

## MINUTES

Faculty Assembly 28 January 2005

School of Liberal Arts

Present: Aponte, Bao, M.C. Beck, Bennet, Bertrand, Carlin, Chakrabarti, Cochrane, Craig, T. Davis, De Waal, Dibble, Donle, Dubé, Duerksen, Duffy, Eberl, Eller, Ford, Freeman, Gardner, Goff, Goldfinger, Grant, Gronfien, A. Haas, L. Haas, Harrington, Hayes, Henriksen, Houser, Howard, Hoyt, Hughes, Kelly, Kryder-Reid, Lindseth, Miller, Minielli, Molinder-Hogue, Powell, Robertson, Rozycki, Sabol, Sauer, Scarpino, Shepherd, Souch, Stallings, Stenzoski, R. Sutton, S.B. Sutton, Thuesen, Upton, Weeden, Wheeler, R. White, A. Williams, Wills, Wininger, Wittberg, Wokeck.

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Susanmarie Harrington called the Faculty Assembly to order at 2:01 p.m.

### 2. ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

A motion was made to accept the minutes from the last meeting of the Assembly (12 November 2004) and the minutes were unanimously accepted.

### 3. PRESIDENT'S REMARKS (Susanmarie Harrington)

President Harrington reminded the Assembly that the School was facing a time of transition—not only because of the challenges from the fiscal situation, but because of the development of the Strategic Plan. It will be important that the Dean hears from the Faculty concerning priorities, concerns, directions, and questions. In today's Assembly, we will be addressing the issues of both the revised SLA P&T Guidelines and the SLA Criteria for promotion of Lecturers. It is critical for Departments to work toward establishing their own guidelines, especially for lecturers. This will assist departments in commenting on the School guidelines so that the latter work for each department.

### 4. DEAN'S REMARKS (Robert White)

The Campus Campaign is beginning February 14th. The Committee for SLA is Ramla Bandele, Ellen Brennan, Kris Frost, Joyce Haibe, Bob Harris, Sue Herrell, Amy Jones, Maureen Minielli, and Scott Weeden. Last year, we had 880 donors and the goal this year is 950. World Languages and Cultures had the highest participation rate last year. Departments have their own priorities; for the School, the priority will be the Dean's Scholarship.

The Taylor Symposium, "Faith-Based Initiatives: Boon or Bust?" will be Feb. 16, 2005.

The Dean's Day, "Understanding Islam," will be March 5, 2005.

At the request of the faculty, this year the "Honors Convocation and Celebration of Scholarship" will be combined into one event, to be held Friday, April 15th, 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. [It will not be an academic regalia event.]

#### 4. DEAN'S REMARKS (cont.)

##### **In regard to the health of the School:**

For the Spring Semester, credit hours are down compared to last year by .06%—i.e., 393 hours, which is, approximately, what we expected. We are, however, up 5.4% in majors which translates into 76 more students than last year, for a total of 1,487.

As discussed in a previous Faculty Assembly, and after discussion with the faculty of the Resources and Planning Committee, a cap of \$400,000 has been placed on graduate fee remissions for next year. Previously there has been no cap and, as a School, we have not monitored fully the growth of graduate programs. At present, however, the change may not be so big this year since it appears fee remissions will be less than \$470,000. The decrease will be spread over the departments; Deans Ford and Hanson will work with the departments to implement it.

##### **Other items discussed with Resources and Planning Committee:**

All course buyouts, including those for on-campus internal grants (such as OPD), will now be 12.5% (1/8), plus fringe, of the faculty member's salary which makes School policy for internal grants consistent with the policy for external grants.

The School will be able to offer four summer research grants at \$5,000 each which are available to tenure-line faculty and will be processed by the Research Advisory Committee.

There is a cap for summer salary in 2005 of \$12,000 for full-time faculty. In setting the cap, two priorities were kept in mind. One, the value of research and the desire to encourage senior faculty to engage in research in the summer. Two, the financial situation of the School.

In light of these points, as well as continuing budget constraints, the cap in Summer 2006, will be a minimum of \$4,000 which will raise the summer salary for some lecturers. For those earning more than \$40,000, the per course rate will be the standard 10% up to a maximum of \$5,000.

Marnie Maxwell is continuing to meet with various constituencies to help develop the School's Strategic Plan. There will be a Strategic Planning Committee; input will also be garnered through a web survey and a town hall. You may also contact Ms. Maxwell. The School needs everyone to be involved.

The search for the Millennium Chair is underway. The Dean invited Philip Goff, (Religious Studies), as chair of the Committee, to speak about the search to date.

#### 4a. REPORT FROM THE MILLENNIUM CHAIR COMMITTEE

Philip Goff reporting for the Committee (himself, Gabrielle Bersier, Khaula Muradha [School of Education], David Ford, Monroe Little, Bill Blomquist, and Joe Slash [Indianapolis Urban League]) thanked the Faculty for its assistance in nominating potential scholars. As part of the process, candidates were asked to provide six letters (consistent with expectations for tenure). The Committee had winnowed the list down to a half dozen and was seeking critical reviews of their work. The Committee expects to present a list of three to four names, with interviews taking place in mid February. The relevant departments will be asked to "host" any candidate from their field, but presentations will be open to the School. The process entails both finding the best candidate AND attracting him/her to the School.

#### 4. DEAN'S REMARKS (cont.)

The Dean concluded his remarks, noting that, by summer, the construction on the Student Center will start and the building currently on the site will be removed.

There were no questions for the Dean.

#### 5. REPORTS FROM UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL/FACULTY COUNCIL

Andre De Tienne submitted a report about the most recent IUPUI FC meeting which was circulated by email prior to the Faculty Assembly.

Reporting on the FC, Marianne Wokeck announced that there will be a Town Meeting on Communication and Public Relations for the Campus, including changing the public face.

#### 6. REPORT FROM ASSOCIATE DEAN, STUDENT AFFAIRS.

Dean Catherine Souch reported for Rick Ward that IUPUI is examining the Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities. The IU Code is up on the SLA Faculty Assembly website. Each Campus is to develop procedures to implement the Code and we will be addressing this in the future.

#### 7. APPRECIATION FOR KIM MILLS-WHITE

The Faculty unanimously expressed its thanks to Kim Mills-White for her tenure as Secretary of the SLA Faculty Assembly.

#### 8. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

##### 8a. Faculty Affairs Committee

The "Promotion Criteria for Lecturers" (referred to as Criteria below) and the "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines" (referred to as Guidelines) were distributed ahead of time. They are also available on the Faculty Assembly website: <http://liberalarts.iupui.edu/facultyassembly/>

Linda Haas introduced the Committee members present: herself, Subir Chakrabarti, Maureen Minielli, and Jason Eberl. The Committee also received assistance from Susan Sutton and Dean Souch. Linda Haas indicated that the goal of the Committee with both documents was to give enough guidance to candidates so that they can present the best case possible for advancement; the Committee tried to avoid (especially in the case of the Guidelines) being too specific.

## 8a. Faculty Affairs Committee (cont.)

The Assembly first discussed the revised Criteria; this document will not be voted on until the April meeting so the Committee sought input from the Assembly for the final version. Discussion centered on the third paragraph. Mary Sauer sought clarification of the phrase “as judged by departmental standards.” Dean Souch pointed out that departments were to have a document where these standards are spelled out and Dean White reminded the departments that a copy of that document was to be on file with the Dean’s Office.

The following suggestions were made and accepted by the Faculty Affairs Committee:

- Bob Sutton requested the **elimination of italics** (i.e., *not required, can enhance*).
- Harold Donle recommended the addition of “**outreach to adult learners**” in light of the recognition of the important of K-12 education.
- Leslie Miller recommended that “**department**” be added to the phrase “important contributions to the curriculum of the school or campus.”

Discussion ensued over the inclusion of “advising” under both teaching and service. Marianne Wokeck observed that it could be either and Dean White reminded people that it was the candidate’s job to make it clear why advising was being included in a particular part of the dossier (and why some advising was in one part, and some in the other). Liz Kryder-Reid and Marianne Wokeck offered a variety of examples of what kind of advising might constitute teaching and what might be service. Subir Chakrabarti added the caveat that a candidate could not “double count” a specific activity.

The Committee will circulate a revised draft of the Criteria to vote on at the next SLA Assembly.

The Assembly then turned to a discussion of the Guidelines in preparation to vote on them. The Faculty Affairs Committee introduced the following motion:

That the Assembly adopt the revised P&T guidelines as distributed, with the addition of the following:

In section VI (on the duties of the SLA P&T Committee):

G. In carrying out its duties, the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee will follow the Standing Rules for the committee as listed in the SLA Faculty Assembly Bylaws.

President Harrington drew attention of the Assembly to two specific issues: those passages drafted to address the promotion of lecturers and the question of scholarly editing. The Assembly discussed issues pertaining to lecturers first. For the Committee, Linda Haas explained that they had added references throughout the document to lecturers, but they wanted to know if something was missed. The discussion of this motion was complex. What follows in these minutes is a distillation of the questions raised and comments made at the Assembly indicating the concerns about implications of the Campus Guidelines.

8a. Faculty Affairs Committee (cont.)

Discussion centered first on Section VII. External Letters of Recommendation, including: the number, what constituted “external,” how to secure the necessary number of reviewers, and who was best suited to assessing the teaching of lecturers. Linda Haas stated that the guiding principle for the Committee was to develop guidelines that provided “good advice” to assist the candidate and the department in making the “best case.”

At present, the expectation for six “external letters” is a University requirement although Dean Souch observed that it is under discussion at that level (which could necessitate/permit a change in the SLA guidelines in the future).

Maureen Minielli raised the question of how “external” reviewers are able to judge teaching. Dean Souch indicated that reviewers were intended to be people who can appreciate the kind of teaching lecturers do. The question, in part, is what constitutes “external” for lecturers—University guidelines permit the “outside” reviewers to be from IUPUI, although not the candidate’s department. Chairs have responsibility for soliciting the letters, but the candidate contributes. Dean White confirmed the candidate input in the process was important.

Scott Weeden raised the issue of what the standard will be for judging lecturers, since their impact is here on campus, not out in the field? Gail Bennet raised the issue of how to find the names of possible reviewers.

Dean White stated that the candidate has the responsibility for putting the materials together that provide some context for the reviewer. Candidates might locate possible reviewers at other schools in the cities or at national meetings.

Marianne Wokeck observed the need for departments to be doing mentoring, while Phil Scarpino commented on how hard it might be for chairs to get so many letters (based on experience with tenure track faculty) and drew attention to the wording of point 5 concerning how many reviewers could be from the candidates’ list. Jim Powell added that if several lecturers were going for promotion at the same time, it could be particular difficult (and promote a sense of competition as opposed to collegiality since they might be turning to the same people as reviewers). He raised the issue of whether it would be possible to reduce the number.

At this point, Linda Haas observed that the number was in the Campus guidelines, but that it would be good to convey our concerns to those working on Campus guidelines.

Mel Wininger pointed out the difficulty of reconstructing accomplishments from day one since many lecturers did not have the records necessary to do so in order to document their several years of work (when promotion was not an issue).

8a. Faculty Affairs Committee (cont.)

Dean White pointed out that reviewers did not necessarily have to be from the field, and in addition to finding potential reviewers from elsewhere in the city, there were possible reviewers in the Center for Teaching and Learning and the Office for Professional Development. Jay Howard asked if people from elsewhere in the IU system could be reviewers; the answer was “yes.”

Maureen Minielli asked whether reviewers will be told that lecturers teach “pre-fab” courses. Phil Scarpino commented that the candidate prepared his/her own statement and would be able to provide a context for evaluating him/her. He went on to express the concern that Section VII. B: 1 included specifics that did not address the situation of lecturers and that it is important that examples did not become “scripture.” Dean White noted that it was incumbent on reviewers to disclose their relationship with the candidate. At the same time, if the candidate could make a case for someone who, upon first glance, appears to be ruled out, the candidate has that option.

Jason Eberl summed up the advice to candidates as: it is easiest to stick with the Campus guidelines; if one does deviate from them, be prepared to explain (and document) why. Didier Bertrand offered that Sharon Hamilton and Richard Turner were highly knowledgeable about the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and could assist in documenting a case for assessment. He continued that it was possible for people in one discipline to then evaluate teaching in another.

Phil Scarpino offered as a friendly amendment the insertion of “ordinarily” to Section VII. B: 5, **“Ordinarily some (but no more than half) of those finally selected to serve as reviewers will be from the candidate’s list of nominees.”** [page 13] **It was accepted.**

Subir Chakrabarti expressed concern that Section VII. B: 1 did not include other kinds of collaboration. Ain Haas recommended the inclusion of the phrase, “frequent collaborator” to cover all bases. Dean White reminded the Assembly that this wording was, in part, to alert candidates to concerns at the Campus or IU level. Phil Scarpino proposed the statement be revised, then, to read **“(for example, by previous close association with the candidate such as a frequent collaborator or a dissertation advisor).”** [p. 12]. He moved the question; Harold Donle seconded; the **motion to amend carried.**

The Assembly then turned to a discussion of the issue of scholarly editing. Philip Goff on behalf of the Consortium of SLA Editors (T. Davis, De Waal, De Tienne, Eller, Goff, Houser, Hoyt, Sutton, Thuesen, Touponce, Wheeler, Wittberg, and Wokeck) proposed two amendments to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

That the term 'scholarship' be added to the 'research and creative activity' rubric referred to throughout the P&T Guidelines, most especially in Section IV of the document. This will bring our Guidelines into accordance with both the Dean of the Faculties P&T Guidelines and the structure of our CV's according to IU policy.

8a. Faculty Affairs Committee (cont.)

That Section IV. D: 6 should be revised to include the following:

Academic editing may be offered as another example of scholarly activity. While there is a range of academic editing, that which requires sustained research and original or critical activity constitutes basic research. Editing in the academy can include scholarly editing of primary texts, the editing of learned journals, anthologies, reference works, and similar activities.

Philip Goff observed that scholarly editing has a national and international reputation and the Guidelines had not kept up with this scholarly work. Discussion ensued over the meaning (or difference in meaning) between “research,” “basic research,” and “scholarship.” Dean Souch advised that the term “scholarship” as the name of a category is not used in the *IU Handbook*, rather the phrase is “research and creative activity.” It became apparent that the two proposals should be separated and dealt with separately (**moved and seconded**).

S. Sutton moved and R. Sutton seconded that Proposal 1 (adding the term “scholarship” throughout the document) be tabled. **The motion unanimously carried.**

Harold Donle moved to table Proposal 2 (the revision of Section IV. D: 6 on p. 8). The motion failed for lack of a second, and the Assembly discussed Proposal 2. The discussion included a delineation of the different kinds of editing (scholarship versus management) and whether it was useful to include examples of “editing in the academy.” Dean White held out that “may be offered” placed the responsibility on the candidate to explain the significance of the editing (and its nature as research as opposed to service). Questions were raised about what kinds of reviewing counted as scholarship (as opposed to service). Nathan Houser suggested raising the standard of “service” so that it was not simply a default.

The question was called and the Assembly voted on the revised proposal, that the following be substituted for Section IV. D: 6:

**Academic editing may be offered as another example of scholarly activity. While there is a range of academic editing, that which requires sustained research and original or critical activity constitutes basic research. Editing in the academy can include scholarly editing or primary texts, the editing of learned journals, anthologies, reference books and similar activities.**

**The motion carried, with 2 nays.**

There was a motion to untable Proposal 1 (to include “scholarship” to the “research and creative activity” rubric throughout the Guidelines) which passed. Philip Goff observed that the term was included on the IUPUI c.v. and in the Campus Guidelines. Catherine Souch raised the question of what the word then meant in phrases like “Scholarship of Teaching and Learning”?

8a. Faculty Affairs Committee (cont.)

Owing to the lateness of the hour, there was **another motion to table Proposal 1 again which carried.**

Phil Scarpino moved to add a Section to IV. D on “applied research.” There was some discussion of whether to table this motion. Dean Souch observed that the 2005-2006 tenure cycle would be starting on March 7th and that it was important to establish the Guidelines sooner rather than later. .

Phil Scarpino moved that to Section IV. D, be added:

**7. Applied research may be offered as another example of scholarly activity. While there is a range of applied research that which requires sustained research and original or critical activity constitutes basic research; see the Guidelines for Applied Research (Section VIII).**

**The motion carried.**

The question was called and seconded. **President Harrington asked the Assembly to vote on the motion as introduced by the Faculty Affairs committee and as amended by the subsequent motions. The motion carried.**

Didier Bertrand moved that **a letter detailing the SLA Faculty Assembly’s concerns over the guidelines for lecturers (including the number of external letters) be sent to the Dean of the Faculties and the Faculty Affairs Subcommittee of the Faculty Council.**

**The motion carried.**

Marianne Wokeck moved that the **SLA Faculty Assembly discuss the issue of “scholarship” more broadly in the future.**

**The motion carried.**

8b. Technical Services: Security Issues

Didier Bertrand reported on technology issues for the Committee. On February 3rd, there will be a Town Hall on the new version of Oncourse, ONCOURSE CL. He also reported on ITS0’s policy for technology may not address the security problems, but could impede work because of surveillance possibilities. It will affect MAC users. Dean Ford continued by explaining that the policy was developed without much faculty input. There are two issues: one--the policy itself (will it work, will it violate privacy) and two--why the policy was developed in this manner. The Faculty Council Technology Committee will be discussing it in the future, but SLA may want to weigh in. The Assembly expressed interest in pursuing a discussion of security issues in the future.



8c. The proposal to revise the by-laws affecting the P&T Committee was deferred to the March meeting.

9. NO UNFINISHED BUSINESS

10. Adjournment

President Harrington invited a motion to adjourn and the meeting adjourned at 4:05p.m. Faculty were invited to the reception following.

Respectfully submitted by Nancy Marie Robertson, 22 March 2005.