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1. Approval of Minutes
April 24, 2007
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/minutes/04.24.07.htm

2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(President Michael McRobbie)

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professors Bart Ng and Lisa Pratt)
UFC Members: http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/circulars/U1-2008.xls

4. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(President McRobbie and Professors Ng and Pratt)
5. President’s Report (30 minutes).
(President McRobbie)

6. President’s Question and Answer Period (30 minutes).
(President McRobbie)

7. Promotion & Tenure Review in Faculty Ranks by the Office of EVP Bantz (25 minutes).
(Professor David Malik, Associate Executive Vice President, Indiana University)

(Professor Irene Tajalli, IU School of Social Work)

9. Executive Session on the Review of Chancellor Sandra Patterson-Randles (30 minutes).
(Professor Norman Lefstein, Chair of the Review Committee, Dean Emeritus, Indiana University School of Law – Indianapolis)
Review Procedures for Chancellors (Trustees’ Version)
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/circulars/Trustees_Chancellors_Review_Procedures.pdf

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie, Professor Ng, and Professor Pratt should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at:
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc.

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

McRobbie: Ladies and gentlemen, I don’t whether I’m meant to use this thing. Do you start a meeting with it, I don’t know? Anyway, welcome to, everybody, the first UFC meeting of the year. Obviously this is my first meeting of the UFC as chair as well. So I’m pleased to be here. I look around and I know many of you; I’ve worked with many of you over the years in various capacities and I’m very pleased to be here. I don’t know whether the tradition has been to gather around the room but I assume we can take that as done except I think it is important to welcome Lisa Pratt who has been elected as the head of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Spechler: Michael.

McRobbie: Yes?

Spechler: You don’t know that the acoustics in this room are rather poor and if you could just speak up. We can hardly hear.

McRobbie: I’ll try Marty. I thought this microphone in front of me was for amplification but I’m told it’s really for the far side. So it doesn’t look like I can get any amplification. I’ll try and project as best I can but I think we have a problem in that regard.

So anyway to welcome Lisa Pratt, the Chair of the Bloomington Faculty Council, as well. Lisa may have been a member before but as a faculty of Bloomington of many years standing. Can you hear okay at the back?
Pratt: Can we change the set-up in here? It seems like we’re as far apart as we could possibly be.

McRobbie: Alright. I’ll just briefly repeat myself in terms of welcoming Lisa Pratt, the head of the Bloomington Faculty Council to this meeting as well. Good, I have amplification. Could you hear Marty, is that working?

Spechler: Yes.

McRobbie: Good. So let me then move to the agenda, the first item is the approval of the minutes of the April 24th meeting. Can I have a motion for approval of those minutes please?

Terry: Moved

McRobbie: And a second?

Male Speaker: Second.


AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER’S BUSINESS

McRobbie: The next item is Presiding Officer’s Business. I’m not actually certain what business I’m meant to bring to you and I’ve got some things to report on so I’m going to jump over that to item 3; the Agenda Committee business and ask Bart and Lisa to report on issues there.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Ng: Okay, today I just want to bring to your attention a few items that we need to deal with this year; the most important item really is to work on a new policy, or rather to draft a Family Leave Policy. We have made an attempt to do so a couple of years ago and came up with a policy but that was met with some difficulties as it made it’s way to the trustees. So we are now functioning on an interim policy which will sunset June of this year. So the Fringe Benefits Committee will be working hard this year to address that problem.

Now, there is also an item that will come before the Academic Affairs or Educational Policies Committee and that is a policy drafted by the ALC, the Academic Leadership Council, on credit transfer. There’s an upper limit on credit transfers that will be imposed on transfer credits from two year colleges. The genesis of this was that last year it came to the public’s attention that the School of Continuing Education will allow up to 90 credits to be transferred from the two year colleges and that created a lot of discussion. And so the ALC now has developed a policy. This will make its way through the faculty councils on various campuses and the UFC co-secretary of the EPC will be working on that.
Pratt: Bart I think we do need to clarify though that the policy will not address so much whether or not if it’s transferable in the sense of the statewide library, but how those credits can be counted towards a degree. So it really had to do with credits toward a degree.

Ng: That’s correct, that’s correct, that’s correct. Basically how many credits from a two year college will be acceptable towards a degree in Indiana University? I think that is the primary thrust of it. Well, you will in fact have a chance to read the policy and so the details—we just got that, I think it was a couple of days ago, Lisa is that correct?

Pratt: Correct.

Ng: So it has not been circulated yet and we will try to circulate that as quickly as we can.

Pratt: And I think there is one area where we really will be seeking your input and that is the difference between a transfer limit based on a finite number of credit hours; 64, to throw a number out there, versus a limit expressed in terms of no more than 50% of the credit hours required for the degree, whatever the degree requirements are. So, certainly you need to talk to your programs and schools on your campuses to see how that language might vary and how well it worked for individual programs and schools. Is that…?

Ng: That’s correct. And you will also recall that last year this council passed two policies; one is the Intellectual Property Policy and the Policy on Research Misconduct, and those policies were forwarded to the Trustees for their action. So far the Trustees have not worked on them yet and as I understand it, some work is still being done through Dottie Frapwell’s office—looking at those policies, and I just want to ask John Applegate, who is the faculty liaison of the President, to actually give us an update on the two policies.

Applegate: Right, well the second one the Research Misconduct Policy we’re still not quite clear what happened to that and we’re looking for it. The Intellectual Property Policy that was reviewed by President Herbert’s leadership group and President Herbert concluded that he couldn’t support it as written, not because of any of the substantive issues but as you may recall it was a very long, rather unwieldy policy and the thought was that it would not serve the people who needed to use it very well. So there was no disagreement about the categories of intellectual property there was no disagreement about the funding formulas and how they should be treated. It’s really a matter of trying to make the policy something that is more workable, easier to use and understand. So that’s what we’re doing at this point.

Ng: And so I think after that iteration do you think that it may actually come back to this body for us to look at?

Applegate: Certainly, we wouldn’t go forward without coming back to either the whole group or the relevant committee without solving certain knots.

Ng: Alright, that completes my report. And then Lisa do you have anything to add?

Pratt: No, I think those are the top items.
McRobbie: Now we have a question and answer period here for all three of us, and I know I have a question and answer period after I talk about some issues. We could just restrict this to Lisa and Bart and then I’m happy to answer whatever questions you may have after I talk about some matters, so maybe I could just ask for any questions for Lisa or Bart and what they said. Yes sir?

Atkinson: This is more in the nature of comment relating to the Intellectual Property Policy. That was a long process that was going through in developing the policy and revising it and now to find out that it has to be revised again is a bit disturbing. I think the understanding was for all of us that this was an important policy that we needed to have in place relatively quickly. And now it seems to be stalled again until all the _____ and so it’s not really a question.

McRobbie: Let me make a couple comments on that. Firstly, I’m well aware of how long it’s taken because I initiated the process and I’ve had two new jobs since I initiated the process, so I’m well aware of that. I think there is the question of realistically in what form will it have to be for the Trustees to agree to it and I think I agree with the decision that was taken. It will probably not get through in its present form. That’s not to say that there’s anything at all wrong with it. I think it’s a matter of how one separates out the components of it. The second point though is, we actually, it’s not that we’re going to be suffering terribly in one sense for this because we have a reasonable policy in place. The new policy I think appropriately understood is a better policy but the policy in place at least is reasonable so I would hope this would be sorted out very quickly. But if it’s not, at least we have a policy to fall back on in the interim. Mary, yes?

Fisher: Well my concern is not just about this policy, but the pattern. And I would say of the last four or five things we’ve sent to the Trustees, they’ve all been sent back. Nothing has been acceptable as it is. I think that pattern is more disturbing and it speaks to the lack of relationship we have with the Trustees and I am hoping that you as the new President will be able to begin to mend that because I think the faith has been lost.

McRobbie: I think the two, the other policy, the Research Misconduct you know that happened, I wasn’t on the deck at that stage and I am fully convinced that I know what’s happened. I find that hard to believe that we can’t sort that one out quickly. I’m pretty confident, Mary, that we can sort the Intellectual Property Policy one out, too.

Fisher: But it goes back to review with the Chancellors, I mean it goes back to five years ago when I was the senior co-Secretary. So we have had a pattern over the last five years of this kind of issue of the work of this body not being acceptable to the Trustees and something’s got to give is what I’m just...

Pratt: Mary I will comment that we’re quite sensitive about that as well and Bart and I actually feel very good that when we approached Michael about not having this happen again with the Family Leave Policy he volunteered to work with us to identify a subset of the Trustees that we could work directly with in the development phase so that we didn’t end up in this combative
situation at the very end. So I think, I hope, that we are already starting to find a better way to do this so that we don’t have things coming back.

**McRobbie:** I certainly hope, Mary, that we can establish a new working relationship with the Trustees. That’s no guarantee they’re going to be servants because they won’t be, but that we can manage to negotiate some policies through that are in the interest of the university as a whole. Herb?

**Terry:** A comment sort of related to that. I hope we move promptly on the Family Leave Policy because unlike Intellectual Property, it has a sunset…

**McRobbie:** Right.

**Terry:** It’s a sunsetting policy…

**McRobbie:** Right.

**Terry:** …and I mean these policies are important for recruitment and retention.

**McRobbie:** Right, I completely agree, I completely agree. Yes, Marty?

**Spechler:** Lisa and Bart, last year, well Lisa wasn’t with us, we were promised that Craig Brater the Vice President for Life Sciences would come to the University Faculty Council and tell us about what has got to be one of the most expensive and most promising initiatives which involve more than one campus. So I hope that you won’t forget about that in the storm of these rejected policies.

**Ng:** Marty, I want to assure you we indeed have not forgotten about it in fact we already contacted Dean Brater and I believe we even have a date set up. I believe…

**Pratt:** Yes, he’s accepted.

**Ng:** He’s accepted. He’s going to come to this body to brief us. And I believe it’s in October, is that correct or…?

**Pratt:** It’s the next meeting.

**Ng:** It’s the next meeting,

**Pratt:** Whatever date that is.

**Ng:** Well we look forward to your participation, Marty.

**McRobbie:** Yes Bill, yeah?
Schneider: Speaking of trustees and faculty, I’m also concerned about this issue because when Simon works on the Intellectual Property, it’s not as if the faculty only talked amongst the faculty and that if you walk this up to the hill all of a sudden the Trustees steal it. But we’ve worked quite closely with whoever we could especially with the administration to correct the policy and so I think that’s the only real question for the administration is to make sure that they go along. Specifically though about Trustees and faculty, I’m pretty sure that another bill will come forward to the General Assembly, will come to session for faculty members or the Trustees of the public university. And Indiana University’s actions in the past, particularly with the administration and the lobbyists have not been in very close consultation with the faculty interest and so I hope that the ____ has been planned on their hope that they come up with a better option that I think would serve everybody. Not just Indiana University but the faculty of the public university and of the state.

McRobbie: Yep.

Vermette: I’d like to ask John Applegate is it the Board of Trustees that has rejected the form that the intellectual property document brings to it or is it added verbiage that would make it too complicated for the Board to read?

Applegate: Well, neither actually and certainly not the second one. The President decided, President Herbert decided that it was not, in its current form, was not something that he could support. For the reason I just said that it’s, the policy, it takes thirteen pages to describe it in great complexity is not, a policy—the thought is that a policy ought to be something that people can go to for a reference. It will tell them what they need to know and they can go and follow it and the concern was that as it’s presently drafted it doesn’t meet that standard.

Vermette: Because you said earlier that you’re going to try to boil it down to three major principles that are in there. So is that going to change the whole document? Is that going to be an appendix or is that going to be document totally?

Applegate: Well if you look at…it was part of a larger discussion at the time which is the way we adopt and promulgate policies at Indiana University and I’m sure everyone has had the experience of trying to find policies. And you look for them, they’re in a lot of different places; they’re all in different forms. And there are people who know all about how you issue policies and study this. There are seminars on this at universities. And we’re at sort of one end of how you do that. So that was part of the thinking at the time, I mean, I’m just giving you the background. The reason for that is you want policies to be easily found you want policies to be accessible in terms of understanding, wanting to be clear. And so that’s really what the issue was about again, I can’t emphasize enough, that it wasn’t some back door concern that the policy was wrong-headed or that any of the key elements of it were wrong. There seems to be remarkable unanimity this is a good policy. It really was an opportunity to make the policy more useful.

McRobbie: Yes?
Coffin: I don’t mean to spend a lot of time on the IP policy, but it seems to me that intellectual property is inherently a relatively complex issue to address and I’m not entirely certain how one develops an IP policy that doesn’t have some inherent complexities in it.

McRobbie: My recollection, sorry, I was just going to say my recollection of this, but frankly I haven’t looked at this in a while, my recollection is that there are other universities that have policies that are two or three pages long, other Big Ten universities that have IP policies.

Coffin: My recollection is the recollection that other universities have statements of principles and then they have policies to implement those principles that are quite substantial. So if we’re talking here about shifting from policies that you can actually implement, administer, deal with and understand how they apply in frequent situations to a set of general principles, then that will be interesting to see how that works out.

McRobbie: Other comments? Any other comments?

Terry: I just want to remember that at some point in the discussion there was a recognition that because of the complexity of the problem it would ultimately have to be accompanied by a series of sort of laymanly explanations, that might be written for a different target audiences; there might be one that was pointed to principal investigators, there might be one that was pointed to others occupying other roles on the campus. I think there was a time, I remember that being discussed at some point here as a possible balancing of these interests, with the policy being sufficiently detailed it would cover the subject but a recognition that other folks depending on what their role was in following or implementing that policy, would get some guidance to what it means to them.

Ng: I just want to add that I agree with Terry, Prof. Terry, on this. And I think it will be a very, very challenging task if there is a substantial, and delay, for that matter change of the policy but I think it may be a good compromise just to have a some short explanatory addendum to the policy to make it clear what it means. But I also, I have to say I’m a little bit surprised about the issues being raised by, in the Legal Counsel’s office and correct me if I’m wrong, Simon, that that policy was developed closely, in fact I remember several times that Beth Cate came and briefed us and in fact went through the policy with us and so, you know, everybody was on board. In fact, one time, there were actually more than one person from the legal office that came and briefed us. So anyway, I think that, keep that in mind.

Applegate: Bart I think that you’re misunderstanding me. That was not, there was a general concern about it in that body. I’m not suggesting that the concern originally came from that office rather that was just the logical place to ask for some help.

Ng: Okay.

Pratt: But it does sound like a condensed statement of principles that wouldn’t require us to rewrite or modify the policy could be the way to go here. And could you at least explore that? The document that has come forward?
McRobbie: We’ll try and get this sorted out. Marty, yeah?

Spechler: Well I think Lisa’s right and also John is right that if we were really at the wrong end of the spectrum as far as understandability and accessibility that’s something very important that goes well beyond this policy. But I have to tell you, you know Adam Herbert sat in that seat through a number of long and boring meetings about this policy and he never said anything like that. I just can’t understand this. I would think that our new President, who’s very good at this, might give us some, you know, concrete guidance, because we voted for this policy. I thought this policy was, yes, complicated but, you know, prudential and positive. We all, I think we all voted for it. And if the President doesn’t want to send it on, that’s a real nasty surprise.

AGENDA ITEM #5: PRESIDENT’S REPORT

McRobbie: Let us try and sort this one out, Marty. Anything else? Any other questions on any other matters from anybody? Good. Let me just, I’m not going to, enough, I’ll talk for half an hour, but let me comment on a number of issues here that I think will be of interest. Firstly, let me just make some general comments. I, since I was appointed the 1st of March, I’ve been travelling the state and other places as well and having toured campuses multiple times obviously I alternate between the two big campuses a lot and have tried to stress a number of things but one of the key things I keep stressing is that a fundamental mission at Indiana University is teaching and research, excellent teaching and research at the highest international standards. And I keep making the point that everything we do has to always be seen through the prism of education teaching, and research and that everything we do has to be sort of justified in terms of what it really does for education and teaching and what it does for research. And I’m mindful that those arguments can get complex and second order sometimes but I think it’s important to reaffirm what our primary mission is and I’ve tried to, through a number of different mechanisms and will continue to stress the policy of academic excellence that, at the end of the day, the university is about the faculty and it’s about both retaining the very best faculty, supporting them in what they do and recruiting the very best faculty and supporting them in what they do as well. I’ve been an academic all my life and I still like to even think of myself as a semi-active researcher and I’m still a P.I. on some grants. And I like to think I have a good understanding of the academic enterprise and what needs to be done to strengthen it and the critical things that are essential to it. I had the enormous honor last night as some of you know of being made an honorary member of the Alliance of Titled and Distinguished Professors which frankly floored me when I was asked to become a member of that august body. But I gather it’s the first time a sitting President’s been put in that position, but I was very immensely honored by that and I know some of you are members of that organization so my thanks to those of you who were involved in that. I had been, I took up the position on the 1st of July and I was faced with a series of resignations or, I guess, retirements in some cases and made a number of appointments pretty rapidly to deal with those vacancies. The first appointment I made, the first major appointment I made was to replace myself as the Provost of the Bloomington campus and I was delighted to have appointed Karen Hanson after a search process that Fred Cate led as the new Provost for the new Bloomington campus. I then made some other appointments, Judy Powell indicated her desire to stand down and I replaced her since it was an administrative position with the Neil Theobald, Terry Clapacs, I’ll go through the senior offices. Terry Clapacs remains in his position as Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer, though Terry will be retiring in the next couple of years. Charlie Nelms as people know left to take up another position as chancellor of North
Carolina Central University and I made some changes to that portfolio. And I believe I focused it differently. This time I focused it quite explicitly on Diversity and related issues, equity, multicultural affairs and after quite extensive consultation with many of the affected bodies there, appointed Ed Marshall as the new Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Multicultural affairs. Ed is a member of the School of Optometry and is a distinguished researcher in that area. And has been very active in research internationally, but also been very active in diversity issues in his field and other fields as well. I, Patrick Mirror had been the Dean of International Affairs for many years reporting to the President though not a member of the President’s cabinet, and I effectively promoted Patrick by way of indicating the importance that I attach to the international dimension as I, some of you I think have heard me talk about that before and Patrick as we speak, in fact, is in China. And so Patrick is now a member of my cabinet and it has I believe given his office more a sort of elevated standing in the institution. I faced a series of issues concerned with the research administration of some concern, issues where I think we had not done as much as we needed to do and was delighted that Ora Peskowitz agreed to be the Interim Vice President for research administration responsible for trying to better organize, coordinate, streamline out research administration services throughout the university. She’s agreed to do that for a number of years and then I will carry out a search for an appropriate successor for her. Tom Healy retired or resigned as the Vice President for Government Relations and I combined that portfolio with the portfolio of Mike Sample held as Vice President for Public Affairs. I also needed to replace myself as the VP for IT, though frankly I hadn’t really been giving that, hadn’t been performing in that job in a major way for some years. And Brad Wheeler had been my number two in that job, and I think I know every CIO in this country and Brad was as good as any of them so I appointed Brad as my successor in that position. Dottie Frapwell stays as University Counsel though I’ve switched the reporting line of Internal Audit and Affirmative Action to report to her and not to me as President. And I appointed Bill Stephan as the Vice President for Engagement with broad responsibility for economic development issues. Somewhat similar to a role that he held at a slightly lower level some years ago before he left the university for four years or three or four years to work for Clarian. The Director of Athletics, Foundation and Alumni Association continue to report to me as they have previously, as do the Chancellors of all the regional campuses. On my cabinet I have, I’ve expanded it to be actually more comparable to the size of cabinet that President Brand used and that includes a representative of the regional Chancellors Ruth Puce, is Ruth here? She’s not. Oh Bruce is here, right. And a number of other, some deans and some other people. And reverted to the process of alternating meetings of that group, that leadership group, between the two major campuses. So the meetings alternate back and forth between Bloomington and Indianapolis. I’m actually hoping that we might even look at having some of the meetings on regional campuses at some point as well. That’s, that’s basically the appointments, the new appointments many of those people are known to many of you here. They have been, I think, fine servants of the university for many years and I think this is as good as and as talented a group as I’ve worked with in my years, my nearly eleven years, in this institution. Let’s see, I was trying to see if there was anything else I wanted to say about that. But that’s basically the structure of the, of those offices, some of those people have only just come on board. Bill Stephan only started yesterday. His office is upstairs and Ed Marshall only started a couple of weeks ago and so on, but I believe everybody is now on board, all those appointments. It’ll take people a little longer to find to fully find their feet but most of those people know the university well so they’re settling in rapidly. The next point I wanted to tell you about is master planning. I announced at the
Trustees meeting on Friday that I’m commencing an exercise to develop a true master plan for
the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses as phase one and then as phase two, we’ll look at a
more general land-use plan for all of the regional campuses but the master plan for the
Bloomington/Indianaplis will be the first stage of that. Terry Clapacs’ office is putting together
just at this moment a specification of what we require for a master plan. I put together a group
I’ve called the University Master Planning Committee that will have Lisa and Bart on it as well
as a variety of other people from the university and I’m putting that in place at the moment. We
will then seek responses from architectural firms that specialize in master planning for large
organizations in particular and hopefully universities in general both in this country and even
overseas and we will interview somewhere between I would say 10, maybe 8 to 10, of these
companies probably over a weekend so we can get the ability to put our undivided attention into
this matter. This is partly in response to a report which you’ll remember that, or some of you
will remember that I did, I think some of you actually were involved in it. A report that I did
when I was VP for research about the need for research space and that report was just restricted
to Bloomington and Indianapolis but it was put together by two task forces: one on this campus
and one in Bloomington and they did an excellent job and the aggregate amount of space that
they believe that we need and this was done by basically by the Associate Deans in all the
schools, so this was done by people who really had some detailed knowledge of the space needs
of their schools the total amount of space needed was in the vicinity of five million gross square
feet of space. So even if one was to heavily prioritize that based on the standing of the individual
units and the really substantial top priority needs and if you halved it, that’s still a very, very
substantial amount of space. So this is a major step in starting to address those space needs, it’s
not the only step clearly, there are many, many others involved but it will help us really
determine how this campus will develop, how Bloomington will develop and as we start to
expand the campuses further in various directions how best to do that in the most efficient way
that best fits the research and teaching needs of the institutions. I would hope that we can have a
recommendation, this is going to be a fairly aggressive schedule, but we can have a
recommendation ready to go the Trustees by the December meeting. And then this process will
take, sorry let me say, at the same time, I’ve asked both Karen and Charles Bantz to reactivate
the two committees that I used when I was VP for research to develop the detailed analysis of the
space needs of the two campuses to review and revise those figures, I think it will probably be a
pretty different group of people and the figures will probably change, I would say reasonably
significantly, not hugely. And then, then have that information ready or close to ready when
we’ve chosen a master planner and we’re ready to start that process. I expect that that process
will be quite extensive in how it involves all the constituencies of the universities and will take
place over next year, next calendar year, 2008. And the goal will be hopefully, to be able to
bring a master plan to the trustees by December 2008. So that’s master planning. Let me also
say about the Trustees, I think as some of you are aware, the Trustees have decided to cut back
on the meetings somewhat so there will be fewer meetings of the Trustees so the next Trustees
meeting will not be until December of this year, so some of these matters we were discussing
before if we can get those cleaned up adequately whatever the issues are resolved concerning
some of them we might be able to take most, if not all of them, to the Trustees for their attention
at that meeting. Finally let me, actually two other points. Sponsored research, we as a
university, the total amount of sponsored research externally sponsored research for the
university for the last financial year was 433 million dollars. This is the second highest figure
ever and is about a 3% increase over the figure for last year. Now, the overall figure is excellent
I think it reflects enormous credit on all involved, all the faculty and others who contributed to this. It does contain as many of the previous figures have a large one time grant from the Lilly Endowment a 40 million dollar grant for the Center on Philanthropy. There have been previous grants of that size 53 million a couple of years ago, 105 a couple of years before that for INGEN and so on. So this does tend to cause a sort of fluctuation in the overall pattern of our grants, so if you look down at the underlying figures there is an issue of concern and that simply is that in the same way that you see NIH and NSF funding is flattening out we see a flattening out on the amount of money that we bring in from the NSF an NIH in fact we’re seeing a slight decline. Figures already this year are looking somewhat better, but there is no doubt that we are, like many other universities, by and large riding the NSF/NIH curve when it comes to externally sponsored research and we are now seeing that flattening and of course this is going to have implications for the university because this is how most of our research is funded. That requires funding obviously and so that is an issue of concern. I think a lot of issues that I’ll be focusing on and I think many people in this room, Karen and others, will be focusing on will be aimed at how we can reverse that trend if possible and how we can also stem it and as even before we reverse it. So that’s the situation with sponsored research. And finally, just some comments on the fall classes. We had, I think it was the second largest number of students ever and just a shade under 100,000 students on all the campuses up over about 1.2%. Enrollment is up on all of the campuses except one by somewhere between one and three percentage points. Bloomington had its most academically well prepared class for a long time with a 25 point SAT jump to be 1 point ahead of Purdue which people were very pleased with. And overall, I think on all the campuses the figures were by and large, by and large excellent in terms of numbers and the quality. There’s definitely a shift on I think all of our campuses except Bruce’s as he keeps pointing out to me, towards more full-time students. The student bodies on all their campuses looking more traditional. And this has been a trend that has continued over the last five years. Bruce maintains a kind of interesting mix of both where there doesn’t seem to be a clear trend in either direction. You taught me well Bruce. But overall, I think those figures look excellent in terms of the student enrollment. So those are just some key points. I personally being I think must have given well over a hundred, probably closer to two hundred speeches in the last six months and have tried to be as active and vigorous as I can in pursuing the university’s interest and with all the multiple, multiple constituencies that we have both in the state and outside the state as well and I think the, there’s no doubt that the university really is extraordinarily highly regarded in the state. My goal is to try to continue to improve on that with, obviously, your assistance.

AGENDA ITEM #6: PRESIDENT’S QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

McRobbie: So questions? Yes Marty. Why am I not surprised you’re the first question?

Spechler: What’s that?

McRobbie: Why am I not surprised by you giving the first question?

Spechler: Well, because I thought about it before the speech, that’s why. Well I wanted to congratulate you on the quality of the people you’ve convinced to put on your cabinet. I’m very impressed with those I know and it clearly shows the advantage of having a President who knows the territory, as the Trustees said. Now, my question has to do with the positions that are
still open. I think you’d probably agree, that aside from fundraising, the most important job of
the University President is to appoint competent people to carry out the basic mission of research
and teaching. And so maybe we could review a little bit, some of these very important
appointments at the B-level that are going to be crucial for the years ahead and in particular,
Michael, could you tell us about your plans for consulting the faculty in the appointment process
to make sure that we’re all familiar with the people and the objectives you’re setting for them.

McRobbie: Right. Well Marty, as with the five Deans that I appointed last year, all Deans are
appointed by policy through a process of search where there are search committees that, whose
members are determined by the relevant campus official and myself in some cases and the
relevant faculty councils. That will continue. There’s no question of that changing. I believe I
appointed five Deans last year all done with search committees There’s I think, there’s going to
be another three or four deans in SPEA, Optometry, the Library, and I’m missing one..

Spechler: My school, the School of Liberal Arts.

McRobbie: Liberal Arts, sorry, of course, yeah, Liberal arts, they will all be Deans will be found
for those in the usual way. It will be up to the campus offices when those searches start.

Spechler: SPEA.

McRobbie: SPEA, I said SPEA, yeah right, SPEA. Yeah SPEA I think is started, SPEA is
already started. SPEA’s started. Optometry, I don’t think the Dean stands down for a while, but
that one will start pretty soon, Karen will restart the library search, which sadly, we weren’t able
to find an appropriate person though it started off well, it looked great, but the people fell away a
little bit. I think Karen’s going to start there in the next probably few months or so, so they will
just proceed in the normal orthodox way.

Spechler: Would you permit me another question about the master plan? I remember when you
presented this very ambitious thing, and as an economist I immediately pick up that demand for
space vastly exceeds the likely supply of the space. And that poses the question of how we’re
going to cut down what people say they need. I need a bigger office, too, by the way… (END
OF SIDE A OF TAPE ONE; Missing Comments)

McRobbie: Right, that’s an excellent question.

Schneider: …in the interim the research one is the one that’s closest, and I assume that’s part of
the reason for the concern for all the faculty in that area.

McRobbie: Of course. Right.

Schneider: Can you talk a little about the difference between, it sounded like the main ___ of
that position was different from the one that you held.

McRobbie: It is. Right.
Schneider: Could you talk a little about the difference?

McRobbie: Right. It’s, the research administration position is really focused on two key areas; one is grants administration, and the second is research compliance and those are both administrative functions. And they both really, you can think of them as being services that are provided to the researchers, but they both are heavily affected by government policies and regulations and laws and so on. And to inadequately perform in adhering to those policies and laws and so on can result in pretty draconian penalties for institutions. I mean the, one of the key ones being the freezing of federal research funding which some universities have suffered from. This is an attempt to significantly improve our services in that area. In the sponsored research funding area, one thing I’ve done there is put together is, I believe as being the desire of many researchers for a long time, put together pre-award grant processing and post-award grant processing, which had been in two completely separate offices. Pre-award grant processing had a least at one point been in the VP for Research Office then got broken up. Post-award grant processing was in what was then Judy Palmer’s office. So you had this sort of disconnect where you may be working with the same person at the NSF on a grant. Once you get the grant you then flip to working with a different person in a different office, and I have to say that even when I was VP for Research I heard repeated complaints about that situation, so I’ve rectified that. But I think that we, it’s important to improve significantly our activities in that general area of research administration. I think once that’s improved we can then review the question as to whether that’s the best model to continue with, or whether we should move back to the model of a full scale VP for Research as was the case when I was in that position, but I’ve left that open. In either case, that would be a position that in my view would be appropriately filled by a search, because it’s a matter that directly affects the academic mission of the university, the research mission of the university.

Schneider: What about the two big campuses and the research administration there? There are appointments in the administration in Bloomington and Indianapolis aren’t there?

McRobbie: Yes. Yes, so their responsibilities are for what I call research development. And in those jobs they report to the Provost or the Chancellor, and appropriately so, too. Yeah. Any other questions? Yes.

Bjornson: On our campus I’m hearing a lot of complaints about the new bookstore and I’m hearing students and faculty say that the books, the price of books went up dramatically, and I’ve heard that they are thirty percent higher than they were last year. And I’m hearing that they’re $40 per book higher than they were last year. And in a course, that I’m using we have a brand new textbook, first time it’s been used, the book says ‘If you’re buying this textbook new, you have free access to the website.’ And the bookstore apparently bought the books from a discount house and so the first part of the password for the website weren’t included. So even though the students are buying the books brand new, they don’t have access to the website, and I’m just wondering if some kind of an investigation could be done so that we know what’s going on. If it, we have a change in policy, are you saying some things were going to happen anyway, and so there really isn’t any effect from Barnes & Noble taking over the bookstores?
McRobbie: Let me take that one on notice. Probably, I know this is going to come up in my discussion with the Agenda Committee, but let me take that on notice and try to get a response for the next meeting. Yeah, I mean I think there’s a lot of rumors flying around and we need to sort of separate out sort of fact from rumor in this matter, too.

Pratt: May I make one comment to that?

McRobbie: Sure.

Pratt: I know that in Bloomington they have specifically asked the BFC to put out the word that there is an individual in the Contracts and Grants Office that wants to receive those complaints, and is then directly taking those complaints to Barnes & Noble and is demanding that they negotiate a solution. So I don’t know what’s happening on the individual campuses, but I know in Bloomington it’s being looked at aggressively and there is an individual who’s keeping track of the number of complaints and the nature of the complaints. I hope that’s true in Indianapolis.

Ng: Well I suppose that this is really, because the outsourcing is done through one central office, so if that person is handling complaints from Bloomington, that person should handle complaints from all campuses.

McRobbie: Yes. Or it should.

Pratt: I will check with Contracts and Grants, I’ll get the name of the individual and we’ll send it out...

Ng: Yeah, yeah great.

Pratt: …Craig if you want to remind me? We’ll send it out by e-mail to all of you, because we want everybody to know what the path is for those complaints to get into the hands of one individual so we can count them at the end of the day and know how serious the problem is. Thank you for bringing that up.

McRobbie: Yeah, I think it’s very important that if people have a, I mean I think it’s important to try to determine the facts and make sure that one has the facts right, but if there are issues, I think it’s essential that they be brought to the attention of the person that Lisa mentioned. Because this is a, the university’s entered into a major commitment here and we’ve got to make sure we’re getting what we contracted for. Yes, Mary?

Fisher: I guess I’ve been waiting to see if everybody else was going to ask this obvious question, but we are still seeing performance issues with Oncourse CL And what hope do we have that it won’t continue on so? Or what’s being done to try to avoid that?

McRobbie: Well I don’t have the details in my head, Mary, but I spoke to Brad Wheeler about this. I think about maybe two weeks ago or something and Brad indicated there had been an issue that he believes has been rectified, but people are still seeing issues.
**Fisher:** I keep giving the __ forums is really bad. I downloaded an attachment and the whole computer freezes up and I had turn off my computer and then turn it back on and this happens two or three times. It’s just…

**McRobbie:** Would you, would you, maybe there are, obviously the two of you have the same concern, could you get me directly just a brief statement of what your concern is and let me…

**Fisher:** Well, I send in one of those help complaints every time, sure…

**McRobbie:** Well…

**Fisher:** …but…

**McRobbie:** …send me something. (Laughter) And let me take it up with Brad, because I, it doesn’t sound like this is completely sorted out yet. And then I’ll, we’ll see what response we can get to that. Send me something directly.

**Pratt:** One of the students is saying it kicks the students out, too.

**Fulk:** It kicks the students out, too, so it’s not just a faculty issue. (Laughter)

**Male Speaker:** It kicks the students out too, so don’t feel bad.

**Wokeck:** No, it kicks everybody out.

**McRobbie:** Why don’t you sort of coordinate them. Mary can get me a response, just so I can get a number of different individuals on this one and so on. Okay, why don’t move, why don’t we move on?

**Ng:** May I actually just, I forgot to introduce Craig.

**McRobbie:** Oh.

**Ng:** Sorry, I forgot to actually do a very important introduction today. As you know that Kelly Kish has been our coordinator for the UFC for a number of years, has done a fantastic job. And I’m just very happy to really introduce to you today our new UFC coordinator, who will also support the BFC and he is Craig Dethloff. And Craig has a Ph.D. in Classics and so he can, you know, keep us on our toes well enough. And so I just wanted to take this opportunity to really welcome him and look forward to his support in the coming year. And I also want to introduce one other person from that Faculty Office who’s always been helping us and that is Robin Murphey, and so I also…

**Pratt:** Robin can you wave?

**Ng:** Yeah wave.
Pratt: Thank you.

Ng: And finally I just want to take this opportunity to thank one person who has just resigned and that’s Molly Martin. It’s a great loss to the IFC and also to the UFC as well. But you still can see her hovering around and keeping everything straight, but Molly has gotten a position with the Lumina Foundation, an excellent position and if you see her, make sure you offer her our congratulations and thanks. And we are quickly moving ahead with looking for a replacement for Molly. So thank you very much.

McRobbie: I should say that Kelly Kish has come to work for me which I think Lisa said was an act of hostility against the Faculty Councils.

Pratt: That’s exactly right.

Ng: So if you have any problems, blame it on Michael.

AGENDA ITEM #7. PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEW IN FACULTY RANKS BY THE OFFICE OF EVP BANTZ

McRobbie: Let’s move on Agenda Item 7. David, I think you are to report on this, is that correct? Would you like…?

Malik: Sure.

Pratt: Do you want to use a microphone?

Ng: The microphone is over there.

Malik: Can I just speak loudly?

Pratt: We can hear you up here.

McRobbie: Sure.

Malik: I mean I’m used to speaking to hundreds of students under the same model. First off, Charles Bantz, who is the Executive Vice President in this area was not able to come today, so I’m here. Second, there’s a handout that you should have gotten, you received today that is the current version of a work in progress. Actually this has been in progress for the past six months. It came out of the last two years of the Executive Vice President’s responsibility for making recommendations on promotion and tenure at Indianapolis and the regional campuses so Bloomington will go through Provost Hanson, but the others go through Executive Vice President Bantz. Just to make two comments before I entertain your questions. We determined there were some problems in looking at all the tenure and promotion documentation from all the campuses and that there were a lot of very different practices and policies that in some cases made it very difficult, you know, to figure out exactly what was going on. And there’s some problems of unfairness and inequity and ambiguity. There were, if I tell you some of the horror stories about people multiply voting at different levels, it could easily spiral into a quagmire of
inequity. So in order to avoid litigious outcomes, lawsuits and other difficulties, and actually come up with a recommendation that would be wrong, the Academic Leadership Council has been undertaking discussions about what issues should be common amongst all of us. This isn’t in any way, shape or form an attempt to change the determination of standards. That is clearly something which rests with departments and the schools. This is all about the process and bearings. So we wanted to identify some common objectives and expectations in the process. We wanted to increase the accuracy and fairness of the evaluation throughout. We want to ensure that faculty reviews are clearly present, that administrator reviews are clearly present, and documented as well. And that the focus on procedures and process provided the greatest flexibility for future growth and improvement of our campuses was possible, in other words; how do we make sure we can evolve into, as some in the commission of higher education say, (noise in conference room, comments lost) so with that in mind. (Laughter) Was that the buzzer for how much time I have? We’re open to feedback, as I said before, your Vice Chancellors Reck and __ have been providing lots of feedback as well and so this is why it’s a work in progress. We’ve spent a lot of time this past summer at a retreat among other things, and so I welcome your comments.

McRobbie: Yes.

Coffin: I have one question and one comment. Do we find what the UFC’s role in this is, are we being asked at some point to approve this? Or is this something that is being presented to us for information and feedback, but is, the adoption of it is going to be determined and currently it is fine?

Ng: I believe this is going to be determined external to this body. The reason why this item comes up, there were members of the Agenda Committee who are representing various campuses raised this issue with us. And we thought it would be very good for Charles Bantz’ office to make a presentation to the UFC so that our people understand what is the purpose of what they’re trying to do and at the same time give a forum to people who have questions to talk about it.

Coffin: And then my comment, actually I understand the desire to have a shorter, a smaller amount of paper to look at, because God knows, even at campus level, even at department level in keeping with any hearings, the amount of paper that shows up is enough to give you severe back problems if you pick up the dossier. But it is not clear to me why that needs to be separated from the balance of the dossier; why there could not be the summary portion that they ask for here as long as, along with the rest of the documentation, rather than if necessary going through a process of asking for the rest of the documentation. I mean, that doesn’t seem to me to be necessarily a useful additional step. The other thing I would say is, that on, I guess, page 3 of this is practices to enhance the value of external letters, I think that’s long overdue. And very clear guidelines about what the external letters should look like is something that would be extraordinarily useful. And all those things there seem to me to be desirable characteristics that had not always been practices that have been followed.

McRobbie: Do you want to respond? Do you want to respond David or…?
Malik: Yes. The idea of a summary dossier is not to make a departmental level reevaluation of all the information in the dossier. I mean, the Chancellor is an expert in communications. He doesn’t want to say, ‘Ah! Here comes a Communications dossier! You know this isn’t a very good publication, where are they going with that?’ It’s to really avoid that; not to look at all the teaching evaluations and things like that. (cell phone chimes) Sorry, I turned it off earlier. The idea is to allow that to be part of the faculty process, and a lot of the information we are not looking for are copies of the syllabus for every course that people have taught. Some of the dossiers we received in the past two years are complete teaching evaluations that every single one of the students filled out which we thought was unnecessary information. We’re more interested in what your committees and the departments and schools thought about the teaching evaluations and when you give a report we don’t need to second guess what those conclusions are. So I think that’s in a nutshell why we were looking for a more streamlined dossier. If there are issues of great conflict where departments and schools and campuses say, ‘Oh, this is really crazy!’ And we don’t have any documentation on that at all. Well it would be nice to see at what people are at such differences of opinion. So that’s the abbreviated version. Most of the decision making at the EVP level has been really to look at the total set of evaluations from all faculty and individuals and all the administrative committees. And just to give you an idea of the magnitude, there were about 150 dossiers that were reviewed here and less than a dozen actually were discussed by the Vice President. So it’s a very small number. As you might imagine it’s usually the ones that are highly controversial and complete turn around is along the way. If faculty and administrators are agreeing they don’t get a lot of attention. If there’s a sentiment to advance or a sentiment to do something negative that pretty much is contradicted. Does that answer that question?

McRobbie: Sorry, George first.

Bodmer: Let me see, I am truly, having sat on many committees, that it, you know, it would be, to streamline these things always seems like a good idea and I also agree with what I heard that, you know, it would be foolish to think that somebody, somewhere up the line is going to turn every page and look at every page. However, when a candidate puts a dossier together this is an argument and every piece of it puts, you know, fits together and makes the argument that that candidate has tried to make for his promotion and/or tenure. I think that I see the dossier going forward and things are added to it, letters from the committees, letters from deans, I don’t see things coming out of it. I think that’s wrong, and you know, who’s going to put, the candidate is not putting the summary together. Someone else is putting the summary together. Once it goes up, if somebody in Indianapolis then says, ‘Okay, I have questions of this, so I want more evidence.’ Then he’s going to send back through the BCAA and then BCAA is going to go through that dossier and fill out the evidence. It’s not the candidate doing that. You know I find this very troubling, and I just think it’s a mistake, and I understand that you don’t want your office cluttered up with 150, you know, big boxes of notebooks and things, but beyond it, I just find this very troubling and, you know, I’m very much against this.

McRobbie: Yeah.

Pomper: I would like to echo this. I think much of this draft here contradicts what is stated in IU. For example, it says there that the entire dossier is used in making the determination of
tenure, all the way along to the Board of Trustees. If you choose only to read part of it, that is your prerogative, but you cannot make decisions based upon saying, ‘I just want the committee bits. I just want this.’ If you only want to do that you can have the entire document and read only the first couple of pages. But I don’t think we should prescribe that we can only forward certain pieces.

**McRobbie:** Yes, Marty.

**Spechler:** Charles, I’d like to ask you about the status of pre-tenure reviews. That is, in many schools, I guess yours too, after a certain number of years, three years of so, somebody reviews new candidates, probationary candidates towards tenure. And they are supposed to write out a helpful guide to what you need to gain tenure. My question is whether those types of letters are to be included in the dossier. Any previous reviews by the department or by the school, by the dean, in particular this formal, pre-tenure review?

**Malik:** Are you talking to me?

**Spechler:** Charles?

**Unknown Female Speaker:** That’s David.

**Spechler:** David, yeah that’s David. David or Charles? I thought you were supposed to be speaking for Charles.

**Malik:** I am. But they’re my answers, they’re not his answers. I think that I’ve been long in the system at IU and I can only speak about ___ and I don’t know what the rules are, is that the interim reports aren’t generally included in the promotion and tenure documents. In many ways I think faculty don’t like that and I would agree with them. Why would you want to bring up issues that may have been critical in the past, where they’ve remedied them, you know, and they make or take corrective action? And at the time of tenure or promotion, do you necessarily want to read through all those previous decisions? So I think the custom has been; create the document that can be created that day and to go with that. I think on the other hand we get to a board of review, that’s when this information becomes essential for understanding what the process has been and what’s come out of that process.

**McRobbie:** Anna?

**McDaniel:** I believe, that IUPUI passed the policy about third-year reviews. And I believe that the policy forbids those third-year reviews from being included in the final, formal…

**Fisher:** The annual reviews are forbidden. They’re not, they are not to be part of the dossier. According to our __ policy.

**Spechler:** Well, now I understand that David, you do complicate the matter by bringing in board of reviews. Suppose that the dean or school committee says ‘Well you have so-and-so for publications, you know, or a big grant, then you’ll be ready for tenure,’ and now that’s not
included. So a person could then bring it to the Board of Review and say, ‘Look here, this is what they told me to do. I did it, and now they’re not giving me tenure.’

**Malik:** I think that’s not what we’re talking about today.

**Spechler:** I understand that it’s not what we’re addressing.

**McRobbie:** Mary.

**Fisher:** I want to speak in favor of the document, because having been on some boards of review at IUPUI, many of these things have not been stated clearly and the very things that are here like people having double votes, and the things like that have been issues in boards of review. And if we have a nice, this is very clearly written, very clearly communicated and if there’s other things that we would like, maybe we would like to have a chance to give you feedback on specifically about what’s in or not in here. But this type of document would be very helpful to all of us and I would welcome it myself.

**McRobbie:** Yes.

**Cordell:** When putting together a document of this kind, it’s difficult to reflect on variations in units and in types of faculty, I realize that. There is a particular problem with the six external letters which were very important one would presume in this document, and that you would want those letters to address the area of excellence that you state. Librarians in the system must show excellence in performance that is the performance of their assigned duties and that is the majority of their time spent in that area. It’s very difficult to get someone off your campus who knows any details about your performance, and so this emphasis on those letters being external can be problematic for the library faculty.

**McRobbie:** Other comments? Yes.

**Wokeck:** The same holds true with some of the teaching faculty that teach more vaguely because they teach performance excepting maybe a teaching portfolio on a campus and not elsewhere so that’s a similar situation. One suggestion made instead of making it clearer in the guidelines built on the summary dossier component, but we have a distinction in the School of Liberal Arts before the dossiers of what the appendices are. And the appendices do not hold forward, but that’s not really a summary dossier and that’s the dossier, and hence you don’t have that problem of being extracting or not knowing what’s going to be stripped off at one stage or at the other. And I think you want to make it very clear that there are different components of the dossiers and that they can make and replace and that the administrators understand which parts of that dossier go forward in what format. And if that is met, that particular issue, then I think you can, then it’s fair. Otherwise it would be the presumption of the administrator to strip off what is convenient, because of a social reason.

**McRobbie:** Other comments? Bill.
**Schneider:** Yeah I have a question, and I hope you take this in the right spirit. My question is why isn’t IU Bloomington campus included by the same kinds of guidelines? And anticipating your answer, my follow up question would be why is IUPUI included in these guidelines? And I’m perhaps answering for you, is it just because these are Charles’ responsibilities? Those campuses?

**Malik:** Yes. (Laughter)

**Schneider:** I would suggest we have a bit of a danger there. We really do want to have…

**Malik:** Bear in mind…

**Schneider:** …what are entirely heartfelt policies that are the same at all five locations.

**Malik:** Bear in mind a year ago or two years ago when Charles was named Executive Vice President. That was his domain of responsibility and Provost McRobbie was responsible for the tenure and promotion commission. Now we have a slightly new world order with two Executive Vice Presidents, I think that the distinction’s still present, but I think that would be Provost Hanson’s area to resolve of what needs to be done.

**Cordell:** Given that we are under a single IU Handbook that covers PTR procedures, it might be appropriate for two Executive Vice Presidents to work together to come to an agreement and cut a document.

**McRobbie:** I think that, sorry Karen did you want to…?

**Hanson:** Well one of that, I was in on part of the discussion of, involved in the creation of this document and one of the things that was at issue was the number of letters and there are units on the Bloomington campus that require numerous letters and certainly this _____ will not be happy then. I don’t think the Bloomington campus would, the units that require more letters would have backed down from that requirement, so there are some other issues.

**McRobbie:** Herb.

**Terry:** Being in Bloomington, this doesn’t at the moment apply to us. But I would make one observation, that one thing in here that is not thanks to Charles or to the Vice President, it’s the attempt to explain who gets to vote on a tenure case in a faculty review committee. I support the basic language here, those who participate fully should be the ones who get votes, but I would point out that from a perspective of at least some faculty members, you work with a colleague for a long time. They are gone because of a sabbatical, or something like that, they are not able to participate. I hope this contemplates some forms of distance participation into, that faculty members who participate in their program could do something like that and not be deprived of the ability to vote simply because they were not physically present and we’ve had this come up in my department, for example, when there isn’t any clear policies on it and I think it’s used for end of __.
McRobbie: Yeah.

Bodmer: I mean, lots of people here are in Indianapolis and Bloomington and we in the small campuses are kind of out-shouted, out-spoken, out-voiced. I mean, right here it says “committee members’ ranks should be equal to or higher than that sought by candidate.” Our own campus promotion and tenure commitments are not made up of only full professors. It’s a small campus, it’s a small group; we have associate professors and full professors. You know, some of these things are applicable to the larger campuses and not so applicable to the smaller campuses to which it is mostly been directed and affected.

McRobbie: Other comments.

Bodmer: Actually, excuse me. May I add that may be we need to get together a group of the regional campuses to talk about this by themselves.

McRobbie: Hold on a second; who was up? Someone up here, Bruce?

Bergland: From a quick reading of this and the comments, this is focused primarily on the dossier and does not necessarily have to do with the actual order of steps that are followed in getting tenure.

Malik: That is correct, not the order of the steps.

Bergland: Yes.

Malik: Yeah.

Bergland: I guess the reason I am asking is that that way is, at least in my experience ____, each campus follows very different steps in terms of moving from the beginning of the process to the point where it goes in this case now to Charles, and I didn’t know if we were going to work on that as a part of the process or just focus on the dossier.

Malik: That has not been discussed, the order of the steps.

McRobbie: Other comments? Yes, Karen.

Hanson: I’m coming late and David can correct me if I’m wrong, but I assume we have the impression that the regional campuses all the representation on the committee that reviews this document.

Malik: They do. All the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs on all campuses are on this and they have made comments in the evolution and, just to address that latest one, even IUPUI has associate professors on their campus Tenure and Promotion Committee. They just abstain when it comes up for the full professorhood. So there are mechanisms that allow you to have great flexibility and still function in the way you might want to.
McRobbie: Yes.

Bodmer: At the Indiana University Northwest campus we didn’t hear about this policy until two weeks ago. We didn’t hear about this discussion.

Malik: I think we’ve been trying to develop it over the course of time. I think it’s progress, so you know, perhaps that this is the first day of the direction we’ve taken

McRobbie: David, what is the next step? What is it that you would be proposing to do with this next because…

Malik: Next is that probably at the ALC meeting making the changes and then covering some of the other issues that were brought up at our last meeting and then say, ‘this is what we’re ready to go with.’ Then have our final review and determine that the consensus of this is the way we could proceed and that we, the campuses could live with it. Remember, this is for things that are being evaluated at the Executive Vice President’s office that go on to the President. This is what makes us comfortable, okay? If campuses do things differently and people don’t get six letters in, we’re not turning anything back or away we’re just saying we’ll do what we can do, and make the recommendations as carefully as we can, but this is a way of improving how we’re able to make those recommendations.

McRobbie: Yes, Lisa.

Pratt: Michael is somebody, there are some issues that have been raised about whether or not there are points of conflict with the handbook. Who is going to be responsible to reconcile this with the handbook?

McRobbie: Well, I think the first step would be the ALC looking at exactly that question. I was going to suggest that a way to proceed here would be for all the representatives of the regional campuses who are here and have had issues to take those up with the vice chancellors for academic affairs as a matter of urgency. Get those concerns to them quickly. And, when you meet again, when’s the ALC meeting next?

Malik: December, at the board of Trustees meeting. There may be something in the interim but…

McRobbie: You may want to even get together by phone or something to look at this issues that the ALC then consider all these issues, consider the issue Lisa just raised and any other issues with a view to potentially revising this particular document. It sounds like there may be some need to do that depending on what the academic officers come back with as well.

Coffin: Just a question for my own record from the people on the Council who are not from Bloomington and the policy does not apply to you. On how many of your campuses did your chief academic officer talk to the faculty about this proposal? Only IUB’s wasn’t it? I think that says something about a process here, I mean this is in fact a policy that would directly affect the
faculty and on one of the campuses on which this policy was going to be applied did the chief academic officer consult with the faculty?

**Pomper and Frantz raise hands**

**Coffin:** That worries me.

**Malik:** I’ve gotten input from other campuses.

**Coffin:** Well that worries me.

**McRobbie:** Two.

**Malik:** I think there was more feedback than you see.

**McRobbie:** The gentleman over there.

**Gerencser:** I’m from Indiana University South Bend and I know we’ve had a committee working with our vice chancellor and the faculty senate committee. I’m reviewing and bringing together the things from different divisions and colleges on campus. I am not aware, and this came up in our most recent senate meeting last Friday, if there is any interaction with that committee in terms of developing this policy, I actually fear that they’ll report that what they’ve just put together might be not put into place, listening to all this ruckus. But I actually I have one question or two about these external letters. One is, there seems to be at least an incongruity, but I’m not sure, between the paragraph that says following “President Ehrlich indicated a target number of six reviews, with at least four external to IU,” and that that is still a policy of IU, and then below “‘External’ means ‘not from the candidate’s home campus.’” There just seems to be an incongruity even clearer there of what is to stem from other campuses of Indiana University and what counts as an external review. And that also, it seems to me, there’s some language where some of the language says, ‘it must be this way,’ or ‘must be that way,’ and other places where it ‘should.’ And it seems to me that if you’re describing best practices where people understand this is how we would like to receive a case, then we will understand it best under those circumstances, the language of ‘should’ makes good sense. If, however, we determine that what the policy ‘must’ be on campus or they will not accept this, then whether or who may participate in the voting then that seems to be something different. I wonder if every ‘must’ here is intended to be a ‘must’ or whether a ‘should’ is only a ‘should,’ and then be clear here.

**McRobbie:** Yes, Martin.

**Spechler:** Well, Lisa raised the question of consistency between this and the Academic Handbook. I’d like to call your attention to the top three lines on the second page. To me after reading it several times, I still don’t understand that promotion and tenure require one area of excellence. Now what are the areas of excellence? *Research* in italics or, in italics, *Creative Activity-hyphen-Teaching Service*? What does all that mean? What are the areas of excellence here? This is really, to me, quite garbled. In the past, we required excellence in “*Research*” or
“Teaching” or “Balanced Case,” and possibly “Creative Activity,” but, I don’t understand this at all, the hyphens, the different italics, what’s going on?

**McRobbie:** David, do you want to respond?

**Malik:** Yeah, I mean, this is the handbook, the Academic Handbook. I don’t think there’s any ambiguity. I think “Research” and “Creative Activity” are coupled together. If you’re an artist, then you’re involved in “Creative Activity.” If you’re a scientist, it’s probably “Research,” but it could still be “Creative Activity.” That’s one entity. “Teaching” is one entity. “Service” is one entity. And the fourth, new entry is the “Balanced Case.”

**Spechler:** So what are the hyphens doing, David?

**Wokeck:** The problem is that you used hyphens instead of end dashes.

**Ng:** That’s right.

**Wokeck:** That’s what you should have used. (Laughter)

**Malik:** I’m sorry, I thought everyone knew, RSTB so well I guess that, I mean, in our discussion everyone had been pretty clear on....

**Wokeck:** It’s still not very clear.

**Malik:** That wasn’t meant to be a distracter in any way.

**Spechler:** So it’s research and librarian activity number one, teaching number two, service number three or balanced case number four.

**Malik:** Yes, that’s the way it’s always been.

**Wokeck:** So I’ve heard, but librarians have a different program.

**Malik:** Yes, and the next one is performance or professional development or service for librarians.

**Cordell:** That’s not true.

**Malik:** Where they say you have to be excellent in performing.

**Cordell:** Right. You have no choice.

**Malik:** Yeah, well…

**Spechler:** Could you put that so that ordinary readers could understand it?
Malik: No, this wasn’t necessarily meant for ordinary eyes. (Laughter)

McRobbie: Rosanne.

Cordell: I realize you’re designating this as procedural and not crossing the level of the handbook. But given the fact that it relates so closely to our procedures I think it might be appropriate for you to get direct input from the faculties and the PTR committees rather than relying on that happening through the academic officers given the fact that much of this discussion happened over the summer. And yes, I did see the first draft of this this summer, but my PTR committees, there is a committee, and there is an ad hoc committee that presents procedural issues. Neither of them were on campus I forwarded this material to them, but they did not have time to review it and get back to me.

McRobbie: Yes.

Frantz: I have question, is it the intent to apply this this fall to apply this__

Malik: Not necessarily. I think that the straightforward answer is that this is what we’re trying to work towards. I guess one could say this is a state of mind, you know. How do we put these things together? We don’t expect everyone to be working on these, because it’s too much, you can’t possibly do it. I mean, letters have gone out, professor letters have gone out probably in early summer, late spring. So it’s not realistic. On the other hand in terms of helping people put together the dossiers and other things it might be very helpful.

McRobbie: David I think maybe we could wind it up, I mean unless anybody’s dying to say something. But it does seem to me that you need to get more input from the VCAA’s I think they need to get input from the P and T committees and make sure that that’s being done and to deal with that accordingly. And also, there is this question of, you know, harmonizing things with the handbook which is obviously of concern so I think you’ve got a lot of feedback here. There are some issues that clearly need some more attention that I’ll assume that you can take up on the ALC. Yes, George.

Bodmer: You may not want to do this, but is this available in electronic form?

Malik: Yes, but bear in mind it’s a draft and changing every other day. But actually I was already asked to transmit an electronic copy and I will do that.

Wobeck: David next time you send it around would you drop by ____

McRobbie: Yes?

Andre De Tienne: I am Andre De Tienne IUPUI, co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee and I have not ever been asked to intervene in this matter and I am wondering sometimes why, what is happening, whether faculty affairs has anything to do with it, because P and T procedures are part of that..
Ng: To answer that question. The genesis of this is really I mean, all procedures are very well established as far as I can tell. There is really, despite what is said about IUPUI and regional campuses. There is no change in our procedures at all. This really is to, because all the dossiers now from the smaller campuses are now being channeled through our Chancellor’s office. So the way I read this document is this is his attempt to kind of get some, you know, kind of uniformity in the dossiers that come through his office. And of course as you can hear today there are other implications. It is not just simply the form. So I did not feel that there was in fact, that the issue need to be revisited in the context of promotion and tenure at the IUPUI campus or the requirement six letters and whatnot already being enforced for years, for the last fifteen years. So, am I correct? There’s no change in our procedure whatsoever so that’s why I didn’t invite, didn’t send the draft over to you.

McRobbie: Okay, why don’t we move on then to...who’s…

Ng: There’s Irene, Professor …

McRobbie: Irene…

Ng: Tajalli.

McRobbie: Where is she?

Ng: Right over there.

McRobbie: Over there sorry, yes please. Would you like to report?

Queiro-Tajalli: My name is Irene Queiro-Tajalli I am the Executive Director of Demographic Education for the School of Social Work and I have the pleasure of serving (new tape break) School of Social Work has had a presence in IU for since 1911 and we are the oldest School of Social Work connected with a university or institution of higher education. We offer a Bachelors in Social Work, a Masters in Social Work, and a Ph.D. in Social Work. And we have been accredited by the Council of Social Work Education from the very beginning. Why I’m saying this because as of July the first, we have found this house of Labor Studies and this has happened thanks to the work of a few people in various campuses and particularly here at IUPUI. Both the faculty of Labor Studies as well as the faculty of Social Work have approved such a move. I was asked today to give you a report and obviously, I have done, all of us have done a lot of work, but I’m not so sure how much you want to know in terms of the details for what we produce. I should say that we are proceeding very well thanks to the faculty in Labor Studies who have been very supportive, very appreciative of finding a house or a unit to work with. And I think that again, __ an addition to our field as well as our faculty and their faculty. We are trying to work at the administrative level, obviously for two years they have been in a very difficult situation so a lot of producing needs to be done. A lot of work and lots of communication is taking place between their faculty and the faculty in Social Work. Lots of administrative procedures are beginning to be taking place so we can come to in a productive way with transparency and without trying to solve some questions that were posed in the past. We’re ready, the faculty have revised their mission. The staff has been very supportive and we have
had a good opportunity with the staff we have had two-three weeks with the faculty, and as I said overall I think we have made a very good move for the university. But then, I don’t know what kind of questions you would like to ask me. Tell me what you have in mind, and we will go from there.

McRobbie: Marty.

Spechler: Well many of us who’ve been on this body for a while, congratulate you on a merger and helping us solve the problem of finding a good academic place for labor studies. Now, as I remember the discussion about this. There were three, at least three issues that came up and maybe you can address them. The first is whether advocacy in the Department of Labor Studies, Division of Labor Studies which I think one of their visions maybe proper vision is going to be handed over in a responsible and balanced manner so that students understand all aspects of public policy issues that are printed in the division. That’s number one. Secondly, there was a matter of the academic standards. What we wanted and I think what they wanted and what they promised was that the Labor Studies would have the same, I hope, high standards for teaching and research that we aspire to everywhere in the university and that the same procedures would be used in Labor Studies as everywhere else to make sure that this is true. And that includes peer review of teaching as well as articles and so forth. Just the normal course of ensuring standards that we use everywhere else in the university and the third, financial sustainability. Whether the school the division of labor studies which has always financed itself in a, let’s say, an unusual way with a lot of distance education a lot of second half courses on other campuses and so forth on other campuses, you probably know that, whether the Labor Studies is financially solvent and helping you rather than diverting resources from the other wonderful things that you do. So those are the three issues that I recall, Herb maybe, he and I have been on this for a long time, maybe he knows more, but advocacy, standards, and financial sustainability, those are the three issues that I remember.

Queiro-Tajalli: Well I can say that certainly there has been an extended time of what Labor Studies was all about or what was happening and perhaps I’m very naïve, and I’m glad that I’m the Executive Director because I think what we it means is labor (laughter) and I don’t’ have any baggages from the past, in fact I wasn’t part of the discussions. But I should say, that yes advocacy has a role in Labor Studies as it has in many other disciplines as I have observed through my 20 plus years of service at Indiana University, and I think advocacy has a place, but it has to be done with all the respect that an academic environment requires of that topic. And I believe that that is the aim not only of Social Work but of Labor Studies. So I don’t have any doubts about it. In terms of academic standards, they which means us, are not treated any differently from the tenure and promotion processes than any other faculty in the School of Social Work. In fact they have in the Labor Studies program, they have gone from education to program, the Labor Studies program has a unit committee to figure out promotions. And the transition team says that that tenure and promotion committee should be composed of two faculty members from Labor Studies and three faculty members from the discipline of the professor that goes for tenure or promotion. From there it goes to the School of Social Work tenure and promotion committee and then from there it goes to the campus. And tenure and promotion is provided in IUPUI so you can cut through the IUPUI tape for promotions. Therefore, I don’t see that it’s any different than any other academic unit. And in terms of the
financial responsibility of course that’s currently a question for our leader being Michael Patchner, but I can say that at this point, there is no, I don’t see any problems in terms of their financial responsibility towards other units that’s, you know, the same as our other three programs. In terms of credit productions they have happened and the students are, we are producing credit hours. The compressed courses under our leadership will have the same quality as any other course. The evaluative processes are the same for labor studies as they are for the Ph.D. or D.S.W or the Masters program. Again, in terms of the financial report I do not get any red flags from my unit and I don’t think we will if we continue building, rebuilding and having the support of not only our own faculty but also of both the campuses where we have the program and I think all the campuses have been very gracious in supporting us.

McRobbie: Other questions?

Terry: Marty indicated that I also had an interest in given that I am from Bloomington and what I wanted to say is that I am extraordinarily pleased at everything I’ve heard about how this is working out. My primary concern was not so much for the state of IU Bloomington but rather for the state of Indiana. It was important for me that we not discard the historical interest and expertise that we have developed in Labor Studies. And find an appropriate home. And not that the program be saved, but be strengthened and everything I’ve learned from colleagues so far has been that Social Work has been a gracious host. That of course there are many issues yet to be resolved but they are being worked on effectively. And as somebody who cared about this for the last couple of years and various faculty ____ I’m very pleased with the way it’s going ____ colleagues, the efforts that you’ve put into this so far and the success you’ve achieved so far.

McRobbie: Any other comments? Good thank you very much. So we now move into Executive Session.
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