

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis  
**Faculty Council Minutes (“IFC”): December 5, 2006**  
**Wynne Courtroom of Inlow Hall: 3:30 – 5:30 pm**

*Original agenda follows adjournment as attachment.*

**Agenda Item I: Call to Order: Rosalie Vermette (IUPUI Faculty Vice-President, 4.0064).**

Vermette called the meeting to order at 3:34pm.

**Agenda Item II: Adoption of the Order of Business for the Day.**

The order of business for the day was adopted.

**Agenda Item III: [ACTION ITEM] Memorial Resolution for Godfrey "Goff" Tunncliff, Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology.**

The IFC stood for a moment of silence to recognize their colleague, unanimously adopting the resolution.

**Agenda Item IV: [ACTION ITEM] Memorial Resolution for Rebecca Sue Wappner, Professor of Pediatrics.**

The IFC stood for a moment of silence to recognize their colleague, unanimously adopting the resolution.

**Agenda Item V: [ACTION ITEM] IFC 11/21/06 Minutes.**

Hearing no objections, the IFC November 21, 2006 minutes stood as written and were entered into record.

*These minutes are available to view online at <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/minutes/fc061121html.htm>*

**Agenda Item VI: [INFORMATION ITEM] Presentation of Slates for Election to the Board of Review Pool and the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel (“FGAP”): Jacqueline Blackwell (Chair – Nominating, [jblackwe@iupui.edu](mailto:jblackwe@iupui.edu)).**

Blackwell read the slate of nominees for [the January 9, 2007] election to the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel and Board of Review pool. The slate is as follows:

**Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel**

At the **January 9, 2007** Faculty Council meeting, you will be asked to **vote for up to two full professors and one associate professor\*** from the list of candidates below. Official ballots will be distributed at the meeting. The two full professors and one associate professor receiving the most votes\* will serve a two year term (2/1/07 - 1/31/09), joining these four individuals who will continue serving until 1/31/08: **Hasan Akay** (E&T – Tenured Professor), **Susanmarie Harrington** (SLA – Tenured Professor), **Sara Horton-Deutsch** (Nursing – Tenured Associate Professor), and **Rachel Nardo** (Music – Tenured Associate Professor).

\*Two full professors and one associate professor will be elected so as to satisfy the requisite percentage of full professors on the FGAP, as dictated by the Bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty Council.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Unit/Sub-Unit</u>	<u>Academic Rank/Additional Titles</u>
Carol Gardner	SLA: Sociology	<b>Tenured Professor</b>
John McKivigan	SLA: History	<b>Tenured Professor</b>
Michael Pritz	Medicine: Neurosurgery	<b>Tenured Professor</b>
Edward Srour	Medicine: Hem/Onc	<b>Tenured Professor</b>
Jill Murrell	Medicine: Pathology/Lab Sci	<b>Tenured Associate Professor</b>
C. Subah Packer	Medicine: Cellular & Integrative Physiology	<b>Tenured Associate Professor</b>

### **Faculty Board of Review Pool**

Also at the **January 9, 2007** Faculty Council meeting, you will be asked to **vote for up to ten** of the fifteen candidates listed below. Official ballots will be distributed at the meeting. The ten individuals receiving the most votes will serve a two year term (2/1/07 - 1/31/09), joining these ten individuals who will continue serving until 1/31/08: **Simon Atkinson** (Medicine - Tenured Associate Professor), **Sarah Baker** (Medicine - Tenured Associate Professor), **Ed Berbari** (E&T - Tenured Professor), **Nancy Eckerman** (Medicine - Tenured Librarian), **May Jafari** (University Library - Tenured Associate Librarian), **Kathy E. Johnson** (Science: Psychology - Tenured Associate Professor), **Anna McDaniel** (Nursing - Tenured Associate Professor), **Jeffrey Platt** (Dentistry - Tenured Associate Professor), **Reed Smith** (Business - Tenured Associate Professor), **L. Jack Windsor** (Dentistry - Tenured Associate Professor).

<b>Name</b>	<b>Unit/Sub-Unit</b>	<b>Academic Rank/Additional Titles</b>
Ghalib Alkhatib	Medicine: Microbiology/Immunology	Tenured Associate Professor
Terry Baumer	SPEA	Tenured Associate Professor
David J. Bodenhamer	SLA: POLIS	Tenured Professor
John Fetterman	Science: Psychology	Tenured Professor
Lawrence Garetto	Dentistry	Tenured Professor
Charles Goodlett	Science: Psychology	Tenured Professor
Dean Hawley	Medicine	Tenured Professor
Richard E. Humphrey	Law	Tenured Associate Librarian
Richard D. Jackson	Dentistry	Tenured Professor
Bob Jamison	Business	Tenured Professor
Susan Perkins	Medicine	Tenured Associate Professor
Bill Schneider	SLA: History	Tenured Professor
Brian Vargus	SLA: Political Science	Tenured Professor
Chi-Wah (Rudy) Yung	Medicine	Tenured Associate Professor
Jeff X. Watt	Science: Math	Tenured Professor

At meeting time, nominating ballots for the Spring 2007 election of At-Large Representatives to the IFC had been electronically distributed to all voting faculty at IUPUI. Nominating ballots are due back on or before January 14<sup>th</sup>.

### **Agenda Item VII Updates/Remarks from the Chancellor: Charles Bantz (Indiana University Executive Vice President and Chancellor of IUPUI).**

Chancellor Bantz reported the following:

- He will soon be convening groups to review the following issues: the reallocation process for student fees; planning for a campus multi-cultural center; developing the job description for a campus diversity officer; and searching for a campus diversity officer.
- The Chancellor also reported that Dean/Vice President Brater has been traveling across Indiana promoting the Life/Sciences Initiative.
- IUPUI recently received recognition at two events: one honoring contributors to the success of the INShape Indiana initiative and the other celebrating IUPUI being named to the first President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll.

### **Agenda Item VIII: Updates/Remarks from the IFC President: Bart Ng.**

Ng reported the following:

- Ng then asked for faculty input on an open letter to IU's next President, which will provide an opportunity to express IUPUI's unique position in the university, goals, expectations of leadership, etc. A number of faculty noted the need to cite [in this letter] "the inherent conflict of interest created by the Board's decision to ask the President to serve, also, as the CEO of IUB."

Ng would like to have a draft of the letter ready for IFC review in January. Ng, again, asked that faculty forward feedback to the Faculty Council Officer at [molmarti@iupui.edu](mailto:molmarti@iupui.edu) or directly to Ng at [bng@math.iupui.edu](mailto:bng@math.iupui.edu).

- Ng reminded IFC members that IFC meetings will begin at 3:00pm beginning January 9, 2007.
- Ng reported that the IFC Executive Committee continues its conversation with Chancellor Bantz about the faculty Board of Review process (the role of the board, the administration, etc.). He will update the IFC at future meetings.
- *See also Agenda Item XI.*

#### **Agenda Item IX: Question / Answer Period.**

No discussion.

#### **Agenda Item X: [FIRST READING] Policy on Three-Year Formative Review of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty & Librarians: Andre De Tienne (Chair – Faculty Affairs Committee, 4.2033, [adetienn@iupui.edu](mailto:adetienn@iupui.edu)).**

De Tienne read the revised policy which has been substantially rewritten following its original reading at the November 7, 2006 IFC meeting. The policy was returned to the IFC Faculty Affairs Committee—consulted by the original proposal author Associate Dean of Faculties Sharon Hamilton—for review and revision following the November 7<sup>th</sup> meeting and is now being treated as an IFC policy (as opposed to one originated by the administration and simply endorsed by the IFC).

The policy (as read on 12/5/06) reads as follows:

##### “Policy on Three-Year Formative Review of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty and Librarians

IUPUI faculty and librarians (hereinafter referred to collectively as “the faculty” or “the faculty member(s)”) represent one of our campus’s most valuable resources. The University makes a substantial long-term investment in its faculty. Our non-tenured tenure-track faculty’s professional success must be among the highest priorities for all campus administrative officers.

While IUPUI has in place an annual review policy mandating that all faculty members be provided with a yearly written evaluation of their work in the areas of teaching, research, and service (or, in the case of librarians, the equivalent areas of performance, professional development, and service), these annual reviews are frequently conducted by the department chair or the school dean alone, without the participation of a peer review committee.

#### ***The Policy***

To ensure that all non-tenured tenure-track faculty members benefit from helpful and meaningful assessments of their progress toward promotion and tenure near the mid-point of their probationary period, a Three-Year Formative Review [hereinafter referred to as the “Review”] shall be conducted on all such faculty members during the spring semester of the third year of their appointments in accordance with the following guidelines.

#### ***Applicability***

This policy applies to all non-tenured tenure-track faculty members at IUPUI, with the exceptions noted immediately below. The term “third year” refers to the *third full academic year* of the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member’s appointment. However, faculty members who enter with one year of credit toward tenure are in their “third year” during their second full academic year of appointment, and those who enter with two years of credit are in their “third year” during their first full academic year of appointment. Those who enter either with tenure or with more than two years of credit toward tenure are exempt from the Review.

#### ***Procedures***

In schools or units where faculty-approved policies or guidelines for conducting the Review already exist, those policies or guidelines should be followed.

In schools or units where such policies or guidelines have not yet been formulated or approved by the faculty, the Review shall in the interim be conducted in adherence with the following general considerations.

The chief purpose of the Review is to provide non-tenured tenure-track faculty members with feedback from the school or unit

level review committees regarding their cumulative progress toward promotion and tenure. Hence, other than the department chair or school dean, involvement by the department's Primary Committee (where applicable) and/or the school's Unit Committee (where applicable) in the Review is essential.

1. The order of review and deliberation involving the department chair or school dean and the Primary and Unit Committees should generally follow the sequence and procedure used by each school in handling ordinary tenure and promotion cases.
2. The faculty member being reviewed should submit only a candidate's statement together with an up-to-date vita. The statement (not to exceed 5 pages) should be similar in organization to the statement the faculty member would expect to write at the time of making a case for promotion and tenure. In particular, it should clearly state the anticipated area(s) of excellence or the intention to request consideration on the basis of a balanced case.
3. The department chair or school dean and the Primary and Unit Committees (where applicable) must each provide the faculty member with a written assessment that includes evaluation of progress toward promotion and tenure, using normal and appropriate metrics that will eventually be employed in a tenure decision. If the chair, the dean, or the Committees identify any problems, their assessment must include specific suggestions for remedy aimed at helping the faculty member and the faculty member's department or unit in their efforts to rectify the problems.

### ***Documentation and Reporting***

A copy of each review report, whether by the Committees, the chair, or the dean shall be communicated to the faculty member under review within three days of the time it is completed.

To ensure that the Review is properly conducted for all applicable non-tenured tenure-track faculty members, the dean of each school shall be responsible for submitting copies of the chair's or the dean's and the Committees' reports on all non-tenured tenure-track faculty members who have been reviewed to the Office of the Dean of the Faculties by May 31 each year.

### ***Limitation on the Use of the Review***

The thrust of the Review shall be to help the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member to succeed. The Review and its findings shall not be used by the department chair or the school dean, or the Office of the Dean of the Faculties, as the basis for a tenure decision, a pre-tenure decision, a reappointment or non-reappointment decision, or any personnel action of like kind."

Faculty Affairs Committee Member C. Subah Packer--on behalf of herself, Richard Meiss, and Weiming Yu--also provided proposed amendments to the proposed policy. Their proposed amendments—which will be up for discussion and action alongside the proposed policy above at the January 9, 2007 IFC meeting—read as follows:

“Policy on Three-Year Formative Review  
of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty and Librarians

**Questions for Discussion in Blue Font in Comment Boxes and Highlighted Suggested Revisions in the Text are Submitted by C Subah Packer, Weiming Yu and Richard Meiss, November 27, 2006**

IUPUI faculty and librarians (hereinafter referred to collectively as “the faculty” or “the faculty member(s)”) represent one of our campus's most valuable resources. The University makes a substantial long-term investment in its faculty. Our non-tenured tenure-track faculty's professional success must be among the highest priorities for all campus administrative officers.

While IUPUI has in place an annual review policy mandating that all faculty members be provided with a yearly written evaluation of their work in the areas of teaching, research, and service (or, in the case of librarians, the equivalent areas of performance, professional development, and service), these annual reviews are frequently conducted by the department chair or the school dean alone, without the participation of a peer review committee.

### ***The Policy***

To ensure that all non-tenured tenure-track faculty members benefit from helpful and meaningful assessments of their progress toward promotion and tenure near the mid-point of their probationary period, a Third-Year Formative Review [hereinafter referred to as the “Review”] shall be conducted on all such faculty members during the spring semester of the third year of their appointments in accordance with the following guidelines.

### ***Applicability***

This policy applies to all non-tenured tenure-track faculty members at IUPUI, with the exceptions noted immediately below. The

term “third year” refers to the *third full academic year* of the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member’s appointment. However, faculty members who enter with one year of credit toward tenure are in their “third year” during their second full academic year of appointment, and those who enter with two years of credit are in their “third year” during their first full academic year of appointment. Those who enter either with tenure or with more than two years of credit toward tenure are exempt from the Review.

### ***Procedures***

In schools or units where faculty-approved policies or guidelines for conducting the Review already exist, those policies or guidelines should be followed.

In schools or units where such policies or guidelines have not yet been formulated or approved by the faculty, the Review shall in the interim be conducted in adherence with the following general considerations.

4. The chief purpose of the Review is to provide non-tenured tenure-track faculty members with feedback from the school or unit level review committees regarding their cumulative progress toward promotion and tenure. Hence, other than the department chair or school dean, involvement by the department’s Primary Committee (where applicable) and/or the school’s Unit Committee (where applicable) in the Review is essential. A thorough and comprehensive review of the faculty member’s efforts must be performed. [SP1] A fair and balanced evaluation of the candidate’s entire effort even if this involves activity/productivity that lie outside of the norms of the primary unit must be afforded. In addition to progress in teaching/performance, research/creative activity and service, exceptional activities that might constitute a “balanced case” and/or exceptional service must be considered. Finally, reviewers must address whether or not the standard set by the decision-making administrator is actually realistic with regard to the set of financial and administrative rules and policies imposed on all faculty members of the department or the decision-making unit. Specifically, reviewers must make an assessment as to whether the expectations communicated to the candidate at the time of hiring and at annual reviews can realistically be achieved and, therefore, consider exceptions in case they are not.

A secondary purpose of the Review is to help deans and chairs have a clear sense of the cumulative progress of their tenure-track faculty, so that they will consider any recommended supports or changes in local financial and administrative rules and policies as well as in curricular assignments or service expectations in order to help these faculty members be as successful as possible. This three-year review must serve the purposes of a bilateral review; a process that is mutually beneficial for the faculty under review as well as the primary policy-making units and the broader University Community to ensure better faculty performance by assuring that the support needed is being afforded to the faculty. Achieving optimal faculty performance and having an optimal environment in which each faculty member is able to pursue the three missions of the University as well as having every opportunity to thrive in his/her declared area of excellence goes hand-in-hand. Therefore, the Committees writing the reviews will need to keep all three audiences in mind: the faculty member, the chair, and the dean.

5. The order of review and deliberation involving the department chair or school dean and the Primary and Unit Committees should generally follow the sequence and procedure used by each school in handling ordinary tenure and promotion cases.

6. The faculty member being reviewed should submit only a candidate’s statement together with an up-to-date vita. The statement (not to exceed 5 pages) [SP2] should be similar in organization to the statement the faculty member would expect to write at the time of making a case for promotion and tenure. In particular, it should clearly state the anticipated area(s) of excellence or the intention to request consideration on the basis of a balanced case.

7. The department chair or school dean and the Primary and Unit Committees (where applicable) must each provide the faculty member with a written assessment that includes evaluation of progress toward promotion and tenure, using normal and appropriate metrics that will eventually be employed in a tenure decision. [SP3] If the chair, the dean, or the Committees identify any problems, their assessment must include specific suggestions for remedy aimed at helping the faculty member and the faculty member’s department or unit in their efforts to rectify the problems.

### ***Documentation and Reporting***

A copy of each review report, whether by the Committees, the chair, or the dean shall be communicated to the faculty member under review within three days of the time it is completed.

To ensure that the Review is properly conducted for all applicable non-tenured tenure-track faculty members, the dean of each school shall be responsible for submitting copies of the chair’s or the dean’s and the Committees’ reports on all non-tenured tenure-track faculty members who have been reviewed to the Office of the Dean of the Faculties by May 31 each year. [SP4]

Since the purpose of the Review is to provide constructive and supportive feedback to the tenure track faculty member and to provide decision-making unit administrators with concrete recommendations concerning course load, performance, number of course preparations per semester, or changes in research or service expectations in order to facilitate the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure, follow-up will be performed by the Dean of Faculties Office in cases where problems have been identified to ensure that such recommendations are addressed in a timely fashion (8 weeks?). [SP5]

### ***Limitation on the Use of the Review***

The thrust of the Review shall be to help the non-tenured tenure-track faculty member to succeed. The Review shall not be used as a tool against the candidate but, rather, shall be used as a reference point at the time for P&T in order to evaluate the progress at the end of the probationary period. The Review and its findings shall not be used by the department chair or the school dean, or the Office of the Dean of the Faculties, as the basis for a tenure decision, a pre-tenure decision, a reappointment or non-reappointment decision, or any personnel action of like kind.[\[SP6\]](#)”

Discussion followed in which concerns were raised about the timeline of the review and whether or not it would coincide with school timelines. De Tienne pointed out that the policy asks that “in schools or units where faculty-approved policies or guidelines for conducting the review already exist, those policies or guidelines should be followed.” IFC members requested the clarification of some of terminology in the policy; semantic suggestions will be incorporated, as appropriate, into the policy prior to IFC action.

### **Agenda Item XI: [DISCUSSION ITEM] Executive Committee Recommendations on Proposals re: the Reorganization of the Division of Labor Studies: Bart Ng.**

Ng reported that the IFC Executive Committee (“IFCEC”) has drafted a report on the proposed reorganization of the Division of Labor Studies [in preparation to the IFC’s January discussion and February action/recommendations]: [http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/DLS/IFCEC\\_rec\\_12-06.pdf](http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/DLS/IFCEC_rec_12-06.pdf).

Ng asked IFC members to read the report to inform their re-reading and consideration of the administration’s and DLS faculty’s respective proposals. These and other DLS documents are available online at <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/DLS/DLS.htm>. Ng thanked the IFC for reading thoughtfully and carefully. He also asked faculty to forward feedback or questions to the IFCEC by way of the Faculty Council Office at [molmarti@iupui.edu](mailto:molmarti@iupui.edu).

### **Agenda Item XII: [DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEM] Journalism-SLA Merger: Dean Robert White (SLA) and Associate Dean Jim Brown (Journalism).**

Following an explanation of the circumstances motivating a proposed merger (*a high number of Indianapolis majors per a relatively small number of faculty, perceived lack of engagement with the IU School of Journalism at Indianapolis on the part of the Dean of the IU School of Journalism [based at IUB], etc.*), Deans White and Brown explained that both schools are enthusiastic about a merger. While some concerns have been raised on the IUB campus about such a merger, the Council determined that said concerns should be addressed only following the IFC’s registration of their opinion on the matter.

The IFC then unanimously approved the merger of the IU School of Journalism at Indianapolis into the IU School of Liberal Arts [per the section of handbook relating to campus faculties’ consultative authority regarding the “creation,



reorganization, merg-er, and elimination of programs and units affecting more than one school on the campus (*IU Academic Handbook*, p. 26) ”].

**Agenda Item XIII: Unfinished Business?**

No discussion.

**Agenda Item XIV: New Business?**

No discussion.

**Agenda Item XV: Adjournment.**

Vice President Vermette adjourned the meeting at 5:32pm.

Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, Molly Martin  
UN 403 / 274-2215 / Fax: 274-2970 / [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) / <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil>

[Attachment for IFC 12-5-06 Minutes]

**ATTACHMENTS NOT CONTAINED IN ELECTRONIC MINUTES**

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) **Faculty Council (IFC)** Meeting  
Wynne Courtroom of Inlow Hall (**IH 100**) / Tuesday November 7, 2006 - 3:30-5:30 pm  
**A G E N D A** (IFC: November 7, 2006)

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) <b>Faculty Council (IFC)</b> Meeting <b>Wynne Courtroom (Inlow Hall Room 100)</b> / Tuesday December 5, 2006 - 3:30-5:30 pm <b><u>A G E N D A</u></b> (IFC: December 5, 2006)			
I.	( > 1 minute )	Welcome and Call to Order.	<b>Rosalie Vermette</b> (IUPUI Faculty Vice-President, 4.0064, <a href="mailto:rvermett@iupui.edu">rvermett@iupui.edu</a> ).
II.	( > 1 minute )	Adoption of the Agenda as the Order of Business for the Day.	<b>Rosalie Vermette</b>
III.	( 1 minute )	[ <b>ACTION ITEM</b> ] Memorial Resolution for <b>Godfrey "Goff" Tunnicliff</b> , Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology ( <i>see reverse side of agenda</i> ).	<b>Rosalie Vermette</b>
IV.	( 1 minute )	[ <b>ACTION ITEM</b> ] Memorial Resolution for <b>Rebecca Sue Wappner</b> , Professor of Pediatrics ( <i>see p. 4 of agenda packet</i> ).	<b>Rosalie Vermette</b>
V.	( > 1 minute )	[ <b>ACTION ITEM</b> ] Approval of IFC 11/21/06 Minutes ( <i>distributed electronically</i> ).	<b>Rosalie Vermette</b>
VI.	( 1 minute )	[ <b>INFORMATION ITEM</b> ] Presentation of Slates for Election to the Board of Review Pool and the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel (“FGAP”) ( <i>see white hand-out</i> ).	<b>Jacqueline Blackwell</b> (Chair – Nominating, <a href="mailto:jblackwe@iupui.edu">jblackwe@iupui.edu</a> ).
VII.	( 15 minutes )	Updates/Remarks from the Chancellor.	<b>Charles Bantz</b> (Indiana University Executive Vice President and Chancellor of IUPUI).
VIII.	( 15 minutes )	Updates/Remarks from the IFC President. A. Starting in January 2007, IFC meetings start at 3:00pm. B. Updated Report on Faculty Board of Review Activity for 2005-06.	<b>Bart Ng</b> (IUPUI Faculty President & UFC Co-Secretary, 4.8185, <a href="mailto:bng@math.iupui.edu">bng@math.iupui.edu</a> ).
IX.	( 10 minutes )	Question / Answer Period.	<b>Rosalie Vermette</b>

X.	(> 1 minute)	Call for any FC or UFC Standing Committee reports.	Rosalie Vermette
XI.	(10 minutes)	[FIRST READING] Policy on Three-Year Formative Review of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty & Librarians. ( <i>see pink hand-out</i> )	Andre De Tienne (Chair – Faculty Affairs Committee, 4.2033, <a href="mailto:adetienn@iupui.edu">adetienn@iupui.edu</a> ).
XII.	(30 minutes)	[DISCUSSION ITEM] Executive Committee Recommendations on Proposals re: the Reorganization of the Division of Labor Studies ( <i>see blue hand-out</i> ).	Bart Ng
XIII.	(30 minutes)	[DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEM] Journalism-SLA Merger.	Jim Brown, Sharon Hamilton, Bob White
XIV.	(> 1 minute)	Unfinished Business?	Rosalie Vermette
XV.	(5 minutes)	New Business?	Rosalie Vermette
XVI.	(> 1 minute)	Adjournment.	Rosalie Vermette

**Next Faculty Council Meeting: Tuesday January 9, 2007, 3:00-5:00pm, Wynne Courtroom of Inlow Hall (IH 100)**

*Please visit the Faculty Council website at <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil> for agenda, updates & more.*

Agenda prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator Molly Martin: UN 403 / 274-2215 / Fax: 274-2970 / [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) / <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil>

[SP1]Of concern in the current economically stressful environment is that a grant-getting/tenure-getting climate must be avoided; more importantly, a no grant/no tenure scenario must be avoided. In other words, a candidate's performance in areas other than in success at acquiring grants must not be under-evaluated as other efforts/works/activities may be equally important or more important for the University.

[SP2]While this brief statement and a CV reduce the burden of labor for reviewers at the 3-Year mark, young faculty members would benefit from composing a more complete dossier using the IUPUI format at this pre-tenure review stage. Extensive reviews of all materials supplied need not be performed unless a problem with the content of the CV and/or 5-page statement is perceived.

[SP3]Should a copy of the Primary Unit's P&T Standards that are required to be supplied to the candidate also be supplied to all reviewers at this stage?

[SP4]If all the reports need to be submitted to the Office of the Dean of the Faculties by May 31, the dossier and the reviews must be done prior to that date, it is not likely that this is a review of the "third full academic year."

[SP5]Timing of follow-up? Who should be held responsible for implementing the recommendations (i.e. Sch Dean or Dept Chair or Both)? Should the Faculty Member be interviewed for assessment of outcome of the 3-Year review?

[SP6]But what happens in cases where the 3-Year Review and the Annual Review in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Year are in conflict?

Also, since the 3-Year Review goes through the usual hierarchy of layering (i.e. Dept P&T, Dept Chair, Sch P&T, Sch Dean), then one must assume that the Annual Review is incorporated into the 3-Year Review. So, is it really necessary to conduct the Annual Review in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Year or is this redundant in this particular year?

Finally, if annual reviews should be predictive of P&T reviews, then how could a 3-Year Review not also be predictive? Indeed, if a candidate has an excellent 3-Year Review and is then found unworthy of P&T in the 5<sup>th</sup> year, one must question what has gone wrong in the 1.5-2.0 year interim.