The first was that campus and school level criteria do provide clarity and rigor for diocese based on excellence in any single area. This included teaching, research, and service.

It was also concluded that neither campus nor school level criteria provided much guidance for evaluating categories, other than excellence in the area of teaching. We're talking about the very good and the effective ratings here.

Additionally, criteria for evaluating work is very good, or effective, or satisfactory, and unsatisfactory, were needed for research and service as well.

Finally, the school committees and deans felt that the first step forward would be for the campus criteria to go under review.

Simultaneously during that same academic year, a committee conducted a campus-wide review of gender and faculty satisfaction.

One of the primary complications and obstacles for women that was identified was lack of clarity in promotion and tenure criteria for categories other than excellence, including very good when it came to teaching research and service, and this was especially problematic for those who wish to consider a balanced case, both in terms of evaluating one or presenting one individually.

With those findings in mind during the summer of 2019, our office met with the executive committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council and we jointly identified candidates for small committee that would represent school across campus, and this was chaired by Jamie and by me.

The committee had the task of writing the first draft of revisions for the campus criteria with a directive to clarify the path to excellence for teaching, research, and service, with particular focus on the criteria for very good and satisfactory and effective across all three areas.

During the current semester, that small committee presented to the Bloomington Faculty Council faculty affairs committee our draft of that revision. From there, the faculty affairs committee has continued the process of revision and they've sought input from the academic deans during this past month.

So I'll turn that over to Jane, and she can talk more about the policy and its current state.

AGENDA ITEM NINE: QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

MCLEOD: Great. Thank you very much.

I'd like to thank the committee that met over the summer for providing the Faculty Affairs Committee with such a well-conceived set of criteria. They made our work much easier than it would have otherwise been.

So given their document, the Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the document that came, made some additional revisions, and then as Kim noted, shared it with the Academic Associate Deans for comment.

We did receive several comments which collectively encouraged us to clarify our language, to think carefully about how we frame the options available to faculty when presenting their case, and how we distinguish excellent from very good, from satisfactory, or effective performance.

The proposal that you received is the outcome of that conversation.

Just to clarify that the proposed text would replace pages 10 to 11 in the current IU Bloomington principles and policies on tenure and promotion.

As we approach the revisions, we were mindful that campus level policies have to be broad enough to encompass the range of academic units on our campus, so it should provide guidance without being overly prescriptive and that individual academic units can develop more specific criteria as long as they're not inconsistent with the campus level policy.

Because there is a lot to cover, this is a long and complex document, in some ways, and we want to make sure that we hear from as many people as possible, what I'd like to do is just walk through each of the sections, summarizing the revisions very briefly, and then asking for your comments and questions.

We're especially interested in general comments about the distinctions among the evaluative categories. Certainly, if you have suggestions for specific words or phrases, we should use both, take note of those and then take those back to the faculty affairs committee for consideration.

So I'll start at the top of the document which I'm calling the preamble, which is really intended to clarify that the campus provides the option of four possible paths to tenure and promotion, and that the balanced case is one of those options, but it's used in only the most exceptional cases.

So I'll take at this point, any comments or questions about that section of the document.

Sorry. Thank you.

MARSH: Just to clarify, and I think this is very important because I've already heard several times the languages being used which is confusing. What we're talking about today is not in any way, sense or form a policy, or to change to a policy, even though it bears the term policies in the title, correct?

MCLEOD: Yes, I've heard different things from different people about whether those IUB principles and policies on tenure and promotion document constitutes a policy or not.

But indeed, it is a change to what is in that document. We're not proposing a new policy that would be voted on as a policy as such.

MARSH: So I wonder if it would be helpful for the Council to refer to what is the governing policy in this case, which is far as I know is the UFC one.

ROBEL: Eliza?

PAVALKO: So there is the principles and policies document, and you're right, it's not a policy per say, but it was voted on and approved by BFC.

It incorporates the campus and university policies that apply to tenure and promotion, but it's a much broader document than any single policy.

MCLEOD: Yes, Moira.

MARSH: Just sorry to hop on this. But I just looked right now and I find here, there are several campus policies pertaining to tenure and promotion. But I couldn't find the one if it exists that states out what even in broadest terms, what the criteria.

Is that not a campus one or is that a UFC policy?

PAVALKO: There is no policy that specifies the criteria, which I think was the reason for developing this document, because there wasn't really any overriding statement of criteria.

So that's what this document does, though.

ROBEL: Yeah, Peter?

KLOOSTERMAN: Yeah. Could you clarify a little bit what's meant by exceptional? For a balanced case to be exceptional.

MCLEOD: Well, my understanding is that historically balanced cases are considered rarely that in most cases candidates come up for promotion and tenure based on a single area of excellence.

I believe that this language regarding the exceptionality comes out of the existing document if I'm not mistaken. So that's not a change.

KLOOSERMAN: Yeah. I know it's not a change, but it's still not clear to me as to exactly, if there would be a situation where something would say, candidate would say I'm exceptional and somebody else would say they're not.

MCLEOD: I think it's exceptional as in the sense of rarely.

ELSNER: Do we have a two-by-two table on that balanced case? Not balanced case—succeeded didn't succeed.

ROBEL: I'm not sure what you mean.

ELSNER: We heard that this is rare but do we have numbers for those cases that reach the campus promotion and our tenure committee to say how many balanced cases, how many not balanced cases and in each category, how many successes, how many failures.

ROBEL: I'm sure we do. I'm not sure we have them with us.

PAVALKO: You're right, we do have them and I don't have them with me. But I think it's important to say that negative decisions in general for our promotion and tenure are very rare if we're all doing our jobs in terms of mentoring. And so then particularly, when you have cases that are rare, we have a handful of balanced cases most years and in my memory, I don't remember any negative ones, certainly in recent years.

MCLEOD: Okay. Any other comments or questions on that opening section?

In the section on research, the major changes here were the addition of the descriptions for very good and satisfactory ratings.

We tried to offer some examples of what a very good case might look like as distinct from excellent for example having perhaps somewhat fewer publications or publications that are directed to a narrower disciplinary audience. But those were not intended to be exhaustive and I believe individual units could include other examples in their unit level of criteria.

So I will open the floor for comments or questions about that section.

R. COHEN: So to be can clear this is to kind of set a standard across the board for all non-tenure track…what is good, very good, satisfactory and my question is why?

We don't do that for tenure track because we all have very—oh this is tenure track but again my question is why we don't do that now, I mean.

ROBEL: No, we do.

R. COHEN: I mean we have good, very good, satisfactory, all of that but we don't say that you have to have so many publications or anything like that.

That is all said at the campus level.

ROBEL: No. At the unit level.

R. COHEN: Right. Thank you and so I'm just kind of wondering because this seems like we're putting examples that are not going to fit except for one or two specific units. You know, I just I don't quite understand besides just saying you have to have good, very good, satisfactory and that these will be defined at the unit level.

Why—the point?

MCLEOD: Well, I think we were charged with trying to think of a way that we could describe how a very good case would be distinct from an excellent or a satisfactory and we're trying to do that in a way that we felt would be general enough that it would apply across a wide range of units.

If you feel we haven't been successful in that, I would welcome your suggestions for how we might revise that text whether your thought is that we might include other kinds of examples, or I'm not sure without providing some sort of example how to signal the kinds of things that we're interested in other than just say very good is not quite excellent

ROBEL: Comments on this section? Yeah?

RICHERME: Yeah, thank you. I appreciate the clarity that you're trying to bring to this.

I did just have a concern about the language that you just read which is that example, "numerous enough but speak to a narrow disciplinary audience." I just wonder if size of audience is a good metric for evaluation.

It seems that some people naturally work in subsets they're speaking to narrower audiences and others work in subsets that are speaking to larger audiences. So I wonder if that language is necessary or could prove problematic and maybe we should consider another example or just considered the first one—the first part of that sentence which seems clearer to me.

MCLEOD: Well certainly if there were a general concern that that would set forth an example that might not apply widely then that is something we could consider to just strike that text.

ROBEL: Thank you. Jim?

SHERMAN: Yeah I generally hate very much to wordsmith, but I couldn't help seeing the words in that final bullet point. It says very good as high-quality contributions that have not yet resulted in progress toward.

Well, it seems to me that it could result in progress, but not yet the attainment of national or international reputation. I would hope that every piece of work is leading to progress.

MCLEOD: Yes. Well, we left the 'In Progress' in there because the campus level criteria for excellence in research don't require that the candidate have achieved a national or international reputation but require that they be well on the way towards achieving that.

So very good would have to be different from that.

ELSNER: I still, for very good, a set and high-quality good, maybe numerous. But I don't feel comfortable with a narrower disciplinary audience because somebody could be really top notch but in a small field.

MCLEOD: Thank you. I appreciate that comment. That suggests that there is more general concern about that language.

ROBEL: Great. Others?

CHERRY: I'm just trying to ask for clarification, given some of the comments here.

Jim, is your point that part of the problem is the actual language in the statement here does not even match what's in the PowerPoint, right?

So that seems to indicate maybe the committee has to use some more care analytically and how it's thinking about this because they took care to say in the actual document that very good might include have not resulted in the *same* progress toward establishing a national and/or international reputation.

But then you look at your PowerPoint and it says "not resulted in progress."

That's not the same as saying the same progress.

MCLEOD: No. That's true, I apologize for making a sloppy PowerPoint.

CHERRY: So part of the confusion here, I think, is that and sometimes in attempts to characterize things more succinctly, yhat actually starts introducing differences in meaning that can become very important.

So I'm glad, Jim, you raised that because I hadn't quite caught that till you did, that there was a distinction between what was actually in the PowerPoint versus the document itself.

MCLEOD: Yes, thank you. I'm sorry. I apologize for not including that word on the PowerPoint. I was assuming we could input all the text up here and I shortened it too much.

CHERRY: But that's what comes out sometimes in the discourse, and maybe that's a healthy thing that makes sure we double check each other that way.

But I hadn't quite caught that and I was—so I just want to clarify that that that's part of the problem is that in our attempts—you try and take so much care and writing a document, then when you paraphrase, some of the meaning gets lost.

So maybe that's just another level of detail we need to look at. Thank you.

ROBEL: Great. Other comments on this section? Diane.

HENSHEL: This is coming from a set of points that have come out of a discussion online. I guess my first question more than anything else is, would it be possible to include language and, no, I have not thought of the language yet, that would indicate support for people that are

breaking new ground, that are crossing lines, that are really trying to move into what the world is moving into in some sort of way.

It seems allowed in here but it's not in any way encouraged or mentioned in here so it's just a question about that.

MCLEOD: Yeah, that's a good question. I believe that the larger document does have a section that refers to interdisciplinary work, and the importance of considering interdisciplinary and interdisciplinarity and valuing that.

But it's true that we didn't include it in these particular criteria. So are you suggesting that it would be useful to do that?

HENSHEL: It would be wonderful if it could be included.

ROBEL: Dennis?

GROTH: I'm sorry, I can't remember which meeting that—I was not involved in these meetings, but other meetings about that this came up.

There was some discussion thereabout a distinction between—we would expect all of our faculty doing research to be breaking new ground. So that's a kind of given.

But taking new directions might be a different perspective for the tenure case versus the promotion case. That somebody, a junior faculty member that was brought on with an expectation that they've articulated in the department, articulated a particular interest in a research thrust on a particular dimension might be confused by a faculty member that all of a sudden said, "I'm going make a right turn and work over in this other exciting field."

There just may not be time to do that, whereas a promotion case might allow for that time. I think you're right that there should be some reflection there, but not an immediate—I'm moving left and, all of a sudden, after somebody was hired that they're moving right, and that there wouldn't be any ability for a faculty within a department or a chair to say, well, maybe that's not the right idea.

HENSHEL: I haven't thought about how the wording would fit, but I would encourage the committee to think about it. Thanks.

MCLEOD: I guess I would just remind everyone also that, of course, units have the option of adding that language as well. Any language we would incorporate into this campus level policy, I think, we would try to keep quite broad, to make sure that it really could apply across all the many units that are covered by the policy.

So we would have to think carefully about how to do that in a way that wouldn't exclude or signal something inappropriate to certain units on campus.

ROBEL: Are we ready to move on to the next?

MARSH: I'm sorry. I should have spoken up about this because it actually applies to all sections of things, so I could say it or I can leave it to the end.

MCLEOD: You can go ahead and say it now.

MARSH: Going back to essentially the preamble where we said the guidance here is referring to the language in the governing policy which is ACAs 37 or 38 or both of them perhaps, which says that an exceptional case is a candidate may present evidence of balance strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university period, which you've essentially restated here which is fine.

It's the next sentence that may be an issue.

I think maybe others have heard some of the discussion about this prior to the meeting, may want to weigh in.

By adding the language, what this means is you have to be very good in all three areas. That's not in the governing policy, and I wonder if we can honestly- I know that has been the practice, at least, on this campus for, I don't know as how long, that's how we've defined it. But I wonder if it is a fair interpretation of what the original policy meant.

Because, conceivably, what could happen here is it's seen as an alternate route for people who really aren't excellent but it just like in all cases, but not really overall excellent. I wonder if we're not shooting ourselves in the foot by stressing that.

No, we're beefing out what we mean by "very good" which is reasonable enough because no one understood quite what was meant by that. But if we're going to beef that up, should we be thinking about amending the policy itself?

Just thinking that out there.

MCLEOD: Eliza, do you have any comments about where this understanding, that balanced cases involved three very goods comes from?

PAVALKO: I don't have the history of Susan McCammon who, of course, knows more institutional history than all of us combined. Was saying that, at one point, that language has been in place a long time, but her memory was that it was in a sense an effort because it had some statement about normally cases will be excellent in one area then in an effort to clarify that, whether it was the BFC or the UFC, then pushed to really define what do we mean by a balanced case.

So the very good in all areas came out of there.

I just want to add, seeing a number of balanced cases, I think in no way those are cases where they're easier or less than because we are talking about a very high bar of people not of being very good in all three areas.

So the teaching and the service are expected to be quite strong. In reality, the balanced cases are really quite impressive from what we've seen on the campus.

ROBEL: John?

WALBRIDGE: Some of what I was going to say has been picked up. But I'll basically pass on something that Herb Terry, who was the president of this body in the past, wrote in the last 24 hours. Basically saying the original point of the what's come to be called the balanced case was to deal with people whom obviously we should keep, but didn't fit the mold somehow, and that the balance case, as Eliza said, emerged out of that, it does give me pause though that every time I've heard the balance case discussed out in the field, it's always been in the context of, well, this person is a little iffy, maybe we could put him up on a balanced case.

MCLEOD: So, now to the section on teaching, we did find this to be in some ways the trickiest section, and it's the section about which we receive the most comments.

In the committee, we discussed how much this section should parallel the expectations for teaching professors, and mostly agree that the standards for excellent teaching for a tenure track faculty can and should be different.

There was some discussion as well about whether the standards for very good or set too high resulting in an overly capacious category of effective. But the standards at which we arrived intended to clarify that a rating of excellent requires strong classroom instruction as well as impact beyond the campus, that actually then creates a consistency and expectations for excellence across the evaluative categories.

We defined a rating of very good as requiring strong classroom instruction as well as impact beyond the classroom.

We did not specify how far that impact need extend, reasoning that units could clarify that. For example, how much weight to give to a work that was done outside the classroom but within the unit such as, advising and mentoring, having students working in your lab, working on curriculum revisions in your department or program, and so on.

So at this point I will take comments and questions on this section.

J. DUNCAN: So this was discussed, but just because I think it's important to have it strongly in the record, you are not putting this forward with the understanding that the units that are still working on the criteria for teaching professor, should take this as a guideline for the NTT requirements for teaching professor at all, right?

MCLEOD: That is correct.

ROBEL: Other comments?

CHERRY: No, I just want to make sure I understand the clarification. Is it considered that potentially this document as written would cover promotions for teaching professors at all?

Or is it just that for now those working on their teaching professor guidelines—I'm just trying to make sure, intellectually, I understand what's going on. Is it that this policy would never be considered applying to the teaching professor, so that's why you don't have to worry about thinking about it at this juncture?

You're not…that is why the units don't have to think about using this in a guidelines or are you just saying that for now, we don't worry about it because they're going in parallel?

I'm just trying to make sure I understand what's going on, and what the intention is.

MCLEOD: I think our intention is that there is not a necessary parallel between this document and the document for the lecture rank faculty.

CHERRY: Okay. That's helpful because some of the comments I had gotten from some constituents in my unit we're concerned that perhaps this document might become a set of expectations potentially for the teaching professor, and so getting clarity is that that's definitely not the intention here.

Just want to make sure that, because sometimes you'd get to the slippery slope problems. You adopt a policy with one purpose and they could slip to the other one. So, are we definitely saying we're holding the line that this particular document is only for the tenure track?

MCLEOD: That's correct.

CHERRY: Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

PAVALKO: Part of the rationale behind it when we think about it is for them to be considered separately, tenure-track faculty responsible for teaching research and service. So, even in terms of teaching and deciding excellence in teaching, the component of research comes in more strongly than it probably would for lecturer ranks, for example, or clinical ranks where they're based on teaching or teaching and service.

MCLEOD: Thank you. I'll move on to the—oh sorry.

HENSHEL: So, I'm re-reading this one more time or three more times or however many times I've gone through this again now.It's interesting to me that there's no discussion of use or not use or leaning or not leaning on student evaluations very much in here.

I guess I was wondering where the discussion went to on that point.

MCLEOD: Well—

ROBEL: I'm sure like a substantive criteria not the procedural criteria.

HENSHEL: Except that if there is to be a statement of to discourage use of student evaluations that would be a nice thing to see at this level.

ROBEL: But don't we have different procedural, I mean these are the substantive criteria for promotion and tenure.

PAVALKO: Certainly, student evaluations of teaching are still important in here, and really, it's broad into the subset of criteria. We don't talk about the format used. But peer evaluation of teaching is important, and I'm not looking right at the language.

Certainly, some kinds of assessment, and hopefully multiple forms of assessment will evaluate the quality of the teaching, both from students and from peers.

MCLEOD: Did you have another comment?

HENSHEL: Yeah. When I read through this, again, I think I wonder whether there could be more clarity on the role of student evaluations or something like that, not in detail but at a high level which I thought used to be in there, and I don't really see it or maybe it's just in the series.

MCLEOD: Yeah, I think that isn't in the text anymore. I mean, certainly, one would imagine that that could be one of the indicators of classroom instructional quality.

Are you suggesting that we might offer that as an example, or it's sound like you might be suggesting that we discourage the use of student evaluations for that reason?

Given the problematic, problems that have been noted over time in peer reviewed publications with pretty well-controlled studies, I would say we should discourage.

GROTH: There's a separate UFC task force that's looking at course evaluations. So, I think that we are looking at how that information is interpreted, and I would continue to say what lies in a sense, which is, that it's a piece of evidence that could be used if a faculty member decides that's part of the evidence, and that their faculty consider that whether it's the form students fill out, whether it's peer evaluations, it's all been clear that there's a variety of pieces of data that can be used to help people form their judgment in that case.

HENSHEL: Yeah, I was just wondering if there could be some language in here to indicate that it would be one and not the evidence of excellence in the classroom.

MCLEOD: Well, that's certainly something we can consider. I think we don't give many examples of the ways in which classroom instructional quality could be evaluated. So, perhaps

it skirted the issue in that way, but we could decide whether we think it would be important to include specific language of that type. So thanks for the suggestion.

ROBEL: Yes.

SEIGEL: I think that point is very important about the relative value or problematic nature of student evaluations, and Dennis, I wonder if you could tell us a little bit more about this committee, and maybe, Jane, could you let us know whether you are working with that other committee or whether you will make independent determinations on this question.

Maybe, Dennis, you could talk about when it's going to be presented to the BFC, if it is going to make a presentation. I don't want us just to assume that since this other committee exists, the committee that Jane is representing today shouldn't take up the issue.

GROTH: Well the other Committee is not a BFC committee. It's a UFC committee that was formed, and it has people from across the system, and we've had one meeting so far.

So I couldn't tell you when our report will be published. I assume we hope that we can have something by the end of the academic year.

MCLEOD: Yeah. So we weren't aware of this committee, but I think we will proceed with our recommendations for the proposal for these new evaluative criteria in the absence of the information from that committee.

ROBEL: Can I just ask a clarification point because all of you are in different units, and maybe I'm not clear about what the unit-level criteria, non-substantive criteria look like. But I think many, if not most units, have also procedures that go along with their substantive criteria, and my guess is that the forms of evidence are in those procedural criteria not in the substantive criteria.

Does that sound right?

CHERRY: I would like to just raise one thing that my constituents raised about this, and now knowing that there's a UFC task-force about this is helpful, so I thought this information I should share as well.

Given that there's been a change in how student evaluations are even done, going to this online, the response rate is much lower. It also appears that sometimes those who do respond reflect more the tails of the distribution, those that might be particularly disgruntled, or those that are particularly happy. So there's been concerned by some of the faculty in my group about the fact that we've also had a change in procedure about how these student evaluations are collected.

I think that ought to be factored into what the UFC looks at to know that even the value of the data has changed over time.

Then in part, to the Provost's comment to help compensate for some of that in our unit what, we've done, it's been a tradition for some time, is that we usually supplement the teaching stuff by some kind of peer evaluation, we faculty members actually sit in and observe your classes teaching so that you get some peer direct input with that.

I personally don't know how widespread that might be, it might be quite widespread.

ROBEL: It is universal.

CHERRY: Yeah. But that is something maybe that UFC should take into account or the committee here if they're going to be telling anybody anything about teaching evaluation, recognizing there's this other kind of peer evaluation kind of thing. So if we're going to start making statements about where the evaluations are coming from, we need to be a little careful.

ROBEL: What I think might be helpful is for all of you to look into your procedural documents and see what kinds of evidence and whether there are statements about weight because I've never seen a promotion case come forward with student evaluations as the sole, much less the primary form of evidence about teaching.
Ever.

SEIGEL: That was my case.

ROBEL: The sole? Well, I will say I've never seen it. So if that's in the documents, I think it would be helpful for all of you to look at your procedural documents and see how evidence of teaching quality is described in those documents.

SEIGEL: Lauren, I don't mean to be flip, but I think there is opportunity for the misuse of this without a specific set of expectations around student evaluations, and I know that we can't rely on existing procedures and policies.

ROBEL: Other comments? All right.

UNKNOWN: I think John had his hand up.

ROBEL: I'm not seeing hands.

WALBRIDGE: Yeah. Just one comment about peer evaluations.

That's something that tends to be neglected I suspect in practice because it's so much trouble to arrange, and I pester younger colleagues about getting people to observe their classes, much the same for graduate students who are doing teaching.

Everybody understands that peer evaluations are important, but because it's rather a pain to make them happen, that needs to be pushed as an administrative matter.

ROBEL: That really is something that promotion and tenure committees within the units need to take responsibility for, not the individual faculty member who's under review.

I think that it will would not take many experiences with the campus process trying to move somebody through on excellence, who are very good in teaching with no peer evaluations for a department to figure out that's really perilous route.

ROBEL: All right. Diane.

HENSHEL: Just to point out that at least in O'Neil, we've consciously chosen to have peer evaluation being used only for purposes of enhancing teaching and explicitly not to evaluate teaching per se.

ROBEL: Yeah.

BRAUER: Point of clarification in the interest of moving forward.

The actual policy is written lists a whole host of different pieces of information. Evaluations are included as one of those, and explicitly states that a candidate is not require to demonstrate excellence in every piece, which it also included evaluations.

So I don't see it as big of an issue as we're making it.

MCLEOD: Thank you. Then I'll move on to the final section for service, in which we propose a comparable approach with excellence, requiring contributions with broad impact, and very good requiring contributions that extend beyond the home unit.

Are there comments or questions on this section?

So Kim reminded me I think it is important to point out that part of the charge that came from President McRobbie was to include in our criteria moving forward the importance of multiple independent pieces of evidence, and that applies across all of these evaluative categories including teaching as you pointed out.

HENSHEL: So I'm going to come back to a discussion that happened online just to bring it forward here.

One of the other issues of trying to be cross-disciplinary or multidisciplinary or whichever version of trying to extend beyond your own discipline exists is that, and maybe this is true only in the professional schools which is why it was emphasized in the discussion online, but I don't think so—I think that more and more all of us tend to use our research and our teaching, bring our teaching and our research into our service and vice versa.

Certainly, in the professional schools, you bring your service back into the classroom as well because that's how you teach what is going on.

How would we create criteria for even evaluating that intersectionality?

I still am not sure about that but it's if we are going to encourage it, it does need to be at this level, at the campus level, some statement about encouraging this intersectional work, and if it's not here, it's going to be maybe catch-as-catch-can in the units and highly unlikely.

So it really does need to be at this level where we think about or make statements about the appropriateness of having your work not just being teaching, not just research, not just service that they are truly enmeshed and intermeshed together.

MCLEOD: Well, it does seem to me that that's a way of thinking about contributions in the areas that might be particular to particular academic units, and I don't know if there would be broad agreement across all of the units of the importance of that integration.

But, certainly, I don't think there's anything that precludes that in this document, and I would think that if there weren't going to be a statement to this effect that it might be more appropriately placed with the statements about things such as interdisciplinarity and community impact which appear in other sections of these guidelines.

THOMASSEN: So I think that's a good point in something that our unit is wrestling with and also that it's under discussion when we think about the teaching professor criteria being just strictly in teaching and I know that we're not having that discussion at this point, and we'll be moving on to that at another point, but it does relate to this idea of folks where word is the word.

In the Teaching Professor instance everything has to be about excellence in teaching research has to be related to teaching or it wouldn't be considered, and even at our unit or on the BAC committee in thinking about how to make now that we're evaluating NTT in a different way, making a form one size fits all that includes the diversity of things that people do and even unto the some of the research scientists where service is a big part of it but it's research in the use of service, not published research but actually research that's undergone to say calibrate instruments or devise new management techniques.

So one of the things we're grappling with is really how do you divide into these three bins when you actually have subcategories like research in support of teaching and service in support of just subcategories where all these things sort intertwine.

And so I think this is one of the things that a lot of us are really thinking about is how do you present your case or your portfolio, so that things are in the appropriate bins so that you can achieve recognition for the excellence that you might have if the definitions are very, very narrow?

So I guess what I'm saying is that I think being as broad as possible at the campus level is beneficial and then units if everybody would work towards recognizing that our goal is to get our folks that are doing excellent work in these categories habits such that their work is

recognized for the contributions and that of course is an argument that each candidate has to make and marshal the evidence.

ROBEL: Thank you.

KLOOSTERMAN: Yeah, I just wanted to say there's one who's dealt with these cases for a long time, I really do appreciate trying to have a little more detail as to what's going on there, and I think that's going to really help us.

I know I've been involved with some of the online conversations including Herb Terry and some others, and—Herb…just going back to the Stone Age is when we started with balanced case and talked about it, it's his—the original idea was really for people who didn't fit into any of the normal categories but were really good.

He thought of it as something that was really just people who were doing something very out of the ordinary.

My background is in the School of Ed. So I'm professional school person in teacher education where people are out working in the schools and doing lots of service that's connected to everything else that's going on. I see balanced case is an example of what you really should be doing in that area not as something that's out of the ordinary.

And Going back to this idea of what's exceptional, I mean Herb and I have come to an agreement on things that both theories are appropriate but I think I certainly want to stress the idea in my mind anyway that balanced case at least in some certain situations should not be looked at as an also-ran alternative but something that really is should be strive for in some situations, and the more we can do to promote that, the better and I think this document helps.

So thank you.

MCLEOD: You're welcome.

Any other comments then?

I think absent that we will confer in our committee again next week and then we will see you again in two weeks from today with document quite like this.

ROBEL: I really want to take a moment to thank Kim and Jamie first for leading the summer committee and then Jane and Israel for leading the committee this fall. This is a big and important step for the campus and it's been a good discussion and we should continue with comments to the committee and until we vote on this.

MCLEOD: Yes indeed. If you have comments after today's meeting, please feel free to send them directly to me and I'd be happy to take that to the committee meeting.

ROBEL: Great. Well thank you. I think we are improbably at the end of our agenda. So if there's nothing else, I would suggest we adjourn in the usual way.