

**Minutes**

**Indiana University**

**UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL**

**October 8, 2002**

**University Place Conference Center, Room 137  
IUPUI**

**1:30 – 4:30 PM**

**Summary of Action Taken:**

**Agenda**

1. Presiding Officer's Business  
(President Myles Brand)
2. Agenda Committee Business  
(Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)
3. Question / Comment Period\*  
(President Myles Brand and Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)  
(10 minutes)
4. About 2:00:  
Committee Meetings  
(Circular U2-2002)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/02-03/U2-2003.htm>

\*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President Brand, Professor Eno, and Professor Fisher should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office three days in advance of the meeting. UFC bylaws require non-members to have advance permission from the Agenda Committee in order to speak during the meeting. UFC meetings are open to the public.

We are no longer mailing paper copy of our documents. Our documents are on the World Wide Web at this address:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc>

## ATTENDANCE

**Members Present:** Simon Atkinson, Jim Baldwin, Abhijit Basu, Julie Bobay, Polly Boruff-Jones, Myles Brand, Richard Carr, David Daleke, Delaine E. Cochran, Jeffrey Dean, Bob Eno, Deborah Finkel, Mary Fisher, Michael Foos, David Fulton, Ann Gellis, Laura Ginger, Marilyn Kintzele, Anna McDaniel, Ruth Person, Mary Popp, Vandana Rao-Dev, Cynthia Roy, Barry Rubin, Al Ruesink, Roy Schreiber, Moira Smith, Rosann Spiro, K. Vinodgopal, David Vollrath, Kim Walker, Richard Ward, Enid Zwirn

**Members Absent:** Anne Allen, Judd Arnold, Gerald Bepko, Bruce Bergland, Sharon Brehm, Don Coffin, Janice Froehlich, William C. Gray, Peter Iadicola, Chandana Kakani, Michael Nusbaumer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Mark Pescovitz, Una Mae Reck, John Ross, Joshua Runyan, Dennis Senchuk, Sarita Soni, George Walker, Michael Wartell, Jeffery Watt, Patricia Wittberg, Nanci Yokom

**Members Absent with Alternates:** Marty Spechler for Robert Tarver

**Visitors:** Tracy Marshall (Committee member); Jerome Mahaffey (Committee member); G. Mathew (IU East); H.R. Berch; Marty Pentz (IUE Faculty Governance Committee); Karen Gable (UFC-FAC); Ojode Lucy (IUK-FAAL); Beth Plale (IUB TPC); Karen Whiting; Mark Bremer; Scott Opasik (IUB); Ted Miller; Greg Braxton-Brown; Glenn Crother (IUS); Ted Widlanski

### **AGENDA ITEM #1: Presiding Officer's Business (President Myles Brand)**

BRAND: OK, let's begin. I'll be brief about it. Some of you may have seen the article in the Wall Street Journal yesterday. If you haven't on the front page there was a story about the budget situation in the states. Indiana was featured---not for good reasons. Talking about the particular difficulties we're having in our own budget situation. The budget is very tight in the state, it's probably depending on who you talk to and when between 750 million dollars and 1 billion dollars in deficit. That's considerable. Meaning that the work to balance the budget last year and tax restructuring did not go far enough. In this coming long session starting after the New Year there are some difficult choices that are faced by our legislatures. They can take serious cuts out of the budget and find one-time solutions to complement that and balance the budget in a short process many over a year or at most two. Those cuts will have to be very deep and it's inconceivable that they should not seriously include K-12 and I'm not convinced, in fact, I doubt that this will, that the legislature will deeply cut K-12 as deeply as needed. So that's one possibility. The other possibility is that they look at the revenue sources, meaning taxes and go back and finish the work that they've started. The answer will be somewhere between that ends of the continuum—doing it all by new revenues, doing it all by cutting one time so you could expect some tax provisions, you can expect some cuts and you can expect some one-time solutions hoping that over the long run state grows out of this problem Where it falls on that continuum is very important to us. If it falls too far in the cut side it will make our

budget very difficult. If it moves more up to the restructuring side we have better opportunities. Our goal is to replace cuts that were taken in the last session which were about 3.2 percent; we have taken those one-time cuts using our reserves rather than base budget. We don't want to cut base budget unless we have to. That's the last thing we want to do so how close we'll get to returning to the 3.2 percent is going to be the outcome of this debate. I'm a pathological optimist so I think we'll come very close when the time actually gets there. And if so, then we're finished with the cutting. If I'm mistaken and the state doesn't have the will to change the revenue structure than certainly not all of that than some of that, we'll have to return to those issues. So, a lot depends upon the election, and certainly a lot depends mostly upon the legislative sessions coming up. Bob, Mary, Agenda Committee business?

**AGENDA ITEM#2: Agenda Committee Business  
(Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)**

ENO: Ok, a few items on the agenda committee business. We have an enormous crowd here today, this is unusual for the UFC it's because we have our committee meetings, I know a lot of you are on the committees rather than on the council I want to let you all know that the committee meetings are going to occur right after we finish with this plenary session which should be quite brief, we have no real agenda. We'll be meeting in this room we're going to rearrange tables. David Frisby who is secretary of the council has brought some markers along so we'll all know which tables we're at. I thought since at our first meeting down in Bloomington a month ago we had a very small turnout that I could do some of the things I did a month ago and just make sure everybody on the council and those on the committees understands who's up here in the front of the room and what we're doing here. Mary Fisher and I are the co-secretaries of the University Faculty Council because we represent the faculty councils of the two large campuses, IUPUI for Mary and Bloomington for me. Michael Foos from IU-East is our Parliamentarian and we have throughout the room a number of people who are presidents of faculty council on various campuses who form the Agenda Committee which is the Executive Committee of this body; coordinates the meetings, sets up the agenda. And then we have a set of standing committees that are meeting today that really develop the policies that come to the Council for consideration. That's basically the structure of what we do. We only meet 5 real times a year so we have to focus our energies and this is the one day we meet together in committees face-to-face. After your committees meeting today all further correspondence for almost all the committees will be conducted by email rather than by face-to-face meetings because it's too far to drive. I do want to note for those of you who are members of the Council that I anticipate before our next meeting in November that we will have a full set of last years' minutes up on the web for you to review and approve at the next meeting. The minutes have been slow in coming this year, not only because it takes for our staff to produce them, but because they have to be reviewed and edited by the Senior co-secretary of the faculty council who spent a good portion of the summer reading the early minutes and then found it difficult to continue. But I'm sure that once they're fully edited you'll find that they're fascinating and interesting and a lightning read. So please be on the alert that they should be posted well before the next meeting and we'll need to approve them or amend them. Two

announcements that I want to make. One has to do with one of our committees, not a standing committee of the Council, but a committee that the Council has appointed, the Agenda Committee of the Council has appointed in past years along with the Dean of RUGS, and that is the Research Policies Committee. Agenda Committee of the UFC has been responsible for appointing nominations from RUGS; it's a committee that has not been functioning well over the years. It's charged with developing policies governing research for all campuses and certain other tasks that are associated with research. Ann Gellis is a member of the Council and our Agenda Committee and is an Associate Dean in RUGS has been deeply involved in trying to get this committee going, she chaired it for a number of years, she feels it's tasks are very important, and she's completely given up on this committee. Therefore, we are doing the same; we have not reappointed this committee. The Bloomington Faculty Council in September established a new standing committee of its Council which is called the Research Affairs Committee. We anticipate that IUPUI is going to establish, or may already have established an ad hoc committee for this year to become a standing committee next year which will be a Research Affairs Committee. We believe these committee structures will be more productive and we're going to try to reassign the tasks of the Research Policies Committee has been addressing or not addressing over the last few years to those committees to see them get done. One last item I'd like to turn to, which also has to do with research with RUGS. We have had an administrative reorganization as you all know; President Brand announced at the State of the University address, where Michael McRobbie who is the Vice President of Information Technology has now become, designated, as our next Vice President Research, we're having a restructuring of the graduate school. As most of you may be aware, University Faculty Council has policies regarding appointments of this nature. One of these policies which was adopted 15 years ago states that when we have appointments to major administrative positions within the university structure which have direct bearing on teaching and research, there should be a search and screen, in fact there must be a search and screen procedure that we go through for the purpose of making that appointment. In the case of Vice President McRobbie's appointment, search and screen was not formed and the process was not used and some of us are aware of the fact that in the appointment, research-related appointment, of the new head of our federal relations office, John Walda, we also did not use a normal search and screen committee and that also will be an office that might be construed as having a direct bearing on research. So, I'm going to... I'm mentioning these facts and I'm going to ask President Brand to respond to the fact that in these two cases the search and screen process mandated by University Faculty Council policy has not been followed. I'm going to ask Myles for a response.

BRAND: Thanks for the opportunity, Bob. The practice has been when there is an academically-related administrative post we have a search and screen committee; when it's not an academically-directly, connected position we do not. So, for example, if we're replacing a high level person in physical plant we do not form a faculty search and screen committee. When we're replacing someone in the budget office that's only budget work we do not call on a search and screen committee. Are those people related to what goes on academically? Well there's a sense where everything is related academically, even the people who run physical plant or student affairs. But, there's a narrower reading of that

so for example, Deans obviously are going to have a search and screen committees, chancellors are going to have search and screen committees. This academic-administrative posts without question. If it's an administrative post, which being part of the university is academically related, but not in a strong way academically related the practice has been to not have search and screen committees. In the case of federal relations, that's a lobbying position. We've never had faculty search and screen committees for our lobbying positions whether they are state or federal. So that's not a change in practice at all. Is the position academically related? Well, in the broad sense it is, but not, I would suggest to you in a more narrow common sense, sense. The Vice President for Research I would suggest to you is a gray area. There's been a restructure to RUGS after extensive consultation with some ad hoc faculty groups as well as with people in the university administration and even some people off campus to get what's the norm of the University [one word lost]. We have for the last 10-12 years, I think it was George, about 11 years I think it took place with George...combined the graduate school with research. Most universities, or all those that are known to me at least, who are like us, the Big 10 institutions, tend to keep those positions separate and that's the norm. So, we combined them and are now going back to the norm. The university dean for Graduate Studies is clearly an academic position and there will be a search and screen committee for that. In fact I asked UFC to provide some names because we'd like to complete that search before this year's over...so that's clearly an academic position that's not a gray area. The way the Vice Presidency for Research is being defined has some academic responsibilities; it has many that are not as well. It seemed to me in this case, for a number of reasons, that it would be better not to have a national or even internal search. The reason for that is basically two-fold. First of all, I think we had a particular individual who is especially strong and I am very uneasy about running searches when I already know the answer. I don't like to run searches just to verify the quality of the person because if I already know the answer than not only do I spend a lot of money searching, but I waste a lot of people's time and create expectations that aren't real. I believe it's hypocritical to run a search if you know what the end result is already rather than just name the person. The second reason is that we, I mentioned before, our tight budget, as you probably know almost all of the cuts we've taken so far are coming out of the administrative side of the organization not the academic side—I think that's good. But it also means that we have to be very cognizant of cost-containment to the administration. So this combined two vice presidency positions, it produces that, and George Walker and Michael McRobbie are consulting and working on issues that...to see if we can integrate the staffs, no layoffs as far as I can tell, but through attrition decrease the size of those administrative staffs by some people taking on the same responsibilities but over a broader range. So we believe that it was reasonably good for administrative cost savings, I don't know how much that will mean in the end. Additional changes of the IUPUI campus has a, what is your title Mark... [Brenner: Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education]...and that works really well and so we're trying to replicate that on the Bloomington campus. We're also in a transitional period and it appears, and I hope I'm not speaking out of turn, so this isn't definitive, but it appears that Jeff Alberts will continue in that position at least for a while. And that's good it gives us a transition and he does a very good job. And Mark the idea is to eventually get it parallel to what you're doing right now at the IUPUI campus. So the formation of the two faculty

committees is actually quite appropriate I believe because then you're going to have parallel positions on both campuses. Having said all that, this may not be the best organization in the end. So, in two years, once we start this, two years after we start this, we'll have a thorough review. Which I'm sure Bob and this group will make sure we're doing it in the right way or not, and maybe we'll have to refine it and maybe we won't. I'm also, and UFC has already taken steps along these lines, some recommendation of the faculty committee structure, what you've done and perhaps more in terms of getting more input into those who are assigned to the Graduate Dean as well as the VP for Research. The VP Research assignment is to a great assignment a Washington based assignment, but it also has a university component in terms of leadership and new directions for the center directors and so on. I'm open to questions or comments.

ENO: I'd like to make a comment. A lot of what you've said Myles is familiar to me and I certainly think that this was an unusual situation with the consolidation of the Vice Presidencies and I'm personally, perfectly willing to grant that the Office of Federal Relations will be tangential to the policies of the University Faculty Council develops concerning search and screen committees. However, when it comes to the Vice President for Research, the policy reads "administrative officers holding positions which bear directly on the teaching-research mission of the University shall be chosen through a formal process referred to as search and screen." I think it's important to establish that for future Vice Presidents' of Research the normal procedure, the anticipated procedure will be in accordance with this policy and there will be a faculty governed policy having to do with search and screen, involving search and screen.

BRAND: OK

[Laughter]

ENO: Other topics...That's all for agenda committee business.

**AGENDA ITEM#3: Question / Comment Period  
(President Myles Brand and Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)**

ENO: We have a question and comment period. If there are no questions and comments...oh there is...Rosann

SPIRO: Can I ask just one question...I wonder if you can tell us, we heard in Bloomington Faculty Council, the new provost position is going to be budget neutral. Can you explain how that's going happen?

BRAND: No

[Laughter]

BRAND: Don't misinterpret me...this isn't a 'no' that it's not going to be budget-neutral, this is a campus-specific issue and you really have to work with the Chancellor. I have

not been close to that, I have been consulted about the provost position but the details are really the campus Chancellor's.

SPIRO: OK

ENO: Basu?

BASU: This is more a question of principles...are we generally getting into a structure of the university where non-academic administrators would proportionately increase?

BRAND: No, actually I'm decreasing them.

BASU: Because you're saying that the VP of Research, relatively speaking or in practice, in practical terms, is a non-academic appointment.

BRAND: I said a gray area, Basu. I think it has both roles. Clearly a chancellor there's no question about it, or a dean, or provost. There's no questions about those, that's crystal clear, but a lot of what a good Vice President for Research does is off-campus work, pure administrative work, working with Washington agencies, working with foundations for grants, some fundraising, but also looks at, now that's true, but also looks at some issues that are academically based. So, it's much more of a mixed menu there and that's in a gray area, at least in my opinion.

ENO: Martin?

SPECHLER: I'd like to point out that two people recently appointed to Dean positions on the IUPUI campus were at the time of their appointment non-faculty positions and they had previously been faculty positions.

BRAND: OK. I don't know which deans you're referring to.

SPECHLER: Whatever efforts you're making I'd certainly welcome to keep the faculty representation in the administration as strong as it's been. But at IUPUI the trend appears to be in the opposite direction.

BRAND: Thank you, I'll look into that. McRobbie has full professorship both in Computer Science and Philosophy so he's an academic; he isn't coming from an administrative posts...he has a full-fledged faculty position.

ENO: OK, if there aren't any more questions or comments than we've come to the adjournment of the main meeting. We're going to rearrange tables. It will take us about five minutes and then we're going to have committee meetings in this room. The high ceiling will hopefully have enough room for all the noise.

Adjournment approximately 2:00 pm.

