MINUTES -
Faculty Assembly 25 March 2005
School of Liberal Arts


1. CALL TO ORDER
   Susanmarie Harrington called the Faculty Assembly to order at 2:04 p.m.

2. ACCEPTANCE OF THE JANUARY 2005 MINUTES AND MARCH 2005 AGENDA
   A motion was made to accept the minutes from the last meeting of the Assembly and the agenda for the present meeting. A grammatical correction to the minutes was offered from the floor and the minutes (thus corrected) and the agenda were unanimously accepted.
   Leslie Miller moved that the Assembly extend its appreciation to the Secretary for capturing the sense of the last Assembly which was unanimously approved.

3. PRESIDENT’S REMARKS (Susanmarie Harrington)
   President Harrington observed that the celebration at the end of the Assembly would honor the Research Accomplishments of the Faculty and that we would also be addressing significant issues concerning the criteria for the promotion of lecturers and guidelines affecting salary.
   She also reported, pursuant to a vote of the January Assembly, that she submitted a memo to the Dean of Faculties and the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council conveying the concerns of the Assembly regarding promotion guidelines for lecturers. With the unanimous consent of the Assembly, the memo is appended to these minutes.
   She informed the Assembly of Brian Vargus’s surgery and indicated that cards would be circulating for members to extend their good wishes.

4. DEAN’S REMARKS (Robert White)
   The “Celebration of Scholarship: Liberal Arts Honors Convocation” will be held Friday, April 15th, 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. in the University Place Ballroom. It will not be an event where academic regalia is worn. The new format, developed at the request of the Faculty, combines two ceremonies into one.
At the invitation of President Harrington, Dean White offered some observations about Research and Creative Activity by the Faculty of the School of Liberal Arts, pointing out that the School holds to a broad definition of them. He laid out the School’s commitment to and the importance of both “basic” and “applied” research, observing that the two can complement each other.

He further noted the fact that some 22 individuals had succeeded in raising external funds to support research, amounting to $17,053,731 for 2004, and that SLA, as a School brings in more money than any other school at IUPUI (except for Medicine) in most years.

He then turned to a discussion about research publications generated by the Faculty of the School of Liberal Arts and estimated that in 2004, some 200 faculty members (tenure-track and lecturers, combined) produced about 270 publications. He raised a series of issues for the Faculty to consider:

- Given the School’s criteria for excellence in Research (that it is evaluated in comparison to that of the faculty of comparable research institutions), what should the standard be for course release?
- Which institutions should we regard as comparable for the purposes of assessing research production (i.e., what is a major research university)?

In response to the Dean’s observations, faculty raised a number of issues and questions, including:

- Is it more effective to look at research output over a series of years, rather than for a single year?
- Does focusing on numbers substitute quantity for quality?
- What is the course load at other major research institutions (such as IUB)?
- The importance, given the focus on mission differentiation, of putting research production in the context of course and student load for each of the institutions in the system and to present this information to the community.
- The concern that a focus on quantity might push some to publish in “lesser” journals if that was faster.

The Dean summarized the issue as the School needing to consider: “who” do we want to be (and, therefore, whom do we use as a comparison)?

5. CELEBRATION OF RESEARCH (David Ford)

Dean Ford repeated Dean White’s observations about the impressive list of external grants, indicating two of particular note:

Liz Kryder-Reid’s and Helen Schwartz’s grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services to develop online training for museum and library personnel.

Melissa Bingmann’s and Phil Scarpino’s grant from Brown County Schools following her assistance in securing funds from the U.S. Department of Education for Teaching American History.

He invited all faculty to register for the Community of Science (COS) program that, despite its name, covers all disciplinary specialties and can be a vehicle to learn about grants.
Information about COS can be accessed through the IU research homepage:  
www.research.indiana.edu  
See also: http://www.cos.com/

6. INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY  
Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, as chair of the Anthropology Department, introduced Susan Brin Hyatt who is joining IUPUI as an associate professor of Anthropology, having arrived from Temple this semester. Prof. Dickerson-Putman drew special attention to Prof. Hyatt’s work with community-based research programs in an urban setting.

7. REPORTS FROM FC/UFC  
These will be circulated via email, although Marianne Wokeck advised the Assembly that the Faculty Council meeting in early April there would be a first reading of proposed revisions to IUPUI’s Student Code as well as a redefinition of the PULs and the criteria for graduating with distinction. She encouraged SLA faculty to be in touch with SLA members of the Council, including Richard Ward and Andre de Tienne.  
University Faculty Council will be examining issues concerning the General Education requirements for the IU system including those that affect transfers.  
William Schneider advised that the UFC will also examine the Family Leave policy.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8a. Faculty Affairs: Promotion Criteria for Lecturers  
President Harrington reminded the Assembly of the revisions incorporated at the January Assembly:  
the elimination of italics  
the addition of “outreach to adult learners”  
the addition of “department” to the phrase “important contributions to the curriculum of the school or campus.”  

Michael Burke proposed that the criteria include recognition of “research in the fields that the candidate teaches, and its publication, presentation, or application.” Katherine Wills proposed referring to “research and creative activity.”  
After discussion, it was moved that: **The wording:**  
…These may include, but are not limited to: important contributions to the curriculum of the department, school or campus; notable contributions in advising and mentoring; pedagogical research and its publication, presentation, or application;…  

Be revised to:
These may include, but are not limited to: important contributions to the curriculum of the department, school, or campus; notable contributions in advising and mentoring; pedagogical or disciplinary research or creative activity and its publication, presentation, or application;…

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

A motion was made to accept the Criteria with the revisions from last time and today, worded in its entirety as follows:

**PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR LECTURERS**  
**IUPUI SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS**

A candidate for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer will be evaluated by reference to the school criteria set forth below, as well as the more general criteria given in the Indiana University *Academic Handbook* and the IUPUI Faculty Council document titled “Lecturer Appointments at IUPUI,” as well as the more specific criteria approved by the candidate’s department.

Promotion to the rank of senior lecturer is a recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. The candidate is required to show a record that is excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service. In accordance with university and campus policy, evaluations of a candidate’s record will take into account the mission of the candidate’s unit and the particular contributions to that mission that is expected of the candidate.

In demonstrating teaching excellence, candidates must show convincing evidence that their performance in the classroom has been of high quality, as judged by departmental standards, and that they have made important contributions to student learning. There are many activities and achievements that are not required by the school for a successful promotion case, but which, if properly documented can enhance a case for excellence in teaching. These may include, but are not limited to: important contributions to the curriculum of the department, school, or campus; notable contributions in advising and mentoring; pedagogical or disciplinary research or creative activity and its publication, presentation, or application; effective pedagogical innovations, including the effective use of technology; leadership in teaching; the success of former students; participation in teaching workshops, panels, and conferences; the securing of, or participation in, grants for teaching-related projects; contribution to the success and retention of first-year students; outreach and impact on K-12 education; outreach to adult learners; and contributions to the documentation of student learning.
In demonstrating satisfactory service, the candidate must show convincing
evidence that the candidate’s service has been satisfactory in quality as well as in
quantity. Service may include, but is not limited to, professional and university
service, including advising, committee membership, and community work
directly related to the candidate’s disciplinary expertise.

The motion carried unanimously.

8b. Technical Services: Security Issues

Didier Bertrand advised the Assembly that the university-level policy on privacy and
computer security is still under discussion at university and campus levels. Faculty can get
information at:

http://www.itpo.iu.edu/IT07.html

Marianne Wokeck indicated that both FC and UFC were paying close attention to the
issue, especially any effects of such policies on academic freedom.

8c. P&T: by-law revision

The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Agenda Council move that the SLA FA
adopt the following language for the bylaws, Section IV.3.c.1 (on the duties of the Promotion
and Tenure Committee):

Duties. (a) The Committee will review each dossier forwarded in support of a candidacy
for promotion or tenure. The Committee takes into account the recommendation of the
primary committee and the Chair, but makes its own recommendation. The Committee
provides the Dean with a record of its vote(s) and a written review of the candidate. (b)
The Committee will conduct a School-level “third-year review” of tenure-track faculty,
and provide them with a written assessment of their progress toward promotion and
tenure. A copy of each assessment is provided to the reviewee’s Chair and to the Dean.
(c) The Committee will assist the Dean at the Dean’s request, in evaluating
recommendations received from primary committees and Chairs concerning
reappointment, and will serve to examine departmental review procedures.

The Rationale is to bring the bylaws in harmony with our policy on third-year reviews for tenure-
line faculty. After a few questions, there was a call for a vote and the motion carried
unanimously.

8d. Associated issues regarding by-law language

There was then discussion of how to define “full-time administrator” or a “full-time
administrative appointment” (and, in particular, whether to include chairs on the Promotion and
Tenure Committee). Given committee by-laws this question affects the P&T committee as well
as the Committee on Technical Services, although the emphasis of the discussion was the
implication for P&T.
President Harrington summarized some of the issues:

There are no campus guidelines as to the meaning of “administrator”.

Reasons to exclude administrators from P&T:

Associate deans work closely with the Dean; one works closely with candidates and committees on process considerations.

Administrators’ busy schedules make meetings difficult.

Are chairs administrators? The current P&T committee is divided in its views.

Chairs are busy, and, arguably, not faculty peers.

Yet chairs bring a valuable perspective on what contributes to the success of a department, and often are better informed about university documents, criteria, and procedures.

Discussion covered some of the following points:

Would it work to define administrators as those with 12-month contracts?

What about Center Directors?

How hard would it make it to get full professors for the P&T committee if chairs were eliminated (and efforts to ensure balance, etc. were retained)?

Dr. Catherine Souch provided figures which suggest about 1/3 of current Professors are also full-time administrators (including chairs, vice-chancellors, associate deans, etc.).

Although the by-law to have full professors on P&T is only “to the fullest extent possible,” some indicated that they thought a full complement of full professors made a difference when its recommendations go to the Campus Committee.

Paul Carlin (as head of the Nominating Committee) said that he thought, even with the exclusion of chairs, that it would be doable to get enough candidates for the P&T committee—although it was not the hardest committee to fill.

What about past chairs?

The Assembly will come back to the issue in the future.

9. NEW BUSINESS

9a. Recommendations and Announcements from Agenda Council:

Agenda Council announced that President Herbert will be in Cavanaugh Hall to meet with Agenda Council and representatives of Faculty Assembly’s standing committees on Friday, April 8th. SLA is, apparently, the first School he is visiting. Contact Susanmarie Harrington if you are interested in meeting with him. He will not, at this date, meet with students and it was “recommended” that he be given a “courtesy tour” of the facilities in Cavanaugh.

Agenda Council also announced the formation of three working groups. There will be one on Honors with Richard Ward and Catherine Souch as contacts; this group will address how to get more students involved with Honors. There will be one on committees, to advise on
restructuring the committee structure of SLA (in light of multiple committees with similar charges).

Finally, in recognition of the concerns raised in the January meeting about how to conceive research, there will be an ad hoc committee with a charge to examine research in the context of the School’s P&T guidelines.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Research, Promotion and Tenure is charged to:
- clarify language added about applied research;
- clarify definition of “basic research” and “requires research;”
- clarify the relationship between campus and SLA guidelines on these points.

There will be more discussion in future meetings, perhaps in April, definitely in September. After consultation with those who voiced significant opinions about these matters leading up to the January Assembly meeting, President Harrington drafted the committee charge and asked Catherine Souch, Susan Sutton, Subir Chakrabarti, Nathan Houser, Phil Scarpino, and Michael Burke to serve on the ad hoc committee. All have agreed. Subir Chakrabarti will convene the group.

Agenda Council moves that the Assembly suspend its bylaws—section III.2.e.2 (which mandates a mail ballot)—until the April 2005 meeting.

This will permit the use of an online ballot. It can be previewed at http://db.liberalarts.iupui.edu/facultyBallots/FBcaslogin.asp

In the ensuing discussion, questions were raised about the security of on-line ballots and the integrity of the voting process (i.e., to prevent multiple votes from a single person). President Harrington indicated she would seek clarification of these issues with Bill Stuckey. The suggestion was made to contact Molly Martin for information about the FC/UFC voting process. It was also announced that there would be the option for paper ballots.

The question was called; the motion carried unanimously.

9b. Nominating Committee
Paul Carlin presented the slate for the Nominating Committee:

IUPUI Faculty Council Unit Representative (elect 1)
- Robert Barrows (History)
- Marc Bilodeau (Economics)

Faculty Enhancement Review Committee (elect 3*)
- Subir Chakrabarti (Economics)
- Paul Mullins (Anthropology)
- Ursula Niklas (Philosophy)
- Nancy Robertson (History)

* The Nominating Committee recommends that term length be determined by vote total with the individual with the most votes receiving a 3-year term and so on, declining.
Nominating Committee (elect 4*)
- Catherine Dobris (Communication Studies)
- Margaret Ferguson (Political Science)
- Larbi Oukada (World Languages and Culture)
- Kevin Robbins (History)
- Eric Wright (Sociology)

* The Nominating Committee recommends that nominees with the three highest vote totals receive 2-year terms; the nominee with the 4th highest total serve out Tom Marvin’s term (one more year).

Promotion and Tenure (elect 3*)
- Carol Gardner (Sociology)
- John Parrish-Sprowl (Communication Studies)
- Marianne Wokeck (History)
- Larry Zimmerman (Anthropology)

* Even though one current member is leaving early for sabbatical, two individuals remain, so the staggering of terms is fine.

Agenda Council (elect 2)
- Robert Harris (Economics)
- Michael Snodgrass (History)
- Robert Sutton (World Languages and Cultures)

Secretary (elect 1)
- Patricia Wittberg (Sociology)

The Nominating Committee moves:
- that in the elections for Faculty Enhancement Review, term length be determined by vote total with the individual with the most votes receiving a 3-year term and so on, declining;
- that in the elections for Nominating Committee, the candidates receiving the three highest vote totals, will fill two-year terms, and the candidate receiving the next highest vote total will fill a one-year replacement term.

**The motion carried.**

President Harrington thanked the Nominating Committee (Paul Carlin [Economics], Owen Dwyer [Geography], Margie Ferguson [Political Science], Liz Kryder-Reid [Anthropology], and Tom Marvin [English]) as well as those who agreed to stand for office. She asked for suggestions of any other names, but none were offered.

9c. Faculty Affairs

Mary Trotter, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, introduced the proposed salary policy, drawing the Assembly’s attention to the four kinds of raises: annual merit, promotion
adjustment, market adjustment, and equity adjustment. She pointed out that the proposed wording directs that: “The dean must allocate funds for all categories whenever meritorious cases for salary adjustment arise.” She provided other possible wording to guide the Assembly in its discussion of the issue:

- The dean must make every reasonable effort to allocate funds for all categories...
- The dean should allocate funds for all categories...
- In any year in which there is a budget increase in the SLA, the dean must allocate funds for all categories...
- Subject to available funds, the dean must allocate funds for all categories...

Discussion ensued about what acknowledgment (if any) there should be about budget constraints in the policy. Another issue was in what order should the raises be made (i.e., which kind of raise had highest priority?). Another concern was the spelling out of the amounts for promotion increases, especially given how little the increase was for the promotion of lecturers. Others pointed out that new hires were creating salary compression which could produce an influx of requests for equity raises. Discussion centered on who should bear the burden for an equity raise (the Dean, fully, or split between the Dean and the Department)?

The proposed policy will be discussed at the April Assembly.

9d. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Agenda Council:
Recommend that the Assembly discuss the issue of whether it is advisable to have senior lecturers serving on the SLA P&T committee for cases of promotion to senior lecturer

With time running out, discussion was only preliminary. An issue raised was whether lecturers would want this kind of service obligation.

9e. Technical Services
The Committee’s proposal for a change in their by-laws was deferred to the next Assembly.

10. ADJOURNMENT

President Harrington entertained a motion to adjourn, having invited the Assembly to join in a reception in Celebration of Research. She expressed the Assembly’s appreciation to Sue Herrell, Gen Shaker, Gale Plater, and other members of the Dean’s Staff for their efforts to set up the display of Faculty accomplishments. A list of Research publications that was distributed at the Reception is appended to these Minutes. The meeting adjourned 4:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Nancy Marie Robertson, 12 April 2005.
On January 28, 2005, the School of Liberal Arts Faculty Assembly approved new school promotion and tenure guidelines which, among other things, integrate lecturer promotion throughout the document. In the course of debate about these new guidelines, faculty of all ranks raised a number of important concerns about the implementation of the senior lecturer promotion process. The Assembly has asked me to forward its concern to both the Dean of the Faculties and the Faculty Council. We hope that further examination of these issues will answer current questions and improve the policy process in the future.

The School of Liberal Arts has the largest number of lecturer lines on campus, and thus the promotion process is important to us both because of its effect on individual faculty members but also because of the large number of faculty within the school (department chairs, primary committees, school committees, and mentors) who will be involved in the promotion process in an evaluative or advisory capacity. Our ranks have been enriched by the addition of so many full-time colleagues whose professional lives focus on teaching, but this change is not an entirely easy one. Our promotion and tenure guidelines have historically attended to the profiles of tenure-line faculty, and we have found challenges in adapting our structures to meet the needs of lecturers’ professional realities.

**Concerns about Lecturer Promotion**

The first area of contention that came up deals with the external letters required for promotion. Currently, our campus guidelines say “Criteria for judging performance within the categories of teaching, research and service are the same for all faculty” (3) and promotions for all ranks require at least 6 external letters. For lecturers, however, the letters may come from IUPUI colleagues “external to the department or
school” (8). There are differing interpretations of this language within the school, with some feeling it is more prudent, even if not required, to have reviewers must come from outside the school. Department chairs further wonder whether it will be particularly difficult to find so many external reviewers for promotion dossiers, given the number of lecturers in some departments (where multiple candidacies for promotion in a year are likely). Faculty generally wondered whether lecturers should aim for a campus-wide reputation for their work (analogous to the field-wide reputation that tenure-line faculty are expected to develop), whether such a reputation is even possible given the quantity and quality of many lecturers’ teaching load, and whether such an expectation is desirable. Perhaps focusing on school-wide impact or reputation makes more sense. Our discussion of these perspectives revealed not so much pitched divisions of opinion but the recognition that the implications of the currently-outlined process are uncertain.

We recognize that the campus guidelines permit the use of IUPUI colleagues as external reviewers in order to make it easier for 6 external letters to be obtained. However, we are concerned that making it easier to obtain letters makes it more difficult to obtain a fair disciplinary assessment of a candidate’s teaching. We had a spirited debate about the extent to which “teaching is teaching” and thus can be evaluated by a range of people (such as faculty associated with the Center for Teaching and Learning) who might be outside the candidate’s discipline. Some faculty argued that teaching is fundamentally a disciplinary activity and thus is best understood by audiences within the discipline (this argument flows naturally from some of the assumptions in other campus activities and guidelines about the scholarship of teaching). The use of disciplinary reviewers from outside IUPUI raises issues about how a reviewer from another college or university can understand the professional context of someone teaching, for example, 4 sections of introductory speech or writing each semester. Tenure-line faculty are often judged on their ability to innovate, but lecturers teaching in courses with common curricula need be judged in part on their ability to articulate their section goals with a common curricula. This type of performance may not easily be judged with criteria that seem to expect a faculty member to distinguish individual contributions, rather than show how individual contributions support a shared program. Perhaps a reduction in the number of external letters required for lecturer promotion dossiers would make it easier for candidates and chairs to identify qualified reviewers without compromising the quality of the review process. Our discussion did not end with any firm conclusions, but it was clear to all present that it is difficult to balance our usual assumptions about the evaluation of teaching and the new situations faced by candidates for promotion to senior lecturer.

The Academic Handbook notes that “Promotion considerations must take into account, however, differences in mission between campuses, and between schools within some campuses, as well as the individuals’ contribution to the school/campus mission” (Academic Handbook 70). The SLA faculty hope that as our campus explores the complexities of lecturer promotion, it will take up the question of the extent to which promotion considerations should take into account differences in mission between academic ranks. The Handbook is clear that lecturer ranks have fundamentally different responsibilities than tenure-line ranks, and perhaps our campus and university guidelines should honor those differences by making the promotion process more adaptable for lecturers.

Policy Guidance from the Campus and University
Any school’s promotion guidelines must be consistent with campus promotion and tenure guidelines, the IUPUI Supplement to the Academic Handbook, and the Academic Handbook. Unfortunately, these documents provide contradictory information about the status of and policies pertaining to lecturers. It is clearly not the role of the SLA Faculty Assembly to address these inconsistencies, but our faculty’s consideration of local policy is clouded by the confusion in other documents. The campus guidelines
make clear that departments and schools should establish clear expectations for faculty performance and it is difficult to do that when the guidance from above is unclear. Specifically:

- The 1997-1999 IUPUI Supplement to the *Academic Handbook* is still present on the web; if one searches *Academic Handbook* on the IUPUI search engine, it’s the first site listed. Faculty seeking information about the campus lecturer policy may reasonably end up at this site without any indication they are viewing a document which has since been updated. This version of the Supplement explains that every 5 years lecturer positions will be reviewed and new searches undertaken if there is a continuing need for the position (pg. 43-43: see [http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/handbk/hb2.htm#42](http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/handbk/hb2.htm#42)).

- The 2002 version of the IUPUI Supplement to the *Academic Handbook* appears in a different location on the IUPUI website ([http://www.jaguars.iupui.edu/handbook/2002/lecturer.html](http://www.jaguars.iupui.edu/handbook/2002/lecturer.html)). This document presents essentially the same information as the 1997-99 Supplement about full-time lecturer appointments on renewable contracts, this time with a cryptic link to an “enclosed” policy passed by the Faculty Council policy passed in February 2002. This version of the handbook is linked to the bottom navigation bar on the 1997-99 version. The electronic mingling of the 1997-1999 and 2002 editions of the IUPUI Supplement to the *Academic Handbook* is unfortunate.

- A checklist for senior lecturer promotion appears at [http://www.jaguars.iupui.edu/handbook/2002/lecturer.html](http://www.jaguars.iupui.edu/handbook/2002/lecturer.html), bottom of the page. This is an untitled, undated document used in the first year of the addition of lecturer lines to assign titles to senior lecturers who already had long-standing IUPUI careers. It was not intended as a regular checklist for later faculty. Some of our colleagues have found this policy when they searched for the current campus policy and wondered why it is so much simpler than the requirements of our school; there is no indication that the document is no longer in use.


- The IUPUI Faculty Council policy on lecturers, whose web heading still names it a proposal, rather than an approved policy, describes a very different approach to the review and reappointment of lecturers. The vision in the Faculty Council policy is clearly one of continuing positions in which the same faculty member gets reviewed over time, with provision for non-reappointment based on either performance or institutional changes. This appears at [http://www.iupui.edu/%7Efcouncil/documents/lecturerpolicyfc020207.htm](http://www.iupui.edu/%7Efcouncil/documents/lecturerpolicyfc020207.htm) and is consonant with that described in the IU *Academic Handbook* (77-79).

The differences among these documents create a difficult environment in which to craft clear school and department policies and in which to encourage our colleagues to plan for promotion after a probationary period. We also point out that while some of this confusion rests in complex questions (such as what is the relationship between the handbook and a policy passed by the Faculty Council), some of the confusion proceeds from decisions that have been made about how to archive material on the Faculty Council and academic affairs websites, more easily resolvable issues.
Looking Ahead

We know that issues about lecturer promotion are the object of attention by a campus administrative committee headed by Nancy Chism and the Faculty Affairs committee of our Faculty Council and that there is a Handbook committee at work. Several of our Liberal Arts colleagues are involved in these efforts, and the rich discussion at our Faculty Assembly will inform their participation in future discussions of promotion guidelines. Given the number of lecturers in Liberal Arts (a good number of whom are nearing the end of their probationary periods), we feel an urgency about these issues. The fact that Liberal Arts had a long history of lecturer appointments before the Trustees’ initiative increased the number of faculty holding this rank on campus means that we have a broader context for considering these issues than some other schools on campus, and I trust that you will draw on our experience with these issues to help clarify the campus approach. In particular, we hope that the campus will move to

- Clarify the external review process for lecturers
- Consider changing the review process (perhaps reducing levels of review) to make the process fit the requirements of the rank
- Clarify questions about the benefits of advanced rank and length of probationary period

My colleagues and I look forward to joining you in this important work.

Faculty Research Publications
Calendar Year 2004

This list is based on information reported by faculty on faculty annual reports submitted by January 31, 2005. Every attempt was made to make this list as complete as possible. We regret any omissions and welcome any additions.

Books

Economics


English


History


Zhang, Xin, Ershi Shiji Chuqi Zhongguo Shehui zhi Yanbian (Social Transformation in Modern China). (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2004) [translation from original published by Cambridge University Press 2000].

Philosophy


Political Science


Religious Studies


**Book Chapters and Journal Articles**

**Anthropology**

**MULLINS, Paul**


**ZIMMERMANN, Larry John**


**Communication Studies**

**GOERING, Elizabeth**


PARRISH-SPROWL, John


PETRONIO, Sandra


SCHRADER, Stuart


SHEELE, Kristina Horn

Economics

BILODEAU, Marc


CARLIN, Paul
ROONEY, Patrick

RUSSELL, Steven

SANDY, Robert

STEINBERG, Richard S.


WILHELM, Mark O.

English

BINGHAM, Dennis

CONNOR, Ulla


DICAMILLA, Fred

ELLER, Jonathan R.

Section introductions for Bradbury, Ray, It Came from Outer Space. Colorado Springs, CO: Gauntlet Press, 2004: "A Matter of Taste" (p. 44); "Life in Bungalow 10: Ray Bradbury and Sam Rolfe" (p. 403); "Postscript: Ray Bradbury and Harry Essex" (p. 419).

KIRTS, Terry

KOVACIK, Karen

NAGELHOUT, Edwin


TOUPONCE, William

**UPTON, Thomas**
(co-authors)

**WILLS, Katherine V.**

**Geography**

**BEIN, F. L. (Rick)**

**Dwyer III, Owen J.**


**Souch, Catherine**


History

BODENHAMER, David J.

CRAMER, Kevin

GONDOLA, Ch. Didier


KELLY, Jason M.

ROBBINS, Kevin

ROBERTSON, Nancy

Nancy Marie Robertson, Woceck (editor), Documentary Editing, Vol. 25, 4; Vol. 26, 1-3 2004

SCHNEIDER, William R.
Philosophy

BURKE, Michael

COLEMAN, Martin A.

DE TIENNE, André

DE WAAL, Cornelis


EBERL, Jason T.

GUENTERMAN, Richard


**HOUSER, Nathan**

**TILLEY, John**


**Political Science**

**BLOMQUIST, William**


**GOLDFINGER, Johnny**

**MCCORMICK, John**

**PEGG, Scott M.**

VARGUS, Brian

Religious Studies

CRAIG, David M.


DAVIS, Thomas

THUESEN, Peter J.


Sociology

APONTE, Robert

BAO, Wan-Ning

FOOTE-ARDAH, Carrie
“Sociocultural Barriers to the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine for HIV”. Qualitative Health Research. 14 (5): 593-611 May

HAAS, Ain

Ain Haas, Andres Peekna & Robert E. Walker (2003). “Echoes of Stone Age Cataclysms in the Baltic Sea Area.” *Folklore* (published by the Folk Belief and Media Group of the Estonian Literary Museum in Tartu, Estonia), Vol. 23, pp. 49-81. Also available at http://haldjas.folklore.ee/folklore . [This article was listed as a forthcoming publication in last year's FAR. It was actually printed at the end of 2003, but I did not receive word of its publication until after the FAR had been submitted. This year is the first time it has been listed as an actual publication.]

**HAAS, Linda**


**STEINMETZ, Suzanne**


**WITTBERG, Patricia**


**WRIGHT, Eric**


World Languages and Cultures

**ANTÓN, Marta**


**BRANT, Herbert**


**GARCIA, Gustavo V.**

**NNAEMEKA, Obioma G.**


**SUTTON, Robert**

### Edited Journals

**English**

**CONNOR, Ulla**

**WOKECK, Marianne**
Wokeck (editor), *Documentary Editing*, Vol. 25, 4; Vol. 26, 1-3 2004
Religious Studies

GOFF, Philip K.
Goff, P., S. Stein and P. Williams (co-editors). Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation.

Sociology

STEINMETZ, Suzanne
Marriage and Family Review. Suzanne Steinmetz, editor.

WITTBERG, Patricia
Review of Religious Research. Patricia Wittberg, editor.

The Works of George Santayana

FROST, Kristine

World Languages and Cultures

HOYT, Giles
Studies in Indiana German-Americana. Giles Hoyt, editor.

NNAEMEKA, Obioma G.

Series Editor

GOFF, Philip K.
