# **Indianapolis Faculty Council (IFC) Minutes**

January 13, 2009 ~ IT 152 ~ 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Faculty and Guests Present: Ron Ackerman, Margaret Adamek, Hasan Akay, Deborah Allen, Jeff Anglen, Rachel Applegate, Simon Atkinson, Carol Baird, Sarah Baker, Trudy Banta, Charles Bantz, Martin Bard, Robert Barrows, Samantha Bartholomew, Margaret Bauer, Anne Belcher, Ed Berbari, Jacqueline Blackwell, Bonnie Blazer-Yost, William Blomquist, Polly Boruff-Jones, John Butterworth, Amanda Cecil, Todd Daniels-Howell, Andre De Tienne, Cornelis de Waal, Marsha Ellett, Garland Elmore, Charles Feldhaus, John Finnell, Mary L. Fisher, Philip Goff, Carlos Gonzalez-Cabezas, John Hassell, Sue Herrell, Jay Howard, Allison Howland, Marilyn Irwin, Kathy Johnson, Kim Kirkland, Joan Kowolik, Kathy Lay, Chris Long, Carmen Luca-Sugawara, Joyce MacKinnon, Virginia Majewski, Kathy Marrs, Anna McDaniel, Brenna McDonald, David McSwane, Mahesh Merchant, Henry Merrill, Stacy Morrone, Ann O'Bryan, C. Subah Packer, Megan Palmer, Ellen Poffenberger, William Potter, Stephen Randall, Fred Rees, Dawn Rhodes, Mary Beth Riner, Lisa Riolo, Bill Schneider, Jodi Smith, Richard Ward, Stuart Warden, Amy Conrad Warner, Jeff Watt, Corinne Wheeler, Karen Whitney, Kim White-Mills, Jack Windsor, Frank Witzmann, Marianne Wokeck, Frank Yang, and Oner Yurtseven

### Agenda Item I: Welcome and Call to Order

IUPUI Faculty Council Vice President, Jeff Watt, called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

### Agenda Item II: Adoption of the Agenda as the Order of Business for the Day

The Agenda was adopted as the Order for the Business of the Day.

## Agenda Item III: [Action Item] Approval of IFC December 2, 2008, Minutes

Hearing no objections, the IFC December 2, 2008, minutes stood as written and were entered into record. (http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/minutes/Minutes\_IFC\_12-2-08.htm)

# Agenda Item IV: [Discussion Item] Announcement of Slates for the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel, Board of Review Pool, and At-Large Representatives

Jacqueline Blackwell, Chair, IFC Nominating committee (jblackwe@iupui.edu)

Blackwell presented the following slates noting the At-Large Representatives would be presented at the February meeting as the slate is not full at this time.

### **IUPUI Faculty Council: Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel Slate**

Term: February 1, 2009, through January 31, 2011 Need to elect three.

**Slate for 2009-2011** 

Bonnie Blazer-Yost (Science)

Donna Boland (Nursing)
Dean Hawley (Medicine)

Richard Jackson (Dentistry)

Louis Pelus (Medicine)

Lisa Riolo (Health and Rehab Science)

Joseph Unthank (Medicine)

Brian Vargus (Liberal Arts)

William Wooden (Medicine)

### **IUPUI Faculty Council: Board of Review Pool Slate**

Term: February 1, 2009, through January 31, 2011 Need to elect ten.

#### **Slate for 2009-2011**

Dennis Ang (Medicine)

William Babler (Dentistry)

Todd Daniels-Howell (University Library)

Indra Das (Medicine)

Alexander Dent (Medicine)

Dean Hawley (Medicine)

Michael Kubek (Medicine)

Julia LeBlanc (Medicine)

Kim Lovejoy (Liberal Arts)

Malika Mahoui (Informatics)

Steven R. Miller (Law)

Mahnaz Moshfegh (Law Library)

Richard Nass (Medicine)

C. Subah Packer (Medicine)

Jeff Platt (Dentistry)

Joseph Unthank (Medicine)

Elizabeth Whipple (Medicine)

Jack Windsor (Dentistry)

William Wooden (Medicine)

Andy (Qigui) Yu (Medicine)

## Agenda Item V: Updates/Remarks from the Chancellor

Chancellor Bantz gave the following report:

- Becky Porter presented the opening Enrollment Report (<a href="http://www/~fcouncil/documents/">http://www/~fcouncil/documents/</a> Spring 2009 Enrollment Report.pdf. A detailed analysis will be done following census. Enrollment is up on all campuses but IUK.
- The 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary kickoff breakfast is on January 28. There will be a recognition dinner at 5:40 p.m. on January 30.

- Sukhatme and Bantz have been invited to speak to the Higher Education Commission about making the successful transition from open enrollment to the present enrollment.
- Budget: Governor Daniels has announced that he will pull back 1% of the annual appropriation given to Indiana University, which equates to a little more than \$4M (meaning \$1.9 M for IUPUI). The campus schools are in a strong cash position, but there will be some consequences that are yet to be determined. The state budget for the next biennium will be given in his State of the State Address. IU will have a 4% base cut to the budget. The legislature's help will be critical in the next three months. The budget should be known at the end of April. The deans have been asked to create some scenarios of cutting the budget if asked. VC Rhodes has created a website about the budget (<a href="http://www.finance-admin.iupui.edu/budgetnotes/">http://www.finance-admin.iupui.edu/budgetnotes/</a>). VC Rhodes said a framework has been given to the campus. The President has asked that the reduction come from the general funds and more details will be given to her tomorrow. Bantz said the federal government is considering a stimulus package and higher education may be eligible for some infrastructure funds. The University plans to request funds if they become available. \$800B is under consideration in the package and 6% will be set aside for higher education. The funds would be used to support construction.

### Agenda Item VI: Updates/Remarks from the IFC President

IUPUI Faculty President Simon Atkinson gave the following report:

- The Trustees met in December and the focus was on the budget situation. They are concerned and will exert whatever influence they have with the legislature.
- The Trustees approved the Stage 2 Strategic IT Plan.
- The UFC joint task force is working on the policies and procedures for promotion and tenure. Their job was to develop baseline procedures. The committee has found variations among the campuses such as how many times a person can vote and the number of letters requested for dossiers. The report has been submitted and will be placed on the IFC website.
- More nominations are needed for at-large representatives and UFC representation by the IFC.
- We will have a proposal forthcoming for fall break, or academic recess, from the USG as a discussion item at the March IFC meeting.
- Reminded everyone of the two town hall meetings on the Honors College proposals.

# Agenda Item VII: [Discussion Item] Proposal to Address Small Changes to the Constitution and Bylaws

Attachment: http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/Circulars/IFC Circular 2008-3 Clerical Amendments.pdf

Atkinson explained the Bylaw change in regard to mentioning specific persons in administration and as time passes, their titles change. This makes the Bylaws out of date. The proposal addresses this type of change as well as other small changes. It also allows the President to propose simple clerical changes to the Constitution and Bylaws if they do not affect the meaning of the Bylaws. If the President and Chair of the C&B Committee agree, the Bylaws would be changed.

There was no discussion on the proposal. The motion came from the Executive Committee, so no second was needed. After vote, the motion passed.

# Agenda Item VIII: [Discussion Item] Amendments to IUPUI Faculty Council Constitution and Bylaws

- NTTF (Attachment: <a href="http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/Circulars/IFC Circular 2008-5 NTTF.pdf">http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/Circulars/IFC Circular 2008-5 NTTF.pdf</a>)
- Motion to address electronic voting (*Attachment*: <a href="http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/Circulars/">http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/Circulars/</a> IFC Circular 2008-4 Electronic Voting.pdf)

Cornelius de Waal (Chair of the IFC Constitution and Bylaws Committee) led discussion on the NTTF (non tenure-track faculty). Atkinson provided background on the motion and reminded the Council that the motion was approved at the May 2008 meeting and today's discussion is to discuss substantive changes (technical) to the Constitution and Bylaws. There was no other discussion. Since this is the first reading, the vote will be taken at the February meeting.

De Waal led the discussion on the electronic voting. Boukai asked the difference between electronic voting and proxy voting. Wokeck said she believes proxy is used when a paper vote is taken. It was asked to find out what "proxy" means. This will be taken back to the committee for review. Discussion was then closed. A second reading will occur before voting.

# Agenda Item IX: [Action Item] Motion to Allow Non-IFC Members to Participate Fully in Agenda Item X.

It was moved and seconded that non-IFC members be allowed to fully participate in Agenda Item X. The motion passed.

### Agenda Item X: [Discussion Item] Core Schools Report

Attachment: <a href="http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/Core Schools Operations Review Cttee MEMO">http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/Core Schools Operations Review Cttee MEMO</a>
10 06 08.pdf

Chancellor Bantz introduced the discussion with a definition of core schools/campuses. The School of Medicine has been a core school for many years. This model was reviewed in a report constructed by President Herbert and approved by the Board of Trustees in 2007. The schools initially reviewed were system schools that were reduced to core schools. The report reiterated that the core model had been successful and should continue. The report was approved by the Board. President McRobbie asked for a review of how the matrix model works and if it is successful. The model provides more complexity in reporting lines. The Bonser Commission (first report) enabled us to have assets move across campus and have allowed us to recruit a stronger faculty. It has created some complexities including the identity of the schools. The Core School Report was co-chaired by Bantz and Karen Hanson and was charged to find out what steps it takes to help core school work better together. Each core school has been assigned to come up with principles to be acted upon by June 30, 2009.

The floor was opened for questions/discussion.

Will the agreements become public documents? Bantz said yes and he hopes the documents will be placed on the schools websites.

Are their major differences in this report over the Bonser Report? Bantz said no, and that it provides more specificity of how to operate. The task was to not change the previous report but how to implement it.

What happens if someone does not "play ball?" How do you resolve conflict? Bantz said the consensus is that everyone involved in administration reports to someone. A supervisor would have a conversation with the Dean, etc. There isn't an action or punishment section as this is an administrative document.

It was mentioned that the core schools also include Columbus, so as discussions are held, he was asked to remember this. Bantz agreed and this needs to be factored in.

How are we assured this will be implemented and implemented well? Should this become part of the administrative review? It would be a positive way of keeping everyone on track. Bantz agreed this is a good idea and will remember to think of this when conducting reviews. It is a concrete measure that all the deans will be reviewed. He will send the idea to Provost Hanson as well (Bloomington).

On page 6, there is a discussion of the P&T process. In the School of Education, this is topic of concern. Will the dossier go through two review processes or stay in one process. Bantz said that the school should be handled once by the school. Another comment was that although one dossier is good, the two Schools of Education have two separate processes and the dossiers will look different. You will want to watch the progress. There are two dossiers and they look different. Will this be okay?

What if a core school in Bloomington changes its name? How will it have an impact on this campus? This could happen in reverse as well. Bantz said it will come into play in the review by the university of the name of the school. Relevant administrators would discuss the name proposal.

The memo from McRobbie uses the term Chancellor and Provost. How is that used? Bantz said "Chancellor" is Bantz and "Provost" is Hanson and the "core school deans" are the two deans of the two schools.

If we are a core campus school and we don't like some agreements have been made, who do we report a grievance to? Bantz said a forthright conversation with the dean should occur. The faculty member said that had been done and wanted to know what to do now. Bantz said he would need to think about an alternative.

Education has raised a question of a school's mission on our campus. How do you resolve it if there is a conflict? Bantz said he has thought about Education. He believes IUPUI's fundamental responsibility is urban and STEM education. They are essential to the area we live in and those we hope to recruit. The school is working in that direction and it is essential that we continue. What influence does the campus have? The budget every school has belongs to the campus under law. We would influence it through budgetary means if necessary. STEM education is important to this campus and the state. You can't do STEM education with only one school. You need both the School of Education and the School of Science.

On the bottom of page 2, it lists the core schools. How many of those schools have their resident dean on this campus? Bantz said Nursing, Social Work, and SPEA (which is in BL but reports to him). Social Work's dean is different because of accreditation issues and he also has Labor Studies under his purview. Patchner said Social Work is a system school, not a core school. Medicine is the other system school. The report does not apply to Social Work. Nursing is now a core school as they have separated from other campuses.

Should the deans be located on this campus instead of Bloomington? Bantz said he would be interested this thought. SPEA has a good working relationship with the school in Bloomington and we don't want to run the risk of lumping all problem areas together. Business agreed with this sentiment.

Will the agreements be reviewed for control by one campus over another? Bantz said the level of detail probably won't go that deep, but it will be reviewed to see that each campus is growing under their mission.

Watt ended discussion.

Agenda Item XI: [Discussion Item] Employee Benefits: Timeline for New Hires

Ellen Poffenberger, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources (epoffenb@iupui.edu)

Poffenberger discussed a new IRS regulation in which we need to enroll new hires in 30 days instead of 60 days. She brings it to the IFC as many of the Council are involved in the hiring process in some way. Hiring eDocs generate enrollment packets which is the first step in starting the 30 days. Employees (both faculty and staff) have this small window to make the change for benefits to occur. Life changing situations such as marriage, births, and deaths of a spouse also have a 30 day window to make changes. This will affect faculty hired in the summer. The date in which 30 days starts is their start date. On an eDoc, it is the effective date. If the person misses the 30 day period to enrollment in a healthcare package, they will need to wait until open enrollment in November to participate.

Is there a medical plan to default an employee to if they do not meet the 30 day requirement? No. It was further stated that some employees elect not to participate in a healthcare plan because their spouse takes care of this through his/her employment.

Is it 30 calendar or working days? Poffenberger responded it is calendar days.

Are employees required to have healthcare coverage? Response was no, but many do.

## Agenda Item XII: [Discussion Item] Faculty Salary Equity Study

Kim Kirkland, Director, Equal Opportunity (Kirkland@iupui.edu)

Attachment: http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/IUPUI Gender Equity Study.ppt

Kirkland reviewed the PowerPoint handout. The study was commissioned by Chancellor Bantz to review equity as it has been ten years since the last study.

How are 12 month appointments viewed when comparing them with 10 month employees? Kirkland said Gary Pike will take this under consideration during the regression model.

Salaries vary for many reasons. Will merit be considered in another way? Kirkland said merit reviews will need to be handled by the schools. A faculty member who has been in the school for a long time will have many reasons for their salary to be higher. New faculty coming in can negotiate at a higher level which creates a misalignment. Merit would be reviewed and if it is found that a misalignment has been found, that person would receive a raise to compensate. Who is deciding whether there is a misalignment? Kirkland said the school would be doing this in regard to merit.

In the second round of reviews, the committee will provide a template for the schools to use to standardize the process. This will help resolve the process.

Most universities that have employees with less than 100% FTE are able to obtain benefits. The report affects women mostly. Two women who would like to job share. If they do that now, neither of them would be able to receive benefits. We should address benefits as well as gender equity. Bantz said a request such as this has already been expressed by deans for this reason. We are the only Big Ten university that does not provide benefits to less than 100% FTE employees.

Salary/Gender – when going about the process to identify inequity, are men considered? Kirkland said not at this time. It is only women being compared to men.

Why not look at gender independent of equity? Why not equalize men's salary, too? Kirkland said this is not the goal of this study at this time, but if the committee wants to do this in the future, the data is available.

### Agenda Item XIII: Report from the IUPUI Staff Council

Sue Herrell, *President* (<u>sherrell@iupui.edu</u>)

Herrell reported on the following:

- A blood drive was held on October 31. Three blood mobiles were on campus. Our goal was not reached, but the initiative is worthy and another drive will be planned.
- A Staff Council information table was at the Employee Benefits fair and many persons were reached.
- The SC sponsored a fine arts and crafts fair on November 22, at the Campus Center. Considering the economy and it being the first event, the event was successful. Income received was from booth rental. Total revenue is \$1126 which will be designated to scholarships.
- The January 21, 2009, SC meeting will feature a Panel of Vice Chancellors including Vice Chancellors Dawn Rhodes, Uday Sukhatme, and Karen Whitney. They will be provided questions ahead of time. The discussion may be podcasted or videoed. She encouraged the faculty and administration to allow time away for their staff to attend the meeting.
- Staff Council members participate on campus committees. A SC member has been appointed

to serve on the Diversity Cabinet. There is a representative on the Campus Center Advisory Committee as well as the Sustainability Committee.

- 2009 is the 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Staff Council.
- Thanked Joyce MacKinnon for her help in the review of the SC Bylaws. MacKinnon attended an SCEC meeting. Sarah Baker is also helping with this initiative.

### Agenda Item XIV: Question and Answer Period

What is the status of the School of Public Health? Bantz said he and Sukhatme have been in conversation with Marie Swanson on a plan to develop the school across time. A school has not been declared at this time because once we do, the time clock begins on getting the school ready for accreditation in two years. Until that can happen, they are discussing the enhancement of the department of public health.

#### **Agenda Item XV: Unfinished Business**

No business.

### **Agenda Item XVI: New Business**

• Jagathon: Taylor Rhodes discussed the Jagathon, which is an event to raise funds for Riley Hospital. Riley families will be invited to the event. She will sell tickets following this meeting.

### Agenda Item XVII: Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The motion carried. Vice President Watt adjourned the meeting.

Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, Karen Eckert UN 403 / 274-2215 / Fax: 274-2970 / fcouncil@iupui.edu / http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil