



FACULTY ORGANIZATION MINUTES

January 19th, 2007

Time: 10 a.m.-noon

Location: Hawthorn 107

70 in attendance

I. Call to Order at 10:03 am

II. President's announcements

- a. G. Bodmer announced make sure you make official room switches **◆** don't just change your classrooms as you see fit
- b. Marie Czach and Charlotte Reed will speak in coming months on their Centers and/or work
- c. Spirits Magazine is currently on sale in bookstore **◆** please support
- d. AAUP meeting right after Fac. Org. meeting today

III. Chancellor's report

- a. Stated how great the MLK day celebration was, complimented E. Jones and BSU
- b. Pat Giannini will become Executive Director of Development
- c. Search for Vice-Chancellor of Student Services progressing well with a strong candidate pool
- d. Chancellor on the Presidential Search Committee **◆** just recently had the confidential interviews (about 10 people) and identified 5 people that will be moving on to the next stage of consideration; Committee feels very positive about the strength of the candidate pool
- e. 2007 Strategic Outcomes will be released shortly **◆** includes issues of pay equity, communication and support for professional dev. for faculty and staff among other issues
- f. Toni Lieteau (Marketing) will be providing us a quarterly accounting of our local press coverage so that we have a better idea of what and how we are being represented locally
- g. Health and Human Services **◆** moving ahead well
- h. Course Load Release Policy **◆** conversations with VCAA Aggrey and feels very positive about moving forward on this issue
- i. Q from G. Bodmer - Labor Studies **◆** A-don't really know much more than previously reported

- j. Q from J. Bloom ♦ issue of successive low raises ♦ A-decisions have to be made based on revenues that exist, there is often a trade-off in harsh economic times between new hires and salary increases; we will be having another session regarding the budget shortly so that we can be as open and transparent about the process as possible; follow-up question ♦ haven't we hired more administrators since you have been here and isn't that where the money has gone? Could you provide data that I have asked for previously on this issue? A-we will provide information on that issue; however, when I was hired, I assumed that the institution was more developed than it was ♦ so there was a lot of work developing the infrastructure needed to run the university; follow-up ♦ so nothing will change in the coming years? A- if enrollments go up we will have more money made available to us; HHS I believe will have a huge positive impact on our enrollments; we are actively working on ways to increase enrollment
- k. Q from A. Barr ♦ Nov. meeting on Budget Crisis promised meeting arranged? Small meeting (G. Bodmer will work with VCAA and VCFA to invite appropriate persons to the smaller meeting) and Large Public Meeting will be scheduled
- l. Q from J. Poulard ♦ would like to do away with % raises and instead use dollar amounts so that those with larger salaries consistently gain more from % raises. A-this is an issue for Academic Affairs to take up before it would come to me.

IV. Vice Chancellors ♦ reports

a. VCFA Vasquez

- 1. enrollment ♦ flat, down 2% headcount, down .4% credit hours from last Spring
- 2. Budget request ♦ Rec. from Commission to the legislature ♦ because of enrollment change; for 2007-2008 - decline in our base of \$208,250; inflation factor of 1.4% added, \$249,407/ difference is \$41,157 plus base from last year for 2007-08 and would be \$170,411 plus base for 2008-09
- 3. Q-Vernon Smith ♦ effort to see the effect of the ALC on our negative headcount? we are getting the revenue and headcount for our students taking courses at the ALC; we are continuing to monitor this issue, however, as our new student headcount did decrease at approximately the rate of increase that Purdue reported
- 4. Q-Ruth Needleman ♦ what about more online classes? out-of-state student tuition? JT Forbes has been working on this issue, in order for us to benefit from this arrangement there has to be an agreement between the two commissions (Illinois and Indiana) on higher education. There is real interest in identifying a set of counties from which we think there might be a draw and producing a reciprocal agreement. follow-up ♦ relieve out-of-state tuition for online courses? discussion of issues related to in and out of state tuition issued
- 5. Q- Jack Bloom ♦ motion to consider a merger between Purdue and IU, no discussion
- 6. Bookstore- all regional campuses asked to keep their bookstores, vendors who have bid want all of the campuses for management; Feb. 23, rec. will be made for all campuses; next on the list are food services, and printing

b. VCAA Aggrey

1. Read a nice letter from a student from Bloomington who took a course from L. Schiefelbusch
2. Congratulations on a successful Fall semester
3. Center for Regional Excellence has been supported in the past by a Lilly Grant and CTE funds. The Lilly grant has been exhausted and the CTE funds are being redirected to HHS. So the CRE moves into a new era of aggressive fund raising to be lead by the new Associate Professor of Education and Executive Director, Debbie Thomas.
4. Visit faculty day has been switched to Wednesdays
5. If you will invite me, I will try to make the time to visit your classes
6. I am preparing to teach a general chemistry class in Fall of 2007 by sitting in on my colleagues Chemistry classes
7. HHS- we will be moving forward on the plans as described previously
8. Announcements praising various recent events and award winners and upcoming conferences to be held on the campus
9. Make sure that your grades are turned in on time.
10. Low Enrollment courses ♦ we must work together as a campus community to maintain our majors and move forward in a positive way regarding these courses; we would like to establish a minimum FTE per faculty member per semester. Then once you reach that number, you can make decisions within your unit about whether a class will make or not. Until we get to that point, we will continue to make these decisions with the Deans and faculty involved
11. Research Course Reassignment - Look at the process ♦ will use a combination of what faculty have done and what they propose to do in the future ♦ ask each unit to draw up new criteria and we will use them from now on; we will then develop a checklist that can be used to evaluate each individual; then each unit will have a review committee for each unit to evaluate problem cases with 3 faculty on them for all divisions except for A&D with 5 for members

V. Report from Academic Affairs Committee--Prof. Gallmeier

- a. Described process used to create report
- b. Report appended to end of this report

VI. Report from the Computer Committee--Prof. Scott

- c. Starting next fall, campus labs and instructional classrooms will move to Windows Vista and Office 2007. Please check to make sure the proprietary software you use is VISTA compatible
- d. Q - Will the upgrades be happening to faculty and staff too? A- no, not unless you want it to be done ♦ you can stay with XP if you want to

- e. Q - Request to allow both operating systems in labs and classrooms made by Professor Hozo
 ◆ Bert Scott will take it up with IT
- f. CETL offered help to faculty as needed
- g. Fall 2007 ◆ the workstations upfront will be moved to ADS logins

VII. Resolution on the Course Release Policy

The Faculty Organization of Indiana University Northwest resolves

1. That the "pilot" implementation of the Course Release Policy adopted by the Faculty in April 2006 confirms that the faculty are overwhelmingly fulfilling their research obligations.
2. Notwithstanding (1), that the process by which the "pilot" implementation was conducted violated the language and spirit of the Policy as it was adopted.
3. That the implementation of the Course Release Policy must incorporate the principle that criteria for the assessment of research, scholarly, and creative work differ among disciplines and academic programs and that the criteria relevant to each discipline shall be determined by the faculty in the disciplines and academic programs.
4. That the full implementation of the three-year "look-back" period required in the Policy shall begin with the 2006 calendar year, with the first full three-year "look-back" covering the calendar year Faculty Annual Reports for 2006, 2007, and 2008.
5. That the implementation of the course release policy shall be consistent with the Academic Handbook and shall allow faculty access to the appeal processes already specified in the course release policy.

Discussion

- a. Q - Why pick 2006? As a start for the look back time? A ◆ 2006 is when the policy was adopted and so should begin then
- b. Call the Question - voice vote- 1 no vote, everyone else aye

VIII. Resolution on the Chancellors Review Policy for the University Faculty Council.

The Indiana University Northwest requests that the Indiana University Faculty Council adopt the following resolution:

The Indiana University Faculty Council finds the lack of Faculty input into the adoption of a policy for review of campus Chancellors problematic. The University Faculty Council believes that any Review Committees for campus Chancellors be composed of at least 50% members of the faculty on the campus of the Chancellor being reviewed. The UFC is also concerned about language in the "Principles for Chancellor Reviews," specifically point 3 which says "The fifth-year evaluation should include information from the following: (a) The results of a faculty review process outlined in this document..." This language could allow the Review Committee to proceed without a faculty review process. The UFC is also concerned about language in point 8 which says "The Review Committee may utilize a survey as a part of the review," as this clearly allows the Committee not to use a survey. Finally, the UFC is concerned about language prohibiting the Review Committee from incorporating anonymous comments into its deliberations, as (particularly untenured) faculty might feel pressured into providing only positive comments. The UFC requests that the Trustees postpone implementation of the Chancellor Review Policy until meaningful consultation between the UFC and the Trustees can concur.

Discussion

- a. Chancellor pointed out the Board and UFC have been working on this for several years and while this draft was written
- b. Call the Question ♦ voice vote, unanimously passed

IX. Presentation on the Institute for Innovative Leadership from Director Kirkpatrick

- a. Showed powerpoint presentation on IIL
- b. The Randall L. Tobias Center on Leadership Excellence at IU ♦ Director evaluated the Program and stated it was an outstanding model
- c. Impact ♦ work with about 1200 -1500 people a year through IIL
- d. Revenue ♦ over time we have increased our external funding and hope to reach 50% this year in that regard
- e. Very positive regional reputation and most important our graduates are stepping up to higher and higher leadership roles in their workplaces
- f. Brought graduates from the program to speak to its effectiveness

X. Old business

- a. Election Committee- still need Faculty Board of Review nominations

XI. New business

XII. Adjournment by President Bodmer at 12:00

Faculty Affairs Committee Report on the Pilot Program

In April, 2006, the Faculty Organization reaffirmed its belief that IU Northwest is a research university; we understand that, along with good teaching and constructive service, we are expected to do credible research. The reduction of our teaching load from 4 to 3 courses underscores this expectation. Chancellor Bergland has raised the question of accountability: how comprehensively are faculty members ♦earning♦ or justifying this course reduction. A **pilot** program was designed to assess exactly what the reality was. This year the Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to review the pilot program and to make recommendations based upon that review. George Bodmer, as Faculty Organization President, solicited responses from the faculty and relayed them to the Committee, along with copies of the original Faculty Organization resolutions. The Committee has read and discussed the documents and issues. It met with four of the deans (Linda Rooda, Stan Wigle, Karen Evans and Denise Travis) and the Chair Chuck Gallmeier met individually with Dee Dee Ioe and Anna

Evans, and Denise Travis), and the Chair, Chuck Summers, met informally with Bob Dooce and Anna Rominger, as well as with the Arts and Sciences chairs.

We wish to take comfort in the Chancellor's expressed delight with the 85% compliance rate (actually 87+%). This is a markedly productive faculty, as the divisional bibliographies and annual reports reflect. The pilot study provided evidence that we are in good shape. Happily, we also have in place procedures sufficient to monitor our compliance.

The Faculty Affairs Committee quickly recognized how uniformly negative the comments from faculty were regarding the pilot program--from rage to sheer bewilderment. So far no one, either from the faculty or the administration, has been heard by any of us on the Committee to express the view that this has been a good or productive process other than Anna Rominger in her interview with Chuck (and her response was apparently more defensive than positive). Quite to the contrary, many have been outraged and embittered; some, after many years of positive participation on campus, feel humiliated and betrayed as they approach retirement. The pilot process 1) has raised widespread suspicions about how honestly it is a pilot program to be reviewed (this does not exactly jibe with the Chancellor's statements that he expects to see the results reflected in next year's scheduling); 2) has left many puzzled about what the problem is, a problem that resulted in so extreme and alienating a procedure; and 3) left people wondering why the singularity of this campus campaign (unique in the IU system) and why the urgency; where is the pressure coming from. What signified a problem? We respect the reduction of the fourth course. Has there been any external pressure (from the President? the Trustees) to examine whether we, alone among the eight IU campuses, have been transgressive?

The comments from the four deans who met with us were particularly pointed here. They clearly saw no advantage to this added procedure, believing that all of the mechanisms needed for accountability were already in place, and most emphatically that the deans (and chairs in COAS) were best suited to monitor their faculties' research, that the VCAA should not be involved except in egregious instances. With three-year records in hand, they saw no need for a burdensome (adversarial, provocative?) extra review.

The consensus of the Committee's deliberations is that we strongly assert that we are accountable for our performance as researchers, but that it would be immensely expensive in terms of morale and bureaucracy to implement the proposed additional annual review *and* that it would produce no results not already available through accepted, sanctioned, existing mechanisms. *If* there is a fault, it is not with the mechanisms, but with the mechanics (the overseers and supervisors).

There already exist procedures in place that, if followed, would provide as much accountability as is practicable: from hiring interviews to faculty annual evaluations and merit recommendations to tenure and promotion procedures, and, if appropriate, to post-tenure reviews. To charge out into the professional psyches of faculty in quest of 100% compliance seems, at the very least, quixotic. No faculty--from Bloomington to UIC to Stanford to Columbia--can assert such a presumption. Part, we feel, of being a mature, confident academic institution is to invoke every existing reasonable instrument available to ensure quality and productivity--and then graciously to accept that a small (inevitable) fraction of the faculty will have wandered from research. To the procedures itemized above, we would urge the campus-wide incorporation of a third-year review for tenure-track faculty as one more safeguard in monitoring and guiding faculty productivity.

Not only does the Committee reject the need for this additional review, but we found the pilot itself problematical. First, what was presented as a pilot program (to be subsequently evaluated, with the inference that it could be judged unwise or ill-advised) and--if deemed successful--instituted over the course of three years, is now being spoken of as the prelude to a procedure with scheduling ramifications for next year. The deans we met with were firmly of the view that course rescheduling as a consequence of this program would not begin until 2009 (their statement, without demurral and one that coincides with the Faculty Organization resolution). The pilot was also wisely intended to exclude tenure-track faculty; such was not the case.

A faculty member's research over the previous three years was to be considered, presumably as measured against clearly articulated unit standards. The question of standards and criteria seems to have been variously construed and generally muddled. The acting VCAA expressed one view the convening deans quite

variously considered and generally ignored. The acting VCOT expressed one view, the contracting teams quite contrary views. The discussions of individual cases between the Dean of COAS and the administration seem to have been significantly different from those of other divisions. We have looked at the numbers reported by the deans and hardly find them reassuring: the great disparity of results among divisions does not instill great confidence that the criteria were standardized, valid, or useful. Some further argued that the exclusion of such things as the procuring of grants and the mentoring of student research from consideration compromised the utility of the evaluation.

The provision that faculty who had not performed successfully as researchers while teaching 3 courses could rehabilitate themselves while teaching 4 courses defies comprehension. Finally, the delivery of the letters was apparently a ghastly and miserable experience for all concerned.

Considering our general misgivings about the need and appropriateness of such an additional process and the specific difficulties encountered, we recommend that it not be pursued. Instead, we urge (and not at all rhetorically) that the administration make a concerted and convincing effort to emphasize its research expectations and that it engage the existing procedures. To strengthen these procedures we also urge that a third-year review be made campus-wide.

Relish the successes and productivity we have enjoyed and genuinely accept a reality that every other institution of higher education has to accommodate. Insist that real research is a central part of what we do, support it, and make every effort to exact it. IU Northwest is a community of productive scholars, but does not want to be the first and only campus in the system to make a *causus bellum* out of the few who may have run dry. The pilot results would seem to indicate that the problem is largely mythical--or minimal. We applaud the pilot program for verifying our impressions.

Return to [Faculty Org Main Page](#)

INDIANA UNIVERSITY NORTHWEST

Quality Education. Lifetime Opportunities.

3400 Broadway - Gary, Indiana 46408

888-YOUR IUN

219-980-6500

(1-888-968-7486)

Comments: [Faculty Organization Webmaster](#)

Last updated: 2 May 122

[Copyright](#) 1997 — 2022, The Trustees of [Indiana University](#)

[Copyright Complaints](#) • [Privacy Statement](#)