MEMORANDUM

TO: IUPUI Faculty Council
    Faculty/Staff of the IU School of Nursing

FROM: Charles R. Bantz, Chancellor

DATE: September 2, 2009

RE: Administrative Review of the Dean, IU School of Nursing, Marion Broome

This memo summarizes the report of the Administrative Review Committee (ARC) on the Office of the Dean of the IU School of Nursing, Marion Broome.

Dean Lawrence Goldblatt of the IU School of Dentistry chaired the committee. Its members from the IU School of Nursing were Professor Janet S. Carpenter (Department of Adult Health), Professor & Assistant Dean Joyce A. Splann Krothe (Bloomington Campus), President of the IUSON Staff Council Norma Pahl, and Dean of Nursing and Health Professions/Professor of Nursing Mary Jo Regan-Kubinski (IU South Bend). Representing other schools were Chancellor’s Professor of Psychology Gary R. Bond (School of Science), Professor of Economics Paul S. Carlin (School of Liberal Arts), Professor of Oral Biology, Preventive and Community Dentistry, and Pathology & Laboratory Medicine Richard L. Gregory (Schools of Dentistry and Medicine), Paul E. Beam Professor of Law Andrew Klein (IU School of Law-Indianapolis), and Professor and Chair, Department of Public Health, G. Marie Swanson (IU School of Medicine). Also on the committee were Mary L. Spath (Graduate Student) and Noah Robert Zanville (Undergraduate Student).

A subcommittee of the ARC worked with the office of Jim Wolf, Director of the Survey Research Center at IUPUI, to design and conduct two structured surveys: one designed primarily to be completed by IUSON faculty and staff, and one targeted specifically toward students. The ARC divided up into teams of two committee members each to interview 32 individuals, including other deans on the IUPUI campus; current and former campus finance, research, and other administration officials; members of the IUSON Board of Advisors; officers of the IUSON Alumni Association; high- level administrators at area hospitals used as IUSON clinical education sites; current and former assistant/associate deans; and department chairs of the IUSON. The ARC assigned a team to do telephone interviews with two deans of other nursing schools to provide a national perspective to the review.

In the Executive Summary of the review report, the ARC drew the following conclusions and made the subsequent recommendations.

In the five years since Dean Broome joined Indiana University as University Dean of Nursing, the data collected by the ARC show that she has displayed strength, vision, energy, and commitment to enhance nursing education, practice, and research at IU. She has forged a number of important collaborations between her programs and others within IU, to the benefit of them
all. She is a nationally respected researcher in her own right and thus possesses both the knowledge and stature to strengthen the research enterprise at her school to even greater heights than when she arrived. She has also been a strong fiscal manager, turning the very precarious fiscal situation she found when she arrived at IU into a financially solid operation. She is also a leading figure in nursing education nationally as demonstrated and practiced in her position of Editor-in-Chief of Nursing Outlook, and she is a widely respected national figure amongst her peer deans of schools of nursing.

At the same time Dean Broome’s management style has not been received favorably by many of her faculty and staff. While some view her as an appropriately strong, take-charge leader, many feel she does not seek enough input prior to making important decisions. Nor does she adequately consider the human consequence to faculty and staff before she makes some human resource decisions. Her stance on promotion and tenure and her criteria for promotion in clinical rank were particularly hard on many faculty. Finally, many feel that her relationships with those around her could be more effective if she took a gentler approach and made it clearer that she respects the opinions of others even if she disagrees with them.

Preface to Recommendations

The evidence examined by the committee makes it clear that Dean Broome is a very strong representative of IUSON to audiences external to the SON. This is one of her greatest strengths. At the same time much of the evidence makes it clear that her internal management, especially in the area of human resources, has been less successful. If Dean Broome could refocus a portion of her energy to correct these internal difficulties, the combination of a strong, well-functioning, cohesive School and Dean Broome’s excellent external relations could further elevate the IUSON to the very highest rank and make it a complete model for other schools nationally and internationally.

Recommendations

- Continue working on the Core School approach; streamline procedures. Flatten out the administrative/hierarchical structure for efficiency; there are too many administrative layers which create hurdles.


- Be more attentive to leadership style, interpersonal relationships and skills, and political sensitivity. Consider seeking consultation in this area. Being softer and smoother with people and filtering her reactions more would help.

- Discuss decisions and get input before they are finalized and implemented. Be more aware of and sensitive to professional networks and their influence.

- Foster a supportive environment for faculty where teaching, research, and service can all thrive.
• Address questions regarding “service” presence at the SON as it aligns with the mission of the university and the nursing discipline (or not). Revisit the question of whether service can be used as an area of excellence for P&T.

In a response to the Administrative Review Committee report, Dean Broome provided the following statement, which is included here verbatim.

August 3, 2009

Dear Dean Goldblatt,

I appreciated the opportunity to review the written evaluation I received from the committee on July 20, and to meet with the committee on July 22. I know this evaluation process required much effort on the part of the committee members and the chair and wanted to thank everyone for their contributions. I found the evaluation helpful and also appreciate the time the respondents took completing the surveys and interviews.

Not many of the comments surprised me, with a few exceptions. The one area I would like to respond to is the perception that I do not value the educational mission of the school, or the contributions made by faculty and staff who spend most of their time in that mission. In actuality, I highly value the educational mission and have taken numerous opportunities to assess, develop and provide resources to support that mission. I realized, however, that I should have made those opportunities clearer to faculty and staff. I never pulled this information together in writing and shared it with the faculty and staff. This oversight (in terms of communication) on my part was also commented on in the evaluation.

So I have chosen to address this specific issue in my response and provide some tangible evidence that I believe should make clear my strong commitment to education, specifically in the area of undergraduate education, on which I was actually scored lowest on the survey. These ratings were also reflected in comments such as “the strongest measures she has taken were designed to enhance the research mission of the school” and “that the support for the research has been to the detriment of the educational and service mission of the school”. I hope the objective evidence I provide below will help members of the school community frame a better understanding about my commitment to education in IUSON.

Over the past 5 years I have chosen to invest a great deal of money in positions, space, instructional support and faculty development related to education. In many cases, the dollars I invested in these areas could have been used to support the research mission. One example is the funds I invested in building the Resource Center for Innovation in Clinical Nursing Education (RCICNE), which were an unrestricted gift from a donor. I could have used this gift to support an endowed chair. However, after consultation with the members of the academic leadership team in the school, I agreed that in order to maintain the school’s stellar reputation as a leader in nursing education the educational space needed to be renovated. Over $2,247,568 was spent in the construction and furnishing of the RCICNE.
Other examples of my commitment to the proving resources to support the education mission of IUSON

1. $176,670 in new furniture for faculty offices

2. $903,023 release time for curriculum and educational program coordinators at both undergraduate and graduate programs

3. $231,500 for faculty development funds, $77,780 for additional travel requested, and $60,257 for individual faculty development related to teaching

4. Support packages for new faculty hires to the clinical track have been aligned with those on tenure track, which was not available before. This includes 2 years of summer support for scholarship; funds to support scholarship and a course release/each semester for their 1st 2 years.

5. Clinical faculty who have chosen to return to doctoral study have been provided additional cash funds to assist with tuition and a course release each semester for up to 2 years.

6. $450,365 faculty base and bonus allocations for faculty- 45% of which, on average was based on teaching contributions (other areas were research and service). The percentage increases in salary for faculty over the last 4 years have reflected my commitment to bringing the clinical faculty (who are focused primarily on teaching) salaries up: 2004-2005 (CT=2.5%; TT=4.2), 2005-06 (CT=4.8%; TT=5.0%); 2006-07 (CT=4.5%; TT=3.2%); 2007-08 (CT=7.6%; TT=4.3%)

7. $72,000 for speakers and lectureships (not supported by endowed funds) that were directly related to teaching

8. Development of the Center for Research in Nursing Education, and recruitment of Dr. Pam Ironside as director, funding the Billings Lectureship in the CRNE and pilot research

9. $23,000 for consultants to various educational programs.

10. Over the past 5 years, several areas directly related to instructional support of the teaching mission of the school have been supplemented by new staff positions funded on base money. These include a net of 3.3 FTE positions in the Center for Academic Affairs; 1 faculty FTE and 3 FTE staff in the RCICNE; and 1 faculty FTE and 1 staff position for the Center for Research in Nursing Education. This is a total of 7.3 staff positions to support educational mission.

11. There have been 19 tenure track promotions since I became dean: 10 of these were promoted on excellence in teaching and 1 on service – all received letters of support from me.

We have the same number of faculty (n=87) as when I became dean. Unfortunately, we are also currently not being in compliance with the university requirement ratio of 60% tenure track -
40% clinical track. My emphasis on recruiting and hiring tenure track faculty may be perceived as lack of support by some of the faculty. However, it is clear we will have to continue to look at our faculty and program mix to properly align the school with university, professional, state and national mandates.

Finally, I personally taught 3-6 sections each year (depending on the year) in the BSN honors and research courses, and Ph.D. program. I believe this is an important reflection of my valuing of and commitment to the educational mission if IUSON.

It is my intent that by providing this objective evidence my commitment to the educational mission of IUSON will be more transparent and clear. The school has a long tradition of excellence to education – in fact, this excellence attracted me to the dean position of this institution. I hope to continue to work with the faculty and staff to continue that excellence, as well as to continue to support and build excellence in research.

Thank you for the opportunity to share this information.

Sincerely,

Marion E. Broome

Marion E. Broome, Ph.D., RN, FAAN