

IUPUI FC Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes of October 20, 2006

Present: A. Barth, Y. Chen, T. Cummins, A. De Tienne (chair), J. Dynlacht, S. Fox, S. Hamilton (Administrative liaison), J. Hehman, R. Osgood, K. Robertson, L. Schwecke, M. Wolf, M. Wagner (Executive Committee liaison), R. Yost
Visitor: Stephen Jay
Excused: B. Blazer-Yost, R. Gunderman, R. Nickolson, L. Riolo, U. Sukhatme
Absent: D. Agarwal, H. Besch, C. Bostrom, K. Petsche

1. De Tienne called the meeting to order at 2:05 P.M. in the meeting room of the Institute for American Thought (ES0014). He greeted the committee and all members introduced themselves. Attention was called to the Committee's webpage that IFC Coordinator Molly Martin maintains: <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/committees/facultyaffairs.htm>, where meeting announcements and committee documents are accessible.

2. **CURTAILING ACCEPTANCE OF TOBACCO MONIES** [INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEM]. Dr. Stephen J. Jay, former chair of IUSM Department of Public Health, presented this complex issue which has many ramifications, including funding policy, research policy, academic integrity, and academic freedom. At stake is a policy that would prohibit faculty from applying for or receiving grants and contracts from tobacco-industry-linked companies and corporations. Dr. Jay presented a brief historical overview of the issue, emphasized its moral aspect, presented arguments for and against the policy, described IUSM's evolving discussion of it, and showed what other prominent schools of public health and of medicine around the country had already done in framing their respective restrictive policies. Dr. Jay passed around three handouts (a set of notes for a meeting of an IUSM faculty steering committee with several attachments, a University of California document titled "Campaign to Defend Academic Integrity," and part of the program of the 2005 annual business conference showing the CEO of Philip Morris teaching a leadership lesson to Kelley School MBA students). Dr. Jay's presentation led to a substantive discussion. De Tienne cut it short in the interest of time, and asked everyone to further study this issue at leisure; a fuller discussion will be scheduled at a later time.

3. **THREE-YEAR REVIEW POLICY** [DISCUSSION ITEM]. Associate Dean of the Faculties Sharon Hamilton explained the rationale of the proposed policy for three-year reviews (copy of which was distributed to the committee). An essential part of its background has to do with the fact that a number of tenure-track faculty have suffered drawbacks at P&T time in good part because they had not received proper guidance from their school regarding their progress toward tenure, and that such situations could have been avoided or mitigated, had their school provided much better reviews at the mid-point of their probationary period. These unfortunate situations often lead the mishandled faculty to file grievance and go through the Board of Review process, which is very burdensome on all involved. In accord with the IFC Executive Committee and the Deans, the campus administration is proposing that the schools forward annually to the Office of the Dean of

the Faculties (ODF) a copy of the three-year reviews of all of their third-year tenure-track faculty so that ODF may examine the quality of the reviews and of the advising they provide, and subsequently draw the attention of school deans and P&T committees to potential problems that may need remedy.

Discussion of the policy was lively and several questions and concerns were raised regarding the exact nature and purpose of the ODF's survey of three-year reviews, the feedback methodology, enforcement strategy, and especially whether the faculty under review ought to receive some specific kind of individualized notification from the ODF. De Tienne offered to summarize the several questions and concerns heard during the meeting and to forward them both to Sharon Hamilton and to the Executive Committee after vetting from members of the Faculty Affairs committee.

4. FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW [DISCUSSION ITEM]. This issue is tightly connected to the previous item. IFC president Bart Ng has represented that it has become increasingly difficult to select five-member boards of review out of an elected pool of twenty while maintaining adequate compositional balance and eliminating conflicts of interest, and that things will get worse with the push to extend the right for having a board of review to all appointees with at least a half-time appointment. Our committee has thus been asked to examine the feasibility of enlarging the pool from twenty to some higher number. Several questions were examined, including the role of the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel, the likelihood that the new three-year review policy could diminish the number of grievances, ramifications for the nominating committee, and the burden of serving on a board of review. A handout reproducing "Bylaw Article IV, Faculty Grievances Procedures," was distributed. Marion Wagner provided good arguments and vivid testimony, and referred to current difficulties with the IUPUI administration that are being worked out in this connection. De Tienne explained that Molly Martin was going to send us tabulated data related to Board of Review activities over the last two years. Once these are available, we will be in a better position to close our discussion and formulate our advice to the Executive Committee.

5. STUDENTS SATISFACTION SURVEYS. There was no time to discuss this important issue, which is therefore postponed to a future meeting.

6. HIRING POLICIES FOR DIVERSITY INITIATIVES. Idem, with the caveat that the Executive Committee does not see this issue as something this Committee ought to worry about.

7. NEW BUSINESS. There was none.

8. NEXT MEETING. November 17, 2006, ES 0014, 2 to 3:30 P.M.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 P.M.

Submitted by André De Tienne, 23 October 2006