

# Untitled Document

---

Attached are the minutes of April 11.

Minutes

Indiana University

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

IU Foundation Building

February 14, 1995

1:30-4:30 P.M.

Members Present: President Myles Brand; Vice President Kenneth Gros Louis; Chancellor Leon Rand; Elected Faculty Members Barbara Cambridge, Jeanette Clausen, Donald Coffin, Ronald Dehnke, Michael Downs, Paul Eisenberg, Janet Feldmann, Edwin Fineberg, Edgar Fleenor, Kyle Forinash, Donald Gray, Edwin Greenebaum, Steven Hollander, Elton Jackson, Carlyn Johnson, Marilyn Kintzele, Eugene Kleinbauer, Peter Kloosterman, Angeline Komenich, Joan Esterline Lafuze, Robert Lehnen, Elizabeth Lion, Christoph Lohmann, Allen Maxwell, Byron Olson, Lloyd Orr, Thomas Osgood, James Pattillo, Curtis Peters, Albert Ruesink, Ruth Russell, Paul Scherer, Myrtle Scott, James Sherman, Martin Spechler, David Towell, Kathleen Warfel, Karen West, William Wiggins, Nanci Yokom; Student Members Jeff Nowak, Thomas Stilling.

Members Absent with Alternates: Gene Tempel for Vice President Gerald Bepko, William Nuñez for Chancellor Erita Hill, Richard Carr for Elected Faculty Member Catherine Olmer, James McAteer for Faculty Member Richard Peterson.

Members Absent without Alternates: Chancellors Daniel Cohen, David Fulton, Hilda Richards, Michael Wartell; Elected Faculty Members Vannoy Farris, Karen Teeguarden; Student Members Fetewi Ghaim, Todd Schmidt.

Visitors: Morton Lowengrub (Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, IUB).

Agenda

1. Presiding Officer's Business

(President Myles Brand)

2. Agenda Committee Business

(Professors Paul Eisenberg and Kathleen Warfel)

3. Question/Comment Period

(President Myles Brand)

(Professors Paul Eisenberg and Kathleen Warfel)

4. Pending Trustee Resolution on Faculty Productivity

(Professor Paul Eisenberg, Agenda Committee)

(Dean Morton Lowengrub, IUB College of Arts and Sciences)

5. Reports from Educational Policies Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee:

FACET Statement Concerning Teaching

(Professors Catherine Olmer and Richard Ward, Educational Policies Committee)

(Professors Elton Jackson and Martin Spechler, Faculty Affairs Committee)

6. Reports from Educational Policies Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee:

Trustees' Resolution regarding AIs and Part-Time Faculty

(Professors Catherine Olmer and Richard Ward, Educational Policies Committee)

(Professors Elton Jackson and Martin Spechler, Faculty Affairs Committee)

7. Consideration of Honorary Degrees to Be Awarded

(Executive Session)

(Professor Eugene Kleinbauer, Honorary Degrees Committee)

Summary of Action Taken

The council adopted three resolutions about the pending Trustee resolution on faculty productivity:

1. The University Faculty Council recommends to the Trustees that a working group be set up such that it is composed of elected faculty representatives from each campus, deans, and trustees to agree on procedures which will ensure a thorough, fair, and credible application of the capacity model as it is being implemented on a phased basis.

2. The University Faculty Council accepts the Wisconsin model as a way of providing quantitative data for record-keeping. These data must be interpreted in light of other data which more completely describe faculty productivity.

3. The University Faculty Council wishes to convey to the Trustees that the development of a productivity model for research and service would be a complex matter with few precedents and models to draw upon. The University Faculty Council would be willing to meet with appropriate representatives of the administration and the public to exchange ideas and to see whether a viable proposal can be developed.

#### AGENDA ITEM #1: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

BRAND: [Today is Valentine's Day] and I notice there are some candies in front of you. The dentists will thank us.

I only have one item of business and that is a brief update on how we are doing on the budgetary process in this biennium. You will recall that we asked for (in rough numbers) about a 7% upgrading budget increment each year. Four percent of that was maintenance, that is to say, CPI. Another, little more than a point, was for quality improvement. The remainder was for issues such as repair and rehabilitation of facilities and physical plant upkeep. We also put in for five capital projects -- five building projects. The Governor provided an initial recommendation of (again, in very rough numbers) a little less than 4% per year, a significant increase over the 1% per year final amount we got after all negotiations in the last biennium. That was essentially for CPI increases. It is the best the Governor has done for higher education (this Governor, that is) and it is a very good platform from which to work; and we thank him for that. We made a presentation before the Ways and Means Committee of the House recently which was well-received by all the feedback we have. We expect that we will be able to rise somewhat from the platform that the Governor provided. So, so far so good. We are making progress. We have got to take, then, the budget report which comes out of the Ways and Means [Committee] in a week or two to the Senate Finance Committee and then for the entire body. But, so far so good. Don't buy the car yet . . . [Laughter.] But I think we are making progress.

With that, I will call on Paul or Kathy to do the Agenda Committee business.

#### AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

EISENBERG: Okay. I think it is today Paul and Kathy, and even a brief report from Joan Lafuze. Beyond the various matters that appear on the agenda today which got there because of earlier charges given to appropriate committees by the Agenda Committee, the Agenda Committee has more recently discussed several matters which I wanted to call to your attention. Some say that the UFC works slowly, but I wish to disabuse such persons of that idea immediately; for after all it was only on February 13, 1990 that this body passed a resolution calling for the implementation by the Board of Trustees of a University-wide family leave policy for faculty. (And yet, nothing was done.) The fact of the matter is that, shortly after the UFC acted in that way, the matter was brought to the attention of the Board of Trustees, who then asked for a referral of the matter back to the staff, so that a

family leave policy for staff could be devised and that it, along with the proposal already available for family leave for faculty, would go forward as a uniform proposal to the Trustees. Unfortunately, as many of us know full well, things got bogged down early among the staff groups. They remained bogged down through the years, and the earlier motion of the UFC has remained in limbo. Accordingly, it was agreed by the Agenda Committee just this afternoon in our meeting preceding this one that information on that subject should be relayed in detail to President Brand, and he will bring the matter up again with the Board of Trustees.

Another matter that is of concern to all of us on the Agenda Committee, and probably indeed to all us here at the UFC, is the question of expediting the business that we are trying to do now. (I leave aside the question of business held over from 1990.) In its meeting earlier this afternoon, the Agenda Committee considered various measures that this whole group, or that the Agenda Committee in particular, might take to provide just such quicker movement of business through our various committees and so on. And, in particular, we seem pretty much to have concluded that we wish to add to our now regular schedule a September meeting of the UFC, at least for next year, with the October meeting set aside primarily for the State of the University address which President Brand expects to deliver at that time. Other matters that we are thinking about (still in highly tentative fashion) for expediting the ongoing business of the UFC will be clarified by us and then discussed with you and, when necessary, approval will be called for.

The third item on which I want to report concerns the ongoing efforts of your Agenda Committee to get appropriate faculty input about faculty matters to the Board of Trustees. At the start of the last Trustees' meeting, some four of us from the Agenda Committee met with President Brand and three of the Trustees (the two Vice-Presidents and President John Walda of the Trustees) to talk about that matter of faculty representation. A proposal seemed to be worked out in a quite informal way as a result of that, meaning that subsequently a draft of the proposal has been prepared by Don Coffin from the Agenda Committee, a member of that task force of our Agenda Committee. That draft was examined and discussed in our meeting this afternoon and a modest revision of it will be going forward later this week to be looked over quickly by the rest of us on that task force and then sent on to President Brand in the hope that that document can be put more or less literally on the table at the meeting coming up at the end of next week involving (again) the members of the Task Force, President Brand, and the aforementioned Trustees. So we are moving forward, I think, slowly, but also, I think, surely towards getting that faculty representation at the executive sessions of the Trustees.

Beyond those things I wanted to mention one other breakthrough that has occurred relatively recently for the UFC in its dealings with the Trustees; and that is that thanks to President Brand, who has given up some of his own time during the business meetings of the Trustees, it is now the case that your faculty representatives, more especially the co-secretaries, have the opportunity to address the full Board during the course of the final business meeting of their monthly set of meetings. Kathy Warfel started out with such a report on behalf of the UFC at the December meeting; I followed in January; and we are rotating between ourselves through the remaining course of this year.

That completes the things on which I wanted report. As I said at the outset, Kathy has a few things, too; and I believe Joan Lafuze has a message also.

WARFEL: Joan, do you want to talk about the meeting next month?

LAFUZE: [Yes.] Tom Osgood and I, as representatives from the IU East campus, are eager to welcome you in advance to the March 28th meeting on the IU East campus in Richmond. We have made arrangements through part of our Student Affairs Committee to have student ambassadors welcome you at 12:30, as you come in, for a brief tour of the campus. We will do these in small, informal groups. We have had a few glitches with our newest building, which was to have opened in January, but now will open in the later spring. So we will meet in Whitewater Hall. The tours will end there. Our cafeteria or food service is due to open in August. [Laughter.] But we do have a wonderful arrangement. Some of the student groups do arrange with local pizza companies or other kinds of food services; and their representative did assure us this morning that they will make arrangements for that to be true that morning, so there would be an opportunity for you to purchase a light meal, if you'd like to do that.

WARFEL: Let me mention two coming attractions, which I hope we will be able to have on the agenda as early as the March meeting. The Commission on Health Care has been discussing changes in the PCI Plan which some of you will have already heard about and which you will read more about in the benefits newsletter. The Commission would like faculty input on changing from the PCI Plan to the PPN Plan (or Network) for the subset of faculty and staff who are signed up for this particular program. We won't talk about the details of it today. We are going to get them to the Fringe Benefits Committee(s) and to all of the Council members as quickly as we can. Michael Downs is on the Commission and knows a great deal about it. So is Al Ruesink. And I am the third faculty Commission member. So I hope that can be on our agenda for discussion and possible approval in March.

Also coming in the near future, being brought up from the IUPUI Council, is a change in policy about the clinical ranks faculty. This is up for final vote at our Council in March; and, if there is a final vote at that time, we will rush the language to Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, and all of the Council members so that we can discuss it at a University level. It does need University level approval. That's all I have.

#### AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

BRAND: I received one question via e-mail about the Wisconsin model and the teaching capacity model. Rather than try and answer those now, I think we should go through the discussion on faculty productivity (item #4); and, if any question along those lines remains, that would be the appropriate time to answer that. Are there any other questions or comments at this time?

MAXWELL: Can you give us a status report on the possibility of funding for part-time state scholarships for students?

BRAND: That issue was brought up again at the Commission for Higher Education without resolution at this point. I think a number of campuses at IU are very anxious, and appropriately so, to see that SSACI [State Students' Assistance Commission of Indiana] support part-time as well as full-time

students. It does have my support. But right now, the Commission has not made a recommendation on it, nor has it gone to SSACI, at this point. So we are back to the present situation, though the issue remains on the table and the arguments are still being made.

Any other questions or comments?

#### AGENDA ITEM #4: PENDING TRUSTEE RESOLUTION ON FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY

BRAND: Let's turn to the Trustee resolution on faculty productivity. Do you all know what that resolution is? Namely, [it is that] the Trustees voted that by March 31 there should be evidence from every campus and each school or college contained in a campus that the way of counting faculty effort will be the so-called Wisconsin approach or model, and that the model developed for faculty productivity in the College of Arts of Sciences on the Bloomington campus will become the paradigm to use on the other campuses. That is called, in turn, the "teaching capacity model." I believe it will be useful to have more information about just how that capacity model works and perhaps how we are going to count faculty effort as well, so that there can be a response back to the Trustees by this group. For that, I call on Dean Morton Lowengrub.

LOWENGRUB: I apologize to those who [are] hear[ing] this presentation perhaps now for the third time if you were at the Trustees' meeting and/or the BFC meeting. But I will go through it. There are a couple of things, before I start on the overheads, that I wanted to clear up. First of all, the model that was developed was something that was done with the elected Policy Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences and with all of the chairs of the departments with whom we met in small groups. Secondly, when I made the presentation to the Board of Trustees, I was fairly clear (I hope) to them that the model is something which works in the College of Arts and Sciences as long as this is a model that is carried out in a collegial way in which we work with each department and each chair and each policy committee of the departments and elected executive committees. I am not at all certain that this is a model which is appropriate for every campus and for every school. I also pointed that out to the Trustees. I leave that up to the Faculty Councils and other people to decide.

So let me begin. I am not sure of what material all of you had, but let me begin by simply explaining the model and going through it and discussing and answering any questions that you might have about this. First of all, the Policy Committee of the College, again, along with the chairs of the departments, endorses the following statement of the responsibilities of tenured faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. This statement was also endorsed by the chairs of departments and is presently being discussed in some detail (I hope) in the executive committees of the various departments. First of all, we expect that we take seriously that we are a research university. The College of Arts and Sciences expects its members and its tenured faculty to maintain and to sustain an agenda of ongoing scholarly research which we have defined for us over a three-year window (which is the way that most departments have evaluated their faculty members), and that it actually results in either publication or demonstrated evidence of ongoing scholarly activity. (2) Each faculty member is expected to carry out effective teaching of high quality in the range that is determined in each discipline. As you will see as I go over the capacity model, we recognize the diversity of each department in the College of Arts and Sciences. Not all of our departments are the same. Certainly not all the campuses are the same. That is a very important part of this, and I noticed very quickly in

a document that Marty Spechler gave me that that was one of the concerns; but it is also a concern for us. We worked out with each department what an appropriate, normal teaching load is in that department, along with what occurs in the discipline at our peer institutions. We expect that, in addition, regular student advising and thesis work, that is, supervision of independent learning and research, is part of a faculty member's regular assignment. (3) Also part of each faculty member's regular assignment is the performance of effective and normal service, both for the university, the department, and, of course, for the profession as well.

Now, we are really looking to see how we can bring out the best in each faculty member, and this is the way that we have been describing it to the departments and working with the departments. We all recognize that there are faculty whose interests change as the years go on, and it makes sense for us to recognize that that happens. We might not give tenure to those same people now, but we recognize that that happens and we want to make certain that faculty feel good about their own assignments. When one of these is missing, that is, if a tenured member is not fulfilling expectations in one of these areas, then we do expect that steps will be taken to remedy that, or that there might be a restructuring of the responsibilities of a faculty member in accord with the rights of tenured faculty. This really is, in a sense, the basis on which our model is set.

What are the premises of the model? First of all, as I described before, [a premise is] that we set the teaching loads for all the departments with the departments to assure that [we make] the best use of our most important resource, obviously the faculty. We seek to expose as many students as possible to tenured and tenure-track faculty, particularly during their [that is, the students'] first two years. This is an important part of it. I might say that in the first year of this model this has been the case. At the same time, we've put in a new undergraduate general education curriculum (the Topics curriculum) for the College, and there have been only regular tenure-track or tenured (senior) faculty involved in that curriculum. It is also very important to us that teaching takes place in an environment in which faculty are engaged in scholarship. We want to continue to encourage independent study and individual instruction in the College of Arts and Sciences. We have over 7,000 enrollments in a semester in independent study. That doesn't mean 7,000 students, because some students are enrolled in 2 or 3 readings courses. But there are 7,000 enrollments, and that is, to us, a very important part of the kind of teaching that we do. And that goes anywhere from undergraduate honors all the way through to the Ph.D. level. As I have said before, the departments are diverse and the model must recognize the diversity.

The model is actually very, very simple. The process by which we do it is that we take the department FTE [Faculty Teaching Effort] and multiply it by the customary teaching load for the discipline. The customary teaching load is generally a four-course load (that is, two courses a semester) in the Arts and Humanities, the Social Sciences, and Mathematics. The course load varies in the Sciences, where it is generally one course a semester in the laboratory sciences. But we expect that the faculty in the laboratory sciences have an ongoing, active laboratory and have an involvement in a day-to-day way with their students in the laboratory, both graduate and undergraduate students. We make an allowance for departmental administration and other customary course release, and I'll describe what that release is in a moment. The College, in conjunction with the department, calculates a percentage of total capacity that should be taught and, through that, the number of sections that would be taught by tenure-track faculty. Then we

reduce it for sabbaticals, leaves without pay, research leaves, and pre-tenure releases (about which I'll explain in a moment). We also take into account, of course, the amount of independent study and individual instruction done by the department. We do this not by any formula, but by, again, working with each department and looking at what their needs are. I think, so far, that seems to have been carried out reasonably well. But the main concern that we have is not with each individual faculty member, but with the aggregate that a department does. So the department does have the option of doing things in different ways, if they so choose.

Now, let me tell you what the standards for release are in the College. We simply tied release a little bit more to activity for the department chair. The course release and summer salary are negotiated with me in getting a faculty member to become chair. For directors of graduate studies and directors of undergraduate studies, we based the release on the activity that is involved. We also [based it on] whether or not that department has a regular, full-time academic advisor. Not all of our departments do, but our very large departments do. Built into this model is the fact that every pre-tenured faculty member during their probationary period (the first five years) is entitled to a release which is equivalent to a full semester. So it's two courses on a two-course load and one course on a one-course load. We believe strongly that that release enhances not only their scholarly agenda but their teaching as well. Many of the pre-tenured faculty have used this to great advantage.

Now, this is probably the most controversial of all of the items on here. That is, the fact that releases were being phased out for journal editorships and certain kinds of co-ordination of courses. Let me explain that a bit, starting with the journal editorships. First of all, it turned out, that as we looked over the College, there was a very variable kind of release for journal editorships -- not even related, necessarily, to the activity that that editorship involved. So what we tried to do is make it reasonably standard across the College. I will tell you that there are two exceptions, for the reasons that are mentioned in Marty's document that he showed me. The two exceptions are the American Historical Review and the Journal of American History. What we have done is to do a review of both of those journals, both an inside and outside review, a careful review; and we determined that the activity involved in those two editorships is really a major administrative task. It's not just the normal kind of editing. And so we worked out with the department a scheme to make certain that that was recognized. That is the kind of thing that we have been doing with our departments. It is very time-consuming, but we feel that it has been very worthwhile. It is a very open process. There is nothing hidden about the process.

As far as the co-ordination of courses taught by associate instructors [is concerned], that has also varied across the College. Again, we looked at that activity fairly carefully. That does not mean that in many cases the co-ordination of courses is related to an actual class that is taught by a faculty member in a graduate course in pedagogy. That is partly why we have been encouraging that, and partly why we have eliminated some of the co-ordination of courses. Also, the teaching of large sections has been very variable in the College. For a whole variety of reasons (not because I'm a mathematician), we have not eliminated course release for teaching M118 (Basic Calculus) and M119 (Finite Mathematics), [chiefly because these are courses] which are taken by most general students in the College and [therefore] have a major administrative task attached to them.



We have recognized, then, that there have been some negotiations that have to go on. It is an ongoing dialogue that I have with the chairs. Have there been any results? Well, the answer is yes. There have been, I think, spectacular results. Let me show you. [Shows table.] I have purposely left the names of the departments out, but you can roughly see . . . . Let's just look at the net capacity. That simply is the capacity that we allow, the number of sections taught (we measure it in terms of sections) by regular faculty; now compare the percentage of full capacity they were teaching in 1992-93, 1993-94, and 1994-95. We put this model in place in 1994-95, and you can see that there is great improvement in some cases. You see a little bit of fluctuation and that has to do with a whole variety of things. One of the things mentioned in Marty Spechler's note, I noticed, is the concern that people have whether, if you made agreements with certain individuals before they came, these agreements are honored. Absolutely. You do not bring people here, make agreements, and then renege on those agreements. And hence, that is why there are some lower percentages in that column for 1994-95. The adjusted capacity is what we actually allowed in that year, based on the fact that this was a transition and there were some things which were not quite clear yet. For example, there is one department (it's Jim [Sherman's] department) in which I've been negotiating with the new chair over what it means. Because in Psychology, I think we want to understand what a teaching load means. That is a department with a mix between heavy laboratory science and social science, and I think that we will work it out as we move along.

I think that, in talking with the chairs, we have been reasonably pleased with the progress that we have made. I repeat again that this is not something that we are going around saying is absolutely suitable for everybody. It has worked well with us. It is important that it has been a collegial endeavor, one in which we have worked together -- the chairs, myself, and the Policy Committee of the College. No system is absolutely perfect. But [this model] does allow for what is happening in the departments, since we are looking at the aggregate. It allows for departments to work with their faculty in a variety of ways, and in creative ways, in delivering the instruction. The point is that what we want out of this is both quality research and quality instruction. All of our decisions are based on that. I'd be happy to answer any questions that anybody might want to ask of me.

KLOOSTERMAN: In our department, one of the things that came up as we discussed this was independent study and dissertation loads. Because they really vary a lot from person to person . . .

LOWENGRUB: . . . and from department to department. I'll give you an example of what we've done. The History Department had an unusual load during this last year. So we assigned an extra release to the department for the department to use. Since we are only looking at the aggregate, the department was able to make some accommodation for some faculty members to have partial releases. We are looking at that with every one of our departments, because we feel that when a typical individual -- and that is what the departments have to look at -- has a very heavy load, that is measured by the discipline. I mean, I was horrified when one of my friends in anthropology told me that, I think, the person had twenty Ph.D. students. In mathematics, that would just be unheard of. If we have two or three, that's an enormous number. So it really varies from discipline to discipline. But we recognize that. We have to. We work with the chairs in trying to address that. But there is no general formula, because everything, even within a department, is very different.

BRAND: Mort, could you relate that to the Wisconsin model for measuring faculty effort?

LOWENGRUB: We have actually related it, but the faculty effort report that is included in the Wisconsin model breaks things down very neatly. It breaks it down to [include] independent study. It seems to me, it recognizes much more what individual faculty are doing. So the models really have different purposes. So, we can see how much activity is done for independent learning with the Wisconsin model, which then gives us a way to help the departments in deciding whether or not we need some kind of release or some adjustment for that.

LEHNEN: What was the impetus for . . . ?

LOWENGRUB: I'll tell you. The impetus was simple. It started long before, by the way, the Board of Trustees. The Policy Committee and I began discussing this many years ago (as any of you who were on the Policy Committee of the College at that time [knows]). When I came into the office and after a couple of years I recognized that releases were given for anything and it varied over the entire College. That is, if you were fortunate enough to be in one department that gave a release every time you sneezed, you had a release. It seemed to me very uneven; and in many cases, unfair. So I presented it to the Policy Committee of the College and we decided that really we did have to do something to make it much more rigorous and tight. And this is the outcome of that discussion.

JACKSON: Mort, does this translate into budget savings?

LOWENGRUB: It did for the College, yes. It definitely did. Because we had a larger percentage of our sections taught by regular tenured and tenure-track faculty. Thereby we saved close to \$2 million in part-time appointments and visiting appointments. There were many fewer people needed for visiting faculty. We were hiring a lot of people who came and who taught just one class for us. They weren't regular visitors to the department. So yes, there was an absolute savings.

RUSSELL: Mort, you said that you didn't calculate teaching large sections into the . . . ?

LOWENGRUB: No, no. I said that we didn't give release-time [for teaching large sections], except for two classes (M118 and M119). But we work with the departments. We haven't had any departments who have had a similar situation to M118 and M119.

RUSSELL: How large are those classes?

LOWENGRUB: They vary. They are usually anywhere from 120 to 250. Those classes do have substantial AI support.

RUSSELL: Because I have a department in my school that regularly teaches from 200 to 400 students per course. I was wondering how that might figure in.

LOWENGRUB: Well, it's not the number, it's the activity that is generated there, depending on the students. But this was very uneven throughout the College, and what we did was to try and make it an even thing.

PETERS: Let's suppose there is fairly uniform and rigorous treatment of release times -- that it doesn't seem a problem or concern. Does this model have other advantages, unrelated to the release-time issue?

LOWENGRUB: Well, the real challenge for the College had been in release time. [But this model] does allow us a lot of flexibility in faculty assignments. As we look at the aggregate, I think that there are lots of opportunities for being creative. For example, if you are only looking at the aggregate, and in one semester there are faculty who are involved in particular projects that need some free time, whereas there are other faculty who during that semester in the same department might more than willingly take on an extra assignment, this allows that sort of thing very easily in the department. This could always happen in the department, but the model gives some encouragement for that. That is, the chairs don't come to me now and say, "Can I have a release for so-and-so? We'd like to release so-and-so to do something." It is up to the department to organize that, still coming up with a correct, agreed number of sections and so on.

MAXWELL: You have me concerned that somebody in one of our external publics will look at this and say, "Gee, you have got a lot of excess capacity. Why don't your faculty teach three courses instead of two (at Bloomington), or four courses instead of three (on regional campuses)?"

LOWENGRUB: I am not concerned about that because I think that we can very easily demonstrate what it is we should be doing. That is actually what Myles has been doing now. That is, stop looking at what the various inputs are for this, but rather look at the outputs that we are producing and what students are learning, and what faculty are learning. To switch it to thinking of ourselves as a total learning environment in which we are all learning. No matter what system you have, this can always come up. No matter how many courses you are teaching, somebody can always tell you that you should teach more. I think that is an issue that would always come up. But I think that is the point of what Myles has been trying to do in changing the conversation that is out there. I do think that is very important. But I don't think we are going to win any game based on numbers of courses, nor should we.

SCOTT: What do you see as the actual or potential disadvantages of this model?

LOWENGRUB: One real disadvantage is if it is not just done in a collegial way. There have been some other institutions who have looked at the model, and there have been some real errors. It is easy to write down a formula and tell everybody, you know, "here is a formula and you will abide by it" with no discussion whatsoever, and not done in a collegial manner. I've actually seen that in a very close university to us. I gave this presentation before an AAU dean of Arts and Sciences, and this dean became very enamored with it and just went in and said, "This is the way it is and I'll tell you what you should be teaching and how many sections" and so on. And that caused havoc. So I see that as a great disadvantage that could happen with the model. That's why I think it is very important that people understand that it must be carried out in a collegial way with the faculty and, obviously, the executive committees and chairs of the various departments. That is a very important agreement if you are going to do this. It is not something that comes from the top dictating what should be done. And you will still get results.

SCOTT: Are there other disadvantages?

LOWENGRUB: I see that as the main disadvantage. Any abuse of the system is a disadvantage. If a chair abuses it, or if a dean abuses it, that's a disadvantage.

SCOTT: Secondly, when you decide to give release time for an activity, how is that decision made?

LOWENGRUB: The decision is made with the chair and with me, generally. We even have discussed this in the elected Policy Committee of the College. If I think it is something that doesn't easily fit into what the model is, I'll discuss it with the elected Policy Committee. So it is done with all of them. But, you see, we have had very few requests in that way, because the aggregate is in the hands of the chairs and the executive committees of the departments. Now some of you may have had other experiences in your departments; and, if you have, you should tell me about it. But this is so far how I've seen it.

SHERMAN: The choosing of peer institutions from which to derive the initial [data] is a difficult task. If you say, pick the Big Ten, well if there are different departments, that's not accurate. If you ask the department [to pick peer institutions], well, they may be biased toward picking the ones known to have a smaller teaching load.

LOWENGRUB: I'll tell you what we did, Jim. We actually got on the telephone and we did the calling. We looked at what we think our peers are. How did we determine our peers? We looked at where our faculty are being raided. We have many faculty, as you know, in the College who are constantly being sought after by other institutions. Our peers, unfortunately, are not the Big Ten. For the College of Arts and Sciences in Bloomington, as I've told Ken many times, our peers are, perhaps, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Ohio State because those places are where our faculty have tended to have offers in the past. Mainly, our [current] peers are Berkeley, Michigan, Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Cornell, etc. So we have to be aware of that. We can't possibly do all of the things that many of the private institutions do. We do work with the departments on the peer issue. We got on the phone and checked (at least, I had somebody in my office check) with various institutions. And I have to tell you that what the departments find out (and this is true all over) from their peers about what the teaching load is and what the dean of the school thinks is the teaching load is not always the same.

SHERMAN: I also will tell you that for at least one of the institutions that you mentioned, I think, their professed teaching load is not the exact teaching load because they have institutionalized courses that are under different names, and so it's a very difficult task to . . .

LOWENGRUB: I agree with you. It's tricky. But I think we are trying to work it out.

BRAND: Okay, one or two more questions.

LEHNEN: How will you need to adapt this model to meet the Trustees' resolution?

LOWENGRUB: I'm sorry. How?

LEHNEN: You will need to adapt this, am I correct? So that you . . .

LOWENGRUB: No. This is the model. As far as I know, the Trustees have been perfectly satisfied with this model for us.

LEHNEN: So . . .

LOWENGRUB: We developed this for us in the Arts and Sciences.

BRAND: Let's go back to what the Trustees have asked. Actually, I misspoke a little earlier. The Trustees tabled their resolution until March 31 and then will vote on it. What they are considering is the adoption of this model in other contexts. [That is,] exporting it to other schools on the Bloomington campus as well as to other campuses. And the question comes up that it is not clearly exportable in just this form, particularly to some of the regional campuses, and some alterations will have to be made. That isn't now built into the resolution that is being considered by the Board; but I assume something like that will have to be built in, because it just can't be exported. It doesn't make sense.

Thank you, Mort. I should say in passing that one of the most interesting features of this model is that it changes the unit of analysis from the individual faculty member to the department in considering productivity. That's what really makes this thing go, that is the driving force behind it. Actually, before you go up, Martin, Paul wanted to say a few things, and then we'll turn to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

EISENBERG: Yes, I wanted to say a bit more than what President Brand himself has done this afternoon about the background to our discussion of this matter this afternoon. I wanted to indicate to you, in case you don't know this, that the motion of the Trustees that came up and then was tabled by them in their meeting in December arose from earlier discussions that went on within the Joint Committee on Learning, a committee which, as its name was meant to suggest, was not merely a Trustee committee, although the impetus for the formation of the committee came from the Trustees, but rather was a committee consisting of students, faculty, and Trustees meeting together. In any case, one of the working groups of that rather large committee was one on productivity, a working group chaired by Gerry Bepko, the Chancellor of the IUPUI campus. After some months of work, that working group on productivity reported to the group as a whole that they recommended to the Trustees adoption of the University of Wisconsin's method for counting individual teaching loads.

[Tape was turned; some words were lost.]

. . . and the Lowengrub model determining teaching capacity. They also recommended that such matters be considered further, both by the Board of Trustees and by faculty governance.

Rather to my surprise, and to the surprise, I am sure, of anyone else on the faculty who was present at that final meeting of the Joint Committee, the Trustees early in December at their meeting seemed to be proceeding towards unilateral action and to the action of putting forth then directly the resolution that the Wisconsin model, on the one hand, and the Lowengrub model, on the other,

be adopted throughout the University in appropriate ways. Fortunately, it was brought to the attention of the Trustees then that it was appropriate and necessary that there be discussion of these very complex issues, precisely by the UFC and, if by us then certainly also, in turn, by the various campus faculty councils. And so, the resolution proposed at the December meeting by Trustee Richardson was tabled by the Trustees, as President Brand indicated just a few minutes ago, until their meeting at the very end of March. At that time, they are still expecting some sort of official report coming from Kathy Warfel and me on behalf of the UFC concerning our, that is to say generally the faculty's response to the resolution brought up and tabled at the December meeting of the Trustees. That resolution concerns, as Myles indicated in his brief introductory remarks, the Wisconsin model for determining what sections are being taught and how they are counted. The model that Dean Lowengrub just explained to us was originally devised by him only for implementation within the College of Arts and Sciences here in Bloomington. Now the thought is that it could be transferred in various appropriate ways, I presume, to all schools and to all campuses throughout the University. Then Trustee Richardson added, perhaps without prior consultation with his fellow Trustees, and certainly without any sort of recommendation on this subject coming to him from the previous action of the Joint Committee, that appropriate models also be developed for determining the level of research activity and service activity of faculty members throughout the University. This last matter is one of serious importance, but it has, at least temporarily, dropped by the wayside, precisely because of this history where the Trustees were alerted by the Joint Committee to issues regarding, in fact, teaching, which, I think, is their primary focus, or will be at the end of March. Nonetheless, we need to understand that the actual resolution concerns more than teaching. It concerns all three areas in which both tenure-track and tenured faculty are supposed to be working pretty much in a regular fashion.

BRAND: Thank you, Paul. Professor Spechler?

SPECHLER: Thank you. At the request of the Agenda Committee and co-secretaries, your Faculty Affairs Committee considered the Wisconsin program and the teaching capacity models at a special meeting convened by us in Indianapolis on January 26th. Ten of the thirteen members, representing all but one campus of this system, attended in person; the others contributed by e-mail and telephone. The response I am going to present to you now has been circulating for the last two weeks among the various campuses. I have received at least six replies, all positive. So, within the constraints the time permitted, this is about as broad a faculty response as I think we can humanly obtain.

We welcome the initiatives of the Trustees and Joint Committee for improving instruction within Indiana University. We also recognize the need for public accountability to the taxpayers and benefactors.

Now, turning to the first matter, the Wisconsin model. The Wisconsin reporting model would report faculty effort in terms of courses and individual instruction. While these obviously measure only part of faculty effort -- as enumerated (ideally) in the FACET statement which you will be confronting in a few minutes -- and hence the Wisconsin model would be liable to create misperceptions, this form of reporting is acceptable to us. Our committee concluded that more comprehensive reporting of hours would be too burdensome and would not likely convince skeptical outsiders of what we

believe to be the truth, namely, that the great majority of IU faculty members devote more than normal working hours to their many professorial duties, even sacrificing their family, community, and cultural lives to do so. Because our work schedules are flexible and many of us work far into the night and on weekends, the public sometimes underestimates our application, not to mention our professionalism and devotion to the public interest. To make the truth better known, might I suggest a small but representative sample time-budget study -- a small one -- of faculty activities performed by competent experts and made available to the Trustees and legislature? We would like to enlist the Trustees and the central administration in convincing the public that we are trustworthy and hard-working stewards of public resources.

Now, turning to the central matter of the teaching capacity model. Your committee members, by unanimous consent, are sympathetic with the basic premises and operational principles embodied in the documents we have received from Dean Lowengrub and Vice President Gros Louis. The idea that faculty may change their emphases several times over a career is one that has been persuasively advanced by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Excellence may be displayed by emphasizing for some time published research or creative activity, and at another period by classroom or laboratory teaching or, perhaps, unusually active service. We particularly appreciate Dean Lowengrub's assurance that any redirection of emphasis -- for example, from intensive research to teaching more lecture courses -- will be accomplished in consultation with the faculty member and the chair and will never be coerced. Faculty must never be placed in teaching positions in which they will be ineffective and frustrated. Tenured faculty should not be threatened with sanctions or reduced salary for refusing an added load. Rather, positive incentives should be found to secure their agreement. Dean Lowengrub's provision for pre-tenure leaves and some research leaves is a realistic and welcome adjustment to gross teaching capacity; these easements should be replicated elsewhere in the IU system.

Now, despite these assurances, some of which have been repeated this afternoon, we are left with five major concerns, which we believe should and must be addressed in working out the ways and means to apply the teaching capacity model throughout IU.

(1) First and always foremost is maintaining the quality of teaching, research, and service. Now, with regret, we acquiesce in what seems to be the inevitable effect of the teaching capacity model as applied. That is, that some research, some service, and some non-course teaching and advising will have to be curtailed by those faculty who are asked to teach more sections than they have up to now. If journal editing, in general, is not allowed for, then prestigious and significant journals like, but not solely, the *American Historical Review* will probably leave IU. We regret even more that some talented researchers may be discouraged from coming to IU or may arrange to leave because expected teaching loads are less elsewhere. This is already happening in my school of Liberal Arts. But the most likely effect of more and larger sections will be to cut writing, oral presentation, and other requirements from each student. That is, and this concerns us most of all, the quality of instruction may suffer. Some faculty may be less willing to develop new courses or to teach large sections of introductory courses. This is exactly the reverse of Dean Lowengrub's sincere and proclaimed intention. Such an effect will be all the more likely if the faculty member feels that she or he is not being treated fairly.

Now, what can we do? What can we do if the Trustees insist on strict, 100% utilization of theoretical capacity? Well, we pledge as faculty leaders and professionals to try and prevent any deterioration of quality by our own example and by proper supervision of subordinate instructors. But we fear this will not be sufficient.

(2) Diversity. And here, I find myself very much in agreement with Dean Lowengrub. The expected teaching load and teaching capacity model must be allowed to differ from campus to campus, but also from school to school and department to department within a single campus. The mode of instruction in physical therapy differs from that in chemistry, history, and computer science. Research emphases, capabilities, and funded opportunities differ very widely. There can be no single number of courses to fit all. The theoretical expectations per FTE must be set in consultation with faculty and chairs.

(3) Fairness. With the encouragement of deans now present, illustrious senior professors have been brought to the university to the benefit of us all with the promise of very low teaching loads. We assume that Dean Lowengrub has reassurance that these promises will continue to be honored. If so, however, that implies pressure on less visible members of those departments to teach more than they do now, or so it seems. While we do not reject the idea of variable teaching loads in principle, equity would seem to require that the latter group, the less visible group, who are typically at the bottom of the salary scale anyway, receive raises based on the evaluation of their teaching and service. That is, that they not be penalized for what seems to us as the inevitable curtailment of their research effort (not necessarily to zero). In other words, those who accept voluntarily more courses and teach them well should not be further penalized for a lower research productivity. In all cases, expectations for merit raises should be proportionately higher for faculty already earning top salaries.

(4) Reversibility. We do not want to create, or appear to create, a permanent "teaching track" for tenured faculty at IU. Accordingly, additional course loads should not be seen as a penalty for failure to get grants and write articles, nor as an imposed coda on a career.

Promotability of associate professors, many of them women, who have devoted years to teaching and service is a special concern of our committee. Many of these associate professors have the ability, the energy, and the interest to revive their research programs with an eye to promotion. For, as you know, promotion to full professor at IU normally requires at least satisfactory performance in their research dimension. But if these valued colleagues are loaded down with extra courses, how will they ever become satisfactory? Outside research leaves, sabbaticals, and faculty development grants must be expanded to allow these valued colleagues to show sufficient published results in rapidly developing fields of inquiry.

(5) Lastly, the principle of all-around sacrifice. Now, we recognize that in the past research priorities encouraged by our disciplines and by the legitimate search at IU for national prominence and by social needs have all joined forces to reduce the number of course presentations that the typical tenured professor makes at IU on all of its campuses. Now, we are willing to lend a hand to reverse this trend to some degree. But we will point out that there have been other drains on available teaching capacity. In recent years, more and more of our talented (I would say, our most talented)



colleagues have been co-opted by campus and central administration and thus withdrawn from the classroom in part or in whole. While the tasks assigned to these faculty are certainly defensible and beneficial, does not the new fiscal and political climate, to which Dean Lowengrub referred, which motivates and animates this teaching capacity model also require that that kind of research release time also be examined? On my own campus, administrative and non-faculty costs have been rising at several times the rate of instructional costs over the last few years, and we are glad that President Brand committed himself here at a previous meeting before this body to investigate this trend wherever it has occurred.

Where absolutely necessary, such administrative assignments should be compensated at full salary to the department of origin, so that the chair can hire experienced visiting faculty, possibly from the fine colleges of our state, to provide instruction of equivalent quality to that we lose from someone seconded to administration. Such an arrangement would reflect the true cost of administrative assignments and discourage their overuse. But it would also allow us to invite more short-term visitors of high caliber to IU than we have been able to do in recent years.

Now, let me conclude by saying that recognition of these five concerns and patient development of ways and means to meet them will not weaken the teaching capacity model. Nor will they delay needlessly a wide application of that model, which we favor. On the contrary, full recognition of side effects and risks is the very meaning of informed consent that we are being asked to give. Therefore:

WITH THE AGREEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE TRUSTEES, WE PROPOSE AS A MOTION TO SET UP A WORKING GROUP COMPOSED OF ELECTED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES, DEANS, AND TRUSTEES TO AGREE ON MECHANISMS AND RULES WHICH WILL ASSURE A THOROUGH, FAIR, AND CREDIBLE APPLICATION OF THIS MODEL AND WHICH WILL ADDRESS AT LEAST THESE FIVE MAJOR CONCERNS.

By early next academic year, an agreed upon document could be circulated among the various campuses and ratified by this body within one year.

Finally, on the last matter of the productivity model for service and research. A motion to develop a productivity model for research and service would be a very complex matter, a matter for which there are few precedents around the country or models to draw on. We would be willing to meet with appropriate representatives of the administration and the public to exchange ideas and see whether a viable proposal can be developed. There is no such viable model now. The wide consultation that Dean Lowengrub has had on the teaching capacity model surely strengthened that model. Similar consultation would now be in order for evaluating research and service. Thank you for your patience.

BRAND: Good, thank you. Am I correct in interpreting you as indicating that you have one formal motion?

SPECHLER: Correct.

BRAND: And two matters of advice?

SPECHLER: Right, the motion is that we invite the administration, the President, and through the President the Trustees, to set up a working group to work out specific mechanisms and rules which will deal with at least the five concerns that we have about the application of the teaching capacity model. But, we assure you that we want to go ahead positively on this, but without prejudice to the many and varied interests around the university.

BRAND: Your motion, if I heard you correctly, also includes a time-line: "By early next academic year an agreed upon document would be circulated among the various campuses and ratified by this body within one year." Is that part of the motion?

SPECHLER: Well, with respect, I would say that the time-line part of it depends on us. We will work as efficiently and expeditiously as we have already. But I think that it is a legitimate hope and aspiration to have something within one year. We want to reassure the Trustees that we are not sandbagging. We are not dragging our feet. We want to go ahead and we want to achieve our common objectives.

BRAND: Fine. Let's take that as the motion with the proposed gloss on it about the time-line, though the motion does not itself include the time-line. It needs no second since it came from a committee. It is open for discussion. Chris?

LOHMANN: First of all, I want to thank Marty and the Committee. I think that was a very good report; and I think you've brought out a lot of issues that concern us, and you have stated [them] in a very positive and instructive way. I would like to ask you [for] a little bit more detail [about] how you see the group that is proposed in this motion functioning. Do you see that as sort of an implementation group that looks at a proposal as it is developed, say, by each campus, or by each school or by each department within a school? As a group that really gets into the specific implementation on the grass roots level? To check, on the one hand, [whether a given proposal] fits a large model (the teaching capacity model)? On the other hand, whether it addresses specific, local grass roots issues? Or do you see this group more as a kind of a review and hearing board; [i.e.,] once it is implemented, you get feedback? I am not quite clear how that group is to function.

SPECHLER: Well, Chris, that's an excellent question. I don't think that the Committee discussed that at length. I think the spirit of the discussion (and my co-chair, Elton Jackson, can certainly comment on this) is that we are trying to address principles, mechanisms, and guidelines for the various campuses, if this is to be mandated by the Trustees. Now if, in years to come, it proves to be the case that we need some kind of oversight about implementation, well, somebody will come back to this body. But we did not have that in mind, Chris. We had in mind the statement of principles and concerns and put forth some concrete suggestions for addressing those concerns, but not mandating that a Chancellor here or there or elsewhere do exactly this, or following up [to see] that she or he does it.

CAMBRIDGE: The time-line suggested works very well with suggestions that will be coming out of the Strategic Directions Task Force on Accountability and Assessment. The charge of that Task Force is to look at various ways that we are going to hold ourselves accountable and that we are going to assess ourselves in a number of different areas. Our charge is to look at both inputs and outputs.

What I like about this suggestion is that it will place the discussion alongside the discussion of those output measures that this Task Force might suggest in our report that comes in June. It will keep us from spending all of our time looking at inputs, [instead allowing] us to look at those inputs in terms of what we also might suggest as outputs. So it seems to me to support quite well what is going on in the Strategic Directions Task Force.

BRAND: Can I ask a point of clarification? Do you see the Strategic Directions Task Force as assuming this responsibility, or would this be an additional committee?

CAMBRIDGE: I don't know what will come out in terms of suggestions for how the implementation discussion goes on after the Task Force completes its work, but I would assume that anything that comes out of our Task Forces will take a great deal of discussion. What the forms will be, I am not sure.

SPECHLER: I've consulted with my good friend Barbara Cambridge about this. She is aware of our views. Of course, we welcome their suggestion to keep the suggestions of all members, here and absent, on this. However, our motion is for elected faculty representatives. This is a very sensitive matter. Not to put too fine a point on it, some of our faculty colleagues, maybe even some of us, will be asked to teach more courses under this model than we have up to now. We think that elected faculty representatives should have a say about the conditions under which this can occur. Because the emphasis is on elected faculty representatives as such, the Task Forces (for all of their expertise) would not qualify.

COFFIN: Marty, just one sort of operational question. Can I assume that you have referred to the Agenda Committee to develop the process by which the faculty representatives will be elected.

SPECHLER: Of course.

COFFIN: Because this doesn't specify how we are going to do this.

SPECHLER: It would depend on the views of the Agenda Committee. It could be an expanded Faculty Affairs Committee. It could be an ad hoc committee. I assume though, Don, that it would have representation from all of the campuses of IU and a sufficient diversity of the interests involved. I again point out that there are some sections of the faculty who will likely find their interests particularly affected by this capacity model. Those people must be given the chance to express their views.

RAND: Did I hear you say at the start that you had received comments, questions, and concerns from all of the campuses?

SPECHLER: Well, let me say this. All of the campuses were represented, including yours, at our meeting in Indianapolis. We circulated these materials soon after we received the charge and we came to some conclusions. Those were written up and then sent out yet again to all of the representatives from the various campuses. We asked them to give us their personal views and to consult (as widely as possible, given the time) with the campus. Now, we recognize that we've had only a month. It is quite possible that the faculty assembly on this or that campus hasn't had the

chance to meet and discuss this. Well, we beg your pardon about that, but this is not the end of the process. And if this document meets with the approval of people here, we will anticipate that the teaching capacity model and our response and other materials will be brought to the attention of faculty on all campuses of IU for full discussion.

RAND: At this point, I note that people on my campus are meeting with the deans and in turn with the faculty, but I haven't heard anything beyond that. It has not gone far enough for some of these concerns to have arisen, if they are going to.

FINEBERG: It seems to me that the concerns that were expressed really have to be applied to these diverse teaching models that will come up on campus after campus; and, in fact, the committee, if it is formed, should really concern itself with principles that ought to be applied to these diverse teaching models. They clearly will not be the same for each campus, and the principles should guide the structure of these. I think you need some houses or some structures to comment upon to see how this works. So I would suggest that we use any teaching models that have already been built and see how these concerns could be applied to it [i.e., the proposed new model].

STILLING: Just a general comment. Dean Lowengrub's capacity model has been passed around several classes and several of the student groups at IUB early last fall, and we really have been looking at it for the last couple of months. This is the seventh time I've heard his presentation. [Laughter.] Believe it or not, there is a great enthusiasm, at least on the IUB campus, from the student representatives for this teaching capacity model. I had two comments on the presentation today. When you were talking about "patient development," I heard [the Board of] Aeons' role through the word "patient." Jeff and I are a little wary of the motion that this be sent to a committee. We are enthusiastic about it being tackled and we would like some sort of time-line, either implicitly added on to the end of it or put into the motion itself, just because, while there are concerns and I think the committee did pick out several areas of concern, a lot of the areas of concern I thought Dean Lowengrub has addressed pretty adequately. I know that when we discussed this in our class, we covered it from many angles and he bounced off and we had a pretty good discussion on it. I would hope that this would move along as fast as possible. I think that, at least from the perspective of the student reps at IUB, we are pretty unified in that we like his model. It's a good one.

BRAND: Further comments?

WARFEL: I think I know the answer to this, but I wanted to clarify it. Marty, this group that you are proposing be set up would be a group that worked ahead of time, before we tried the teaching capacity model throughout the University. Is it conceivable that it could function even better as a group that would review that first trial experience and then define it sensibly?

SPECHLER: Well, yes. Kathy, that is an excellent idea. The teaching capacity model is already being used in the School of Liberal Arts -- not in such an explicit way. Clearly, [it is being used in] the College of Arts and Sciences. A similar model has been adopted in the School of Business. So there is experience to look over. Many of the remarks and concerns that we found actually come from the early application of the model at the departmental level. So the answer is yes. I have to admit, in

answer to the statement of my friend here [Stilling], that at my age, biological processes work slower. We do have eight campuses with incredibly varied situations and missions, and so on. But I would be even more delighted than you if it moved in three months or four months. But I think we must try to engage the Trustees and the administration in a kind of . . . well, if you like, negotiation or discussion that will come to a consensus. This is what we want to do for the people of Indiana. It can't be one-sided. All of the players have got to be at the table. We've got to see what is going to be fair, productive, and feasible for IU as a whole.

BRAND: Martin, I'm confused about the motion now. This is just a point of clarification. So, when you originally presented it, you said that this committee would be set up to agree upon the mechanisms and the rules, and that it would probably take a full year before that is actualized, more or less. Now in answer you said no, what is really going to happen is that this is going to be a monitoring committee to assure that the implementation at the various schools and campuses will comply so that they won't . . .

SPECHLER: Let me . . .

BRAND: Which is it?

SPECHLER: Let me be clear. In answer to Chris Lohmann's point: We did not originally have the monitoring role in mind.

BRAND: Okay.

SPECHLER: And that is not the motion. But my friend, Kathleen Warfel, suggested that we expand the idea. And I'm telling you as a personal opinion that I think it's a good idea. If the faculty wish us to expand the motion or the activities of the committee, that'll be up to the committee. But I don't see any objection to it.

LION: I didn't hear Kathy speak for a "monitoring model." There were experiences by which . . .

SPECHLER: But look at the early experiences. You know . . .

WARFEL: I wasn't thinking in terms of monitoring to make sure that you all were doing what you were supposed to do. I guess I would feel better about saying yes, we will put the teaching capacity model in place everywhere, but give us this group so that as we work with it we can refine.

BRAND: Monitor the process, not the faculty.

WARFEL: Right. So I was thinking of it more in terms of starting with the capacity model here; but a year from now, when we are slightly older and much wiser, we may say, now this is what it should look like to fit us as an institution.

EISENBERG: Yes, I wanted to add my two cents to that same point. One way of taking the motion, if we read the way it was put originally, was that it was calling for a moratorium on direct implementation of the teaching capacity model while we discussed, and wisely discussed, principles

for implementation. What has been suggested more recently, and I'm trying to say, plausibly, is that at least limited implementation begin as soon as it can begin so that the committee can be doing two things, more or less simultaneously (of course, this is next year) -- defining its statement of principles, and, as a help towards that, monitoring specific trial runs of actual implementation.

SCHERER: I think it is important not to rush this too rapidly, particularly from the perspective of my campus and, I suspect, many other campuses. I represent South Bend. I can't speak for any other campus. But this whole idea is relatively new to us. We don't have the kind of experience that seems to have been developed in relation to this on the Bloomington campus. In fact, as I understood the dean, it is to some extent already being implemented, from his point of view, in the School of Arts and Sciences. We have nothing approaching this. We also have a very different experience in terms of what our teaching load is, and, to some extent, what our function has been historically. We don't necessarily fit a model which I think was developed -- as I understand it, I might be wrong -- basically for the main campus at Wisconsin. I don't know if this applies to all of the various campuses around the state. But the way it was presented, it seems to apply to the Madison campus more than to the other campuses; and it seems to me more parallel, in terms of all the commentary and detail that we've seen, for the Bloomington situation than it does for our situation. So I think it is going to need study and consideration of what kind of differences have to be applied on the different campuses. I don't think we are ready to try and rush this through at the moment.

BRAND: The Wisconsin reference refers only to the way you count teaching loads. The capacity model, what constitutes full teaching load capacity, was the one that was developed by our College of Arts and Sciences. Professor Jackson?

JACKSON: I just wanted to read [from] the motion that Trustee Richardson made -- the motion that was tabled. It has three parts, and the second part is: "The Lowengrub capacity model for determining expected teaching load is adopted and referred to the President of the University for implementation." That strikes me as a bit abrupt. I think that the institution of this working group would be a way for faculty to have continuing input as this model is actually put into practice.

LION: I support that. I don't think delaying the model will mean anything to us, but I think there are enough people who have practiced it and there is enough readiness to make the model applicable to individual differences. I think that the group can help with that in finding the principles of implementation as it is being done. I think it would be helpful. To delay the model a year, I would resist completely. But to ask that the model be implemented in incremental steps within each of the places, and these incremental steps be worked through, advised, and helped through the committee makes sense to me and, I think, fits Trustee Richardson's motion.

LOHMANN: I am beginning to get a clearer picture of how this is to work. It is to be implemented and there is this advising group that helps out in [assuring that it is] doing a good job in each locale. What I am still a little concerned about, however, is why so much emphasis is being placed here and in Mort Lowengrub's presentation on how we need to pay real attention to local differences. Now we are creating a group that seems to me a sort of centralized group. I wonder how effective that group is going to be in respect to really understanding what the local differences are that need to be taken into consideration in order to implement this plan in a flexible and appropriate way at each

level. So, I guess what I'm saying is that at the back of my mind is another model -- and I am not proposing this as a substitute motion or anything like that, this is just open for discussion, I think, here -- another model where I think we should have for each campus some such group that advises, consents, implements, and helps refine the implementation of this model.

BRAND: Okay. Let me read you the motion as I understand it to have evolved during this conversation; let's get back to that motion, and you can speak for or against it, or amend it, if you want:

RECOMMEND TO THE TRUSTEES THAT A WORKING GROUP BE SET UP SUCH THAT IT IS COMPOSED OF ELECTED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES, DEANS, AND TRUSTEES TO AGREE ON MECHANISMS AND RULES WHICH WILL ASSURE A THOROUGH, FAIR, AND CREDIBLE APPLICATION OF THE TEACHING CAPACITY MODEL AS IT IS BEING IMPLEMENTED ON A PHASED BASIS.

Is that what has evolved? Is that fair enough? Okay. Could we speak to that motion?

COFFIN: I would like to move to amend the motion.

BRAND: Yes?

COFFIN: To strike the words "mechanisms and rules" and replace them with "procedures."

BRAND: [To Spechler] Would you consider that a friendly amendment?

SPECHLER: Somewhat puzzling, but certainly friendly. [Laughter.]

COFFIN: Let me explain why. One of the things that Dean Lowengrub said in his presentation was that implementing this model on the basis of rules is one of the worst things you can do. So it seems to me that setting up a committee that is going to devise rules is not in the spirit of the capacity model. I don't want to see a set of rules that applies to eight campuses.

SPECHLER: We have real concerns here. One of them is that faculty members not be coerced. Now, I would say that is a rule, not a procedure, and it is a real concern of ours. But if you wanted to add "procedures" to "mechanisms and rules," that would be fine. But there are real concerns. We are trying to protect the interests of faculty not even present.

BRAND: This is a large group. We want to get done. Do you have a specific motion?

COFFIN: Yes. My specific motion is to replace the words "mechanisms and rules" with "procedures."

BRAND: Okay, that's a motion. Is there a second?

ANONYMOUS: Seconded.

BRAND: Do I hear a question?

LOHMANN: Could you please read the motion as amended?

BRAND: I will read the motion as amended:

RECOMMEND TO THE TRUSTEES THAT A WORKING GROUP BE SET UP SUCH THAT IT IS COMPOSED OF ELECTED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES, DEANS, AND TRUSTEES TO AGREE ON PROCEDURES WHICH WILL ASSURE A THOROUGH, FAIR, AND CREDIBLE APPLICATION OF THE MODEL AS IT IS BEING IMPLEMENTED ON A PHASED BASIS.

If you are voting for this amendment, you are voting that what I just read be on the table. Right? All in favor please raise your hand. Opposed? Okay, the ayes have it and that is the way it stands now. So, "mechanisms and rules" deleted and replaced by "procedures."

SCHERER: I have two issues I would like to present. The first is that in the presentation that was made, a comment was made that the proposal should have representation from all of the IU campuses, but that is not in the explicit wording. I would be more comfortable if that were in the explicit wording, if that would be acceptable.

The second point is that I personally, and I think that my representatives as far as I have been able to consult with them from my campus, would be uncomfortable voting on this motion because our campus and faculty organizations have had no chance to discuss this or to make recommendations on it.

BRAND: Okay. That might be a reason to vote against it.

SCHERER: I would prefer to defer it to the next meeting, if that would not be too unconscionable a delay.

BRAND: The next meeting is two days before the March meeting of the Board of Trustees. It would be . . .

SCHERER: I don't know if that is an insurmountable problem or not.

BRAND: Paul, do you want to speak to that?

EISENBERG: Well, if there are people here who are ready to vote on this motion today, it strikes me that it is better to have this motion voted on and accepted (perhaps with some amendments still to come) than for us to put it off to a meeting scheduled only two days before the Trustees. Because, again, one fears that . . .

[Tape was changed; some words were lost.]

. . . to be worked out on the individual campuses during the course of the following months.

BRAND: It was an earlier point you made which I interpreted "elected faculty representatives from each campus." I assume that is a friendly amendment.



SPECHLER: Oh yes, that's fine.

SHERMAN: Myles, is there some number from each campus? I think the smaller the committee the better. [Something like] four from each campus . . .

BRAND: We'll assume that. We'll take that as given. Ed?

GREENEBAUM: There is an imprecision at the heart of what we are talking about which we might be able to clarify with the President's help -- that imprecision being what constitutes the Lowengrub plan. And of course, as Elton just read to us a few moments ago, the Trustees' resolution speaks in terms of asking that the President see that the Lowengrub plan is instituted university-wide. At best, there is a lot of imprecision in the Lowengrub plan, because it calls for negotiations about this, that, and the other thing between various kinds of people. [Determining] what that would mean in various campus contexts is difficult as well. But also it would be possible to take the view that included within the Lowengrub model is the idea that the model is something that was developed through a negotiating process in consultation with those affected. So it might be helpful for us to understand your view of what the Lowengrub model is.

BRAND: I consider it as a type rather than an individual kind of model. [It is] flexible in [that it can be] applied differently in different contexts and the kinds of negotiations are going also to be contextual depending upon what school or campus it is developed in. I don't see it as an exact replication of the Arts and Sciences model exported elsewhere. That won't work, as I said earlier. So I see it as a type model working with general constraints. Does that help?

GREENEBAUM: I think you'll have to ask . . .

BRAND: Well, you asked what I meant. [That's] the way I read it.

EISENBERG: I think the more specific question that Ed was raising was whether, when we speak in this motion about "the model," we mean by this latter phrase to be including the process of negotiation and conversation that leads to its implementation within a particular unit on a particular campus.

BRAND: Right.

EISENBERG: If we mean that, we probably should say so, so as to move away from problems down the road. Again, this would be a friendly amendment. It doesn't affect the substance of it, but does help to clarify.

BRAND: It's a stochastic model.

EISENBERG: [Laughter.]

BRAND: Okay. We probably need to move on. We have other business. Do I hear the question? Okay. Here is what you are voting on. I'll read it to you once more: "Recommend to the Trustees . . . .

" (Now, that means recommend to the Trustees. It doesn't mean they are going to accept it, you understand.)

RECOMMEND TO THE TRUSTEES THAT A WORKING GROUP BE SET UP SUCH THAT IT IS COMPOSED OF ELECTED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES FROM EACH CAMPUS, DEANS, AND TRUSTEES TO AGREE ON PROCEDURES WHICH WILL ENSURE A THOROUGH, FAIR, AND CREDIBLE APPLICATION OF THE CAPACITY MODEL AS IT IS BEING IMPLEMENTED ON A PHASED BASIS.

That is what you are voting on. Okay? All in favor of that, please raise your hand. All opposed. You are opposed? Okay. Almost unanimous. Do you want an actual vote?

GREENEBAUM: The rules of this council don't require that unless someone moves for a roll call.

NOWAK: I move for a roll call.

BRAND: Then, I suppose you can move a roll call.

EISENBERG: Do we need to vote on that . . . ?

BRAND: Is there a second for roll call? No. It dies because there is no second . . .

EISENBERG: No, I second it.

BRAND: Oh, I thought you were the one who brought it up. Jeff did. Sorry. Okay. All in favor of the roll call for that previous motion, please raise your hand. Opposed. Okay. [The proposal for a roll call dies.] Martin, there are a couple of advisories in your report. Do you want to address those, or should we just go past them?

SPECHLER: We are willing to go along with the Wisconsin reporting model, as we understand it . . .

BRAND: No. I was talking about the advisory of setting up a representative sample time-budget study of faculty effort and the one about . . .

SPECHLER: No, that won't be necessary. At the appropriate time, if people think these ideas are useful, we'll explain them.

BRAND: And the second advisory was that you'd be willing to meet with the appropriate representatives of the administration and public to exchange ideas about a viable proposal about research and service.

SPECHLER: We are sincere. Do you know our phone number? [Laughter.]

BRAND: Right. No, I mean do you want to convey that to . . .

SPECHLER: Oh, yes. Of course. We want to respond to every request from the Trustees. If they want to discuss this in detail, we're ready.

BRAND: That actually says that you don't accept the third part of the Trustees' resolution . . .

JACKSON: I think it would be fair to say that at least this member of the Faculty Affairs Committee does not accept the third part about . . .

BRAND: Right. That's what I heard Professor Spechler saying. Namely, that he has an alternative procedure in mind. But that wasn't a motion from the committee. Do you care to turn that into a motion? [Silence.] I think that would be a no.

SPECHLER: I don't think that a motion is necessary. It is so vague and preliminary.

BRAND: Fair enough.

JACKSON: Can I just ask, though . . . Does it seem to you as if the third part of the Richardson motion might pass the Trustees?

BRAND: You mean, that they may vote positively on it?

JACKSON: Right.

BRAND: I think it is not well understood what it says, and it may be very difficult to try to explain what it says. It may not pass in this form. It is a vague part of it.

SHERMAN: I want to reenforce what I think Elton is saying. If that suggestion is taken by the Trustees to mean that this body or the committee supports setting up such a model for research and service, I'm not sure that I could agree. I'm not sure you could set up a model to evaluate research in all the different disciplines and sub-disciplines even within a department, let alone across departments and campuses. I would be very hesitant to go down that road. I hope that that suggestion isn't taken to be an endorsement of it, but one that we are willing to work on.

BRAND: Ken, did you want to comment?

GROS LOUIS: I wonder if there is any reason for the legislative history to show that this group, if it wants to do so, endorses the recommendation of the Faculty Affairs Committee to use the Wisconsin model. Since . . .

BRAND: Since it hasn't been addressed explicitly. Okay. I take that to be a recommendation of the Faculty Committee. That is to say,

THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL ACCEPTS THE WISCONSIN MODEL AS A WAY OF PROVIDING QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR RECORD-KEEPING.

I'll take that to be a motion of the Committee. No second. Any conversation about that?

COFFIN: Can I understand what this motion says? Would it say something like, "We accept the use of the Wisconsin model for measuring faculty activities with the understanding that this is not the only way in which teaching activities will be measured?"

BRAND: No, it is the way in which it would be measured. It would be the official, standard way.

JACKSON: Two points. First of all, as I understand it the Wisconsin productivity model measures only teaching, not other faculty effort.

BRAND: Right.

JACKSON: And, second, that the Wisconsin "model" does not set standards, it simply counts how many courses, credit hours, and individualized instructions you are engaged in. So unlike the teaching capacity model, it does not set standards.

BRAND: It is not a normative model, it just gives you a consistent way of recording the information. Paul . . . ?

EISENBERG: Information about sections met or courses taught. It is not meant for a moment to replace information about course development, student reactions, and all those other things which come under the heading of the quality of the teaching.

RUSSELL: Are there two motions on the floor right now?

BRAND: One.

RUSSELL: Did we actually vote on the motion or vote on the friendly amendment before?

BRAND: We voted on the motion. The friendly amendment was included and then we had an amendment that changed it to "procedures." So we voted on the motion itself. At this point, there is another motion on the floor to use the Wisconsin method of recording teaching effort.

LION: I speak against the use of the Wisconsin model. It is limited. It is individualized. It makes no attempt to have any kind of negotiation, which the Lowengrub model does. I would resist voting for it as being insufficient, non-descriptive, non-productive, and not helpful.

BRAND: Don't hedge your words. [Laughter.] Would someone from the Joint Committee which made the recommendation to accept the Wisconsin way of accounting please speak in response?

GROS LOUIS: All this does is [to clarify] the instructional efforts reports that each one of us fills out each semester and has for years sent into the University Budget Office. In the past, the Budget Office has calculated the teaching load per campus. That is, the number of sections per campus. It has calculated counting individual sections as a section. Therefore, the number of sections is clearly significantly inflated. All the Wisconsin model does is separate out the sections that we teach that are 20-25 students as opposed to that individual student that we teach. So it credits individualized instruction and also gives credit for the courses. It clarifies how many courses are taught on campus

and how many individualized sections are taught on campus, whereas before the two were conflated. So it comes from the instructional effort report. It has nothing to do with the Annual Report or the Summer Report. Elton, I don't know if you have further comments based on your conversations with the Budget Office.

PETERS: I want to speak against the motion. The Wisconsin model may be wonderful. But I think that we -- or, at least, I speak for myself -- that I as a member of this group have been too little informed about the details of this model to vote intelligently. Secondly, we've already seen in our earlier discussion that there is some tendency to confuse the teaching capacity model with the Wisconsin model. I think that if we bring both of these back more or less simultaneously to our campuses, we are going to further that confusion. I speak against the motion.

BRAND: Okay. I don't know if you have a copy of the Trustees' resolution in front of you? No? Let me read you. . . it has three short parts: "Be it resolved by the Board of Trustees that for all campuses: (1) Continuation of the use of the Wisconsin system of separately accounting for group and individual instruction in determining sections and credit hours taught is approved. (2) The capacity model for determining expected teaching load is adopted and referred to the President of the university for implementation." I'll leave off the third part for the moment. So, in voting this down, you are recommending to the Trustees that they do not adopt the first part of the resolution?

PETERS: I am just speaking against the motion. There is no further claim I am making.

BRAND: Okay.

GREENEBAUM: I am inclined to think that the motion is unwise, not that I have anything especially for or against the Wisconsin model. The administration gathers data all the time and presently requests information at this time from the faculty which the faculty supply and I don't think the administration especially needs our authority to adopt the Wisconsin model. On the other hand, I don't know that it is especially wise (especially as Chris has suggested, given the state of our knowledge) to endorse one model or another. So I wouldn't think that our voting down this [ . . . ]

BRAND: Okay. Fair enough. Everyone understand that.

COFFIN: Let me just add to that. If one of the comments is that until we have some feel for how the College of Arts of Sciences capacity model works . . . I think very few of us have actually seen information reporting the categories described in the Wisconsin model. So we don't really know what this kind of report would look like or what kind of information we are talking about being generated. That makes it very difficult for us to say, "Yes, that's a good idea" or "No, that's a bad idea."

GROS LOUIS: Just a comment. I think I understand why people have not looked at this before. [Laughter.] Just to point out -- this did not fall from the sky. There is the working group, the Joint Committee, who [first looked at] the Wisconsin model versus the current way of measuring. The Faculty Affairs Committee has looked at it and is recommending it. Frankly, the way we measure instructional effort now is inaccurate. It does portray inaccurately what the Wisconsin model

portrays much more accurately. It's record-keeping. I can understand why some of you have not seen it. But just understand this is not something that has come from nowhere.

BRAND: That's a start . . .

SCOTT: Is it a credit-hour-production only?

GROS LOUIS: No.

JACKSON: It includes credit hours, courses, and individualized instruction. So it is not just credit hours and it is not just courses.

SCOTT: What is the equation?

JACKSON: Well, actually there was a number . . . . I don't want to present myself as an expert on this. [Laughter.] But as I understand it, there are several different kinds of ways of counting that are done simultaneously. So that if, for example, somebody wants to know how many courses are the faculty teaching, then we could answer that question. If you want to know how many credit hours, well then they can answer that question, too. And so on.

DOWNS: When you read the resolution from the Trustees it recommended the continuation of using the Wisconsin model, yet I just heard that the current method that we use is inaccurate and in some way inferior to the Wisconsin model. I'm having trouble making this make sense.

BRAND: I think that the Trustees' resolution is probably premature in implying that it is in effect now.

DOWNS: I see.

LION: Am I correct in hearing that the Wisconsin model is only to be used in instructional effort?

BRAND: Yes.

LION: Well, it would help me if that was clear -- that the adoption or the use of the Wisconsin model [refers to] the instructional effort report that we make, and it has nothing to do with the capacity model which we have been . . .

BRAND: No, it has nothing to do with the capacity model. Let me read you one more sentence: "After some discussion, the working group recommended the adoption of the University of Wisconsin model that includes five measurements of teaching effort: (a) average number of weekly contact hours per FTE faculty; (b) weighted student contact hours for FTE faculty; (c) average number of course credits for FTE faculty; (d) weighted student credit hours for FTE faculty; and (e) average number of course classes per FTE faculty. These five measures are divided into two categories, group instruction and individual instruction, therefore yielding ten measures." It is a very complete system of accounting for how much teaching you are doing. That is all that is at issue.

JACKSON: It seems to me that this proposal has no fangs, that it is a perfectly innocuous way of counting up what we do.

LION: That substitutes for the instructional effort report we make now?

SPECHLER: Elizabeth, let me say that the Committee looked this over in detail. We have the actual reports and I join Elton in thinking that this is a rather harmless matter as long as we make it clear, as we've tried to, that this is a reporting only of part of instructional effort, not the whole. We have considered in great detail what additionally might be reported and we thought that was too burdensome. So we decided to go along with it, because we didn't think that our opposition would be appropriate or that the costs would be very significant.

LION: Since he addressed me, may I answer? I am persuaded that we should use it. I am changing my mind. [Laughter.] But, what I'm asking is how it would be applied.

CAMBRIDGE: On the Joint Committee, when we talked about this, we looked at a number of different ways of gaining quantitative data for record-keeping, and the Wisconsin model turned out to be the one that seemed to be the most comprehensive. I think reservations come when we try to think about that as the only way of looking at faculty productivity. And so perhaps, if we were to add some sentence like, "These data must be interpreted in light of other data which more completely describe faculty productivity," we set this in a context that makes it clear what it is and only what it is.

BRAND: Okay. I assume, Professor Spechler, that is a friendly amendment.

SPECHLER: From Barbara? [Laughter.]

BRAND: Yes.

SCOTT: Mr. President, I don't know if it is in order or not, but I'd like to offer a substitute motion.

BRAND: It's in order.

SCOTT: That the UFC encourage all the budget offices to use whatever means are at their disposal to account for our efforts in the most accurate and fair way possible.

BRAND: Okay. Is there a second to the substitute motion? Yes, there is a second. I don't think that is debatable. Is that correct?

ANONYMOUS: Are you our parliamentarian? [Laughter.]

BRAND: Okay, it's debatable. [Laughter.] Does anyone wish to speak to the substitute motion? Okay. All in favor of the substitute motion, please raise your hand. We are going to have to count, here. Okay. Those opposed? The substitute motion does not carry. It was close [20-22].

PETERS: Have we been provided with the details of what this plan is?

BRAND: One of your committees certainly has.

SPECHLER: We just didn't feel that it was worth spending . . . . I mean the teaching capacity model is the big thing. We regarded this as quite a minor matter. We could be wrong, and if you want to table this and have a complete explanation, we have as much patience as you. But we really didn't think that this was necessary.

PETERS: Again, I just am reluctant to vote on something that I think is going to have significant impact when I haven't had a chance to look at the details. I would move to table till the next meeting.

ANONYMOUS: I second.

BRAND: Okay. All in favor of tabling until the next meeting, raise your hand. Those opposed. The opposed has it. It's still on the table.

ORR: What I hear from the Faculty Affairs Committee is that this is simply an improvement over the measure that we already do and really nothing else. It is very much an accounting-type effort that has very little to do with tenure, promotion decisions, and teaching capacity. Or nothing to do with [those things.] Nothing.

ANONYMOUS: Could you address how it is an improvement? Just to give us a feel for this?

ORR: As I understand it, one way in which this is an improvement is that it explicitly takes into account individualized instruction, meaning teaching independent honors, one on one, dissertation directing, and so forth.

BRAND: Okay. You probably have as much information as you can get now. Professor Sherman?

SHERMAN: If you can't trust a sociologist and an economist, who can you trust? [Laughter.]

BRAND: The motion says in essence that this is only one of the ways in which faculty effort will be measured:

THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL ACCEPTS THE WISCONSIN MODEL AS A WAY OF PROVIDING QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR RECORD-KEEPING. THESE DATA MUST BE INTERPRETED IN LIGHT OF OTHER DATA WHICH MORE COMPLETELY DESCRIBE FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY.

Okay. All in favor, please raise your hand. Opposed? Okay, it passes. We are now ready, I take it, to go on to the next item? No?

JACKSON: I think that we should explicitly pass a statement of how we feel about the third part of Trustee Richardson's motion about accountability for faculty time used in research and service. So I propose a motion that says



THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL IS DOUBTFUL THAT A STANDARD SYSTEM OF ACCOUNTABILITY, EQUIVALENT TO THE TEACHING CAPACITY MODEL, CAN BE DEVELOPED FOR RESEARCH AND SERVICE. IF SUCH A SYSTEM IS DEVELOPED, IT MUST BE DONE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE FACULTY.

ANONYMOUS: I second.

BRAND: Okay. Discussion? And, that is, you are to recommend this statement to the Trustees. That is the motion. Discussion?

FINEBERG: I believe that that is a little confrontational. What I would suggest is that we frame that in a way that says we would be willing to try and form a committee to tackle that problem and perhaps develop a model and apply it. [ . . . ] I think that's a little confrontational. I would be in favor of developing a model and testing it, rather than saying that we should not try it.

BRAND: If I read you the last couple of sentences of the report that you heard, that may be helpful. It says: "The development of a productivity model for research and service would be a complex matter with few precedents and models to draw upon. We would be willing to meet with appropriate representatives of the administration and the public to exchange ideas and to see whether a viable proposal can be developed." That is what was in the report. You are suggesting that as a substitute.

FINEBERG: Yes.

BRAND: Okay. Is there a second to that?

ANONYMOUS: Seconded.

BRAND: Right. Who wants to discuss that substitute? Professor Spechler?

SPECHLER: Well, Elton and I of course think it is doubtful that such a thing can be developed. And I think that anybody that met on this for fifteen or twenty minutes with the typically opinionated members of this faculty could realize that. But I think you have to be very careful. The Trustees are in our corner. We have to be very positive and diplomatic with them. I don't think you just throw cold water on some Trustee's idea. I think you say, "Well, what do you have in mind? We'll listen." I think that is the more constructive approach. I do agree, though, in substance, that it probably won't go anywhere.

BRAND: Okay. Any further comments on this substitute motion? Do I hear the question?

SEVERAL: Question.

BRAND: All in favor of the substitute motion? Who is opposed? Okay, it carries. It has been substituted, then. Now we have to vote on the substitute motion. Do I hear that question? I'll read it to you:

THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL WISHES TO CONVEY TO THE TRUSTEES THAT THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PRODUCTIVITY MODEL FOR RESEARCH AND SERVICE WOULD BE A COMPLEX MATTER WITH FEW PRECEDENTS AND MODELS TO DRAW UPON. THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL WOULD BE WILLING TO MEET WITH APPROPRIATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE PUBLIC TO EXCHANGE IDEAS AND TO SEE WHETHER A VIABLE PROPOSAL CAN BE DEVELOPED.

Professor Sherman?

SHERMAN: I'll just repeat what I said before. With that wording, it says that it's "complex" and difficult, but it seems to have in it the implication that we believe that it is doable and that we are willing to go ahead and do it. And that certainly doesn't reflect my feeling. I don't believe it confrontational to say that we have our doubts about it. I think this implies that we support the development of such a model, and I think we'll be sorry if we do this.

YOKOM: I think we make that judgment every time we look at promotion and tenure [and are forced to] evaluate those three categories. So we do have some basis to say that we can evaluate our colleagues' research and service, even though we do it [imperfectly].

BRAND: Okay. Any further comments?

ANONYMOUS: Question.

BRAND: Question. All in favor of the motion now on the table which I just read. Opposed? The ayes have it. Is there anything else, Professor Spechler?

EISENBERG: Marty, does that finish the business on this matter from Faculty Affairs? Thank you. You're sure? [Laughter.]

SPECHLER: Thank you for your patience, Paul.

EISENBERG: Not at all. These are very important matters.

AGENDA ITEM #5: REPORT FROM EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE AND FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: FACET STATEMENT CONCERNING TEACHING

BRAND: Let's move to the reports from the Educational Policies Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee, in particular the FACET statement concerning teaching. I'll call on the Educational Policies Committee. Professor Olmer is not here?

ORR: Neither Professor Olmer nor Professor Ward could be here today; I'm their substitute. I'm a member of the University Educational Policies Committee. You have a single sheet in front of you that addresses the Agenda items. The gist of the one on the FACET statement is that we don't think that it is appropriate to put it in the Faculty Handbook, and our reasons are given as #1 and #2 [listed under] "specific concerns." That IT would represent an imbalance is the gist of the first statement. The second statement says that these things don't apply in the same way on all campuses; so to put it in the Handbook is perhaps to prejudice tenure and promotion decisions. This, by the way, in no

way decreases our view about the value of the statement in itself. It was a [ . . . ] almost, although after you read it carefully, if you've been here a while, you realize that you've probably done most of those things at one time or another. We simply thought it inappropriate to include it in the Handbook.

BRAND: Okay. [We have] a motion from the Committee. Any conversation about that?

ORR: I think the Faculty Affairs Committee had a similar kind of view of it.

SPECHLER: My colleague, Professor Jackson, asked me to . . . . Our position is very similar to Professor Orr's and his Committee's. We don't think that this statement belongs in the Academic Handbook. The Academic Handbook is a reference work. Many of us will never read it in its entirety, except under the influence of a profound sense of insomnia. It is not a book that is read, it is referred to. We do think that the statement is a positive one, and we urge that it be distributed to you and to probationary faculty on appointment to IU with our blessings. But we think that the people who suggest [putting it in the] Handbook really, perhaps, don't realize how the Academic Handbook is used in practice. So it's the right statement, wrong place. And if it is distributed to individual faculty, then, of course, it can be amended campus-wise to emphasize one or another thing on this or that campus, and that would be perfectly appropriate. But we think it is out of place in the Academic Handbook.

SCHERER: I agree with this idea. It should not be in the Academic Handbook. But I think consideration should be given to using this for positive propaganda to people like the Board of Trustees, the legislature, the public, etc.

BRAND: Widely distributed both on and off campus. Any further discussion of that?

EISENBERG: Well, the question has arisen precisely whether we need a motion. Certainly, this matter was put to us explicitly by the Trustees. We can simply report that there have been two such reports from these two standing committees; or we can actually draw up a motion in the spirit of what we just heard, so that the report to come from the UFC will be more exactly the report on the motion . . . .

BRAND: I would suggest you just report that it's been discussed. I don't think you need a formal motion.

#### AGENDA ITEM #6: REPORTS FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE AND FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: TRUSTEES' RESOLUTION REGARDING ASSOCIATE INSTRUCTORS AND PART-TIME FACULTY

BRAND: Okay, moving on to number #6, the reports from the Educational Policies Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding AIs and part-time faculty. Professor Orr, are you prepared to speak to that as well?

ORR: Actually, on our conference call we spent a good deal more time on this. I think the key to our reaction to it -- to the notion of a central office on each campus to deal with these things -- was in

the first paragraph, below #2 where the topic switches in the key sentence: "It was noted, however, that the structure for such oversight is already present on the individual campuses." It was our strong feeling that, if it is a problem, the problem is in will, not structure. The will to do these things. You can have a central office and the will wouldn't change at all. Or you can in fact do things through the ordinary administrative channels on each campus to increase the will to engage in training and monitoring and so forth and so on. The structure, it seemed to us, would be wholly unnecessary.

BRAND: I think when this was passed by the Trustees, they thought that there was already in place, or at least were willing to be assured that there was already in place, sufficient structure, and that they were not asking for additional structure.

ORR: Oh, I thought there were words to the effect of a central office.

BRAND: No, I think they want on each campus a reporting procedure that either exists or, if it didn't, to create one. That is, to indicate that this was being done. So, I think on the Bloomington campus, is it done through your office, Ken?

GROS LOUIS: No, it's done through the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

BRAND: But it's already in place.

GROS LOUIS: Yes.

BRAND: So that would be an example of its already being satisfied. My expectation is that every campus will give a similar report, although the structures on the campuses are different.

EISENBERG: I beg to disagree. I think that what the Trustees recognize and what is certainly the case is that there is appropriate monitoring on each individual campus of the work of associate instructors. It is not, I think, the case that there is careful monitoring of the work of adjunct and part-time faculty, consistently. Even if one were to admit that there is that, there certainly is more to the Trustees' motion than a call for monitoring. There is also a call for a reward structure to be extended to part-time faculty in a way in which it previously has not been. There is also a call for the incorporation of such faculty, as appropriate, into the larger life of the university in ways that heretofore have not been particularly matters of concern except on an individual basis. There is also, of course, lastly the matter of whether there should be some sort of uniform title given to persons who teach part-time as a way of making such faculty pleased with themselves through an understanding of their role. The proposal was that they be called informally "associate faculty" rather than part-time faculty or various other names. So there are many more things at stake here than simply the question of whether there is monitoring of the part-timers. That itself is still in question--even if there is adequate monitoring of AIs.

ORR: There is also, as you'll see, some more language down there. There was an endorsement of the notion that they should receive mentoring and training and [receive] recognition and compensation for what our associate instructors and associate faculty do. I don't recall, and it's not in the report that came from the committee chairs, that we address the issue of titles. Although I do vaguely

remember during a conference some conversation to that effect. But there was no resolution from the committee.

JACKSON: I have a question about exactly what is the focus of the discussion. We have before us the Trustees' approval of a recommendation on September 24th that basically speaks to reporting. Then there is the report of the Joint Committee on Learning that says more about encouragement and possibly a change in title, and so on. I don't and (I think) the Faculty Affairs Committee doesn't have any problem about the Trustees' motion about reporting. We do have some fairly strenuous things to say about the content of the Joint Committee's report. I guess I'll just deliver myself in one sentence, all right? I think that, instead of trying to enhance the position of part-time adjunct faculty, we should be moving to add tenure-track faculty and reduce our reliance on part-time and adjunct faculty.

BRAND: Okay. Let me focus this discussion again. The original discussion was about the structure of the reporting procedures in order to ensure responsibility and accountability. There doesn't seem to be any issue there. Now, moving on to the substantive issue that Professor Jackson raised about part-time faculty, at least part-time faculty (we might return to AIs) and their conditions of employment, as well as the role that they play in the university. Those are the substantive issues you raised. Is that fair?

JACKSON: Yes.

BRAND: Okay. Professor Cambridge?

CAMBRIDGE: What you just suggested is not mutually exclusive to this resolution. That is, we can in fact be moving toward a greater number of tenure-track lines on every campus at the same time we are acknowledging that we have many part-time colleagues who in fact do need to have a place that provides for them correct appointment procedures, evaluation procedures, and faculty evaluation. I think that this resolution certainly can fit with your objectives as well as acknowledge and support our colleagues.

The title change that Paul mentioned did come out of the Joint Committee and was not adopted in the resolution; so that is a separate matter. However, there is in the provision #2 perhaps some additional support for part-time associate faculty through providing professional development opportunities. When we looked at the various work that goes on at various campuses, we found that many campuses already do this. This is an attempt to assure that it gets done and that we have a way to report out what gets done.

SPECHLER: Our committee, of which Elton Jackson is the co-chair, considered this at length. We have one agreement to report to you and one disagreement to report to you. The agreement, I take it, of the committee is that the title "associate faculty" is not called for in formal parlance of IU. If you read the Academic Handbook, which, alas, I had to do on this occasion [laughter], you find that there are many titles that are available that are more honorific than associate faculty. For example, "assistant professor, part-time," "associate professor, part-time," and even "professor, part-time." Those are all possibilities. We think that is quite adequate for part-time faculty, and we would urge

the Trustees to consider that to be adequate without further complicating the list of ranks at IU. On that, we are agreed. "Associate faculty" may be an informal designation. Someone found it actually on a door where these people actually sit to do their office hours. We have no objection to informal usages of this sort, as Paul said. But we see no need for a formal designation, especially because it would be misleading. There would be confusion with associate professors and associate instructors. It really does not bias anything and it would be confusing. Now that is the thing on which we are agreed.

The thing on which we are disagreed, as reflected in this exchange between my two colleagues, in this. We all agree that we would like more tenured faculty at IU. And larger offices and more department space and probably better food in the cafeteria. This is very true. But this matter of the rigorization of the position of part-time faculty is a very serious matter. We will see this come up yet again with the clinical ranks. These ranks, these instructional, non-tenure-track ranks are proliferating rather rapidly throughout the university, particularly in the professional schools. I don't think we have time to talk about this matter; and I would urge that the Agenda Committee set up a real discussion of this very important matter, at which time I am sure my friends will again express their opinions, which are widely shared throughout IU.

ORR: We debated in the conference whether we should include it since it indeed is a separate issue, but you'll see in there that we also recognize that our long-term best interest would be with a larger portion of tenure-track faculty, but also that the part-time positions of all kinds are a reality, and we are highly in favor of professional development in the ranks. But they are a reality, and you can't simply say, well, the only way to solve the problem is not to have these ranks. It's just not going to happen.

MAXWELL: I suppose I have a rather different reaction to all of this. I regard part two of the Trustees' resolution as innocuous, but that part one is to be taken literally. It doesn't say "an office which reports"; it says an office "which will do this." Okay?

ORR: That was what we were responding to, in the first place.

MAXWELL: I think that, regardless of what the discussion of the Trustees' tells us is their intention, we need to pay attention to what the words say. If I have the resolution correctly, it says, "Each campus should designate an office to ensure that (1) all AIs are properly supervised and properly evaluated." Now that doesn't say an officeto report that they are properly trained, supervised and evaluated. It says an office to properly train, supervise, and evaluate.

SEVERAL VOICES: No.

EISENBERG: No, it doesn't say that.

BRAND: That is to ensure that what people will do in this office bears the accountability and responsibility function to assure that others do it. For example, on Bloomington . . .

[Tape was changed; some words were lost.]

SCOTT: . . . recommendations. Which is generally an improvement for expansion for instruction on all of our campuses, I would hope [by] our tenure-track faculty, but here by our AIs and by adjunct and part-time and other faculty. I join the committee in opposing the use of the word "associate faculty" for the reasons they say. But the main point that I would like to remind us of as we think about this matter before we, it seems, discuss it again, is that one way to think about this is that several bold moves are being taken simultaneously against tenure by us. On the one hand, we want to value our colleagues, we want to help them in every way we can, and we want to bring them into the life of the community. On the other hand, we are saying that they are still not tenure-track faculty. By setting this up either we have a two-tiered system, or we are saying, in some sense, tenure means less this year than it did last. The most interesting statement that I've read about this problem was by the Executive Secretary of the national office of the American Association of University Professors, who said that this is one of the issues that in the next ten years would be the most influential on what we do in universities, and it would be ourselves who would vote against tenure. That is too strong a way of stating it; but how I value my colleagues in the Department of Educational Psychology and help them to teach better and at the same time protect the rights of academic freedom which are embedded in tenure is not yet clear to me.

BRAND: I think the Agenda Committee will take under advisement further discussion of this; so if there is just one or two more comments, then we'll stop. Professor Jackson?

JACKSON: Well, Myrtle just referred to the Executive Director of the AAUP. I just wanted to read one sentence from her report. She says, "I believe that scattered efforts to do away with tenure throughout the country may be less threatening than faculty complicity with the erosion of tenure through the creation of a non-tenure-track class of academic appointments in universities across the country."

FINEBERG: I believe that it is against our spirit of scholarship that we don't invest time and attention in our part-time faculty. I think part-time faculty are a reality of our lives and they are not going to disappear, regardless of what we would like to have in the ideal world. So I would prefer being in the climate where even our part-time or associate (or whatever you would like to call them) faculty are given attention and status and the ability to develop. If it takes an office on the campus to do that, so be it. I don't see any harm in this resolution. Therefore, I would support this.

BRAND: Okay. There is no motion on the table. This was a general discussion. The Agenda Committee will take under advisement this set of issues again. I don't believe that there has been sufficient discussion on this very important set of issues; so I would assume it will come back to the group. I'd like to suggest we have a 3-5 minute break, but be back as soon as possible to meet with Professor Kleinbauer in the Executive Session.

Adjournment: 4:30 P.M.

Paul Eisenberg

Co-Secretary