

IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee  
April 4, 2012, IT 558  
Minutes

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. Committee members introduced themselves.

Review of Minutes from December 5, 2011

The minutes from the December 5, 2011, meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee were approved as distributed.

Overview of Priority Tasks for 2011-2012

The chair reviewed the tasks that were assigned to the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee for 2011-2012 and were deemed a priority by the committee.

Review and shorten the “Statement of Faculty Work (from 1996)”

Mary Ann Frank and Bill Babler have met and have gathered school materials. They reviewed the suggested deletions and eliminated some of the material that is already in other policies and documents (such as Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment). One of the challenges is how to define a workload and more specific information could be included, such as accounting for teaching courses off campus. It is important to distinguish between kinds of teaching (online, offline, electives, independent study, capstone courses). Other issues are dividing workload into teaching, research and service and then tying it to expectations for promotion and tenure and annual review as well as the A-21 effort reports. Another challenge is to be aware of the different frameworks being used at various schools, the differences between 10-month and 12-month appointments, vacation and unpaid time and starting (August) and ending (May) dates. A separate policy is provided for summer, which is a percentage of salary. If a 10-month faculty member is asked to work during the summer, he or she should be paid or receive some other consideration (such as a course release during the regular academic year). Another issue is course releases for faculty members who have active research projects.

Recommendation: It was agreed that every school at IUPUI should have a faculty workload policy and that these policies should be readily available to faculty members.

Bill will share the original - with the proposed changes indicated - with Mary Fisher. After receiving her feedback, the chair will forward the original - with proposed changes indicated - to FAC members.

Faculty behavior policy for chairs and deans dealing with “toxic” faculty

Larry Garetto has been shepherding the development of these documents, but he is on sabbatical leave during 2011-2012. Marianne Wokeck and Pat Wittberg offered to move this initiative

forward and the chair will ask Larry to work with them and to forward the most recent version of the documents to them. [DONE] Also, FAC members objected to the term “toxic”, especially when the focus of the initiative is to address issues with faculty members in a collegial manner before they escalate to serious situations.

#### Update faculty contracts upon promotion

This is of particular concern to people in non-tenure track ranks, but also to people who have achieved promotion and/or tenure as well. After the initial offer letter, a faculty member’s role or responsibilities may change, but there is no documentation for faculty members and administrators that provides clarity and direction about any new expectations, terms of appointment or duties. Having such documentation protects both the faculty member and the administration. On the other hand, it was requested that any process not be an administrative burden.

The chair was able to find examples from other universities that use a simple form or standard letter template to amend faculty offers letters (or contracts) as needed. Examples of two forms are attached to the Minutes and these forms can be easily adapted to meet the specific needs of IUPUI.

Recommendation: That IUPUI adopt a template that can be used to amend faculty offer letters. This should be incorporated into the annual review process. For example, as part of the annual review form, a checkbox could be provided that would indicate either “no change in appointment” or “see new amendment”.

#### Student evaluation of teaching

A variety of documents were provided to the committee by Bob Yost. He explained some of the reasons for reviewing the process and the rationale for having students evaluate faculty teaching. There is a mandate from the campus that student evaluations be included in dossiers. Schools have borne the costs of these evaluation systems, whereas the Testing Center could provide for a uniform analysis through an online system. The concept of a “global score” for comparative purposes is an issue, because no commonality exists for how global scores are computed. (For example, the School of Informatics has a 4 point scale, with 4 being the highest score, while the lower the score, the better in SLIS). The way global scores are currently calculated, they are averages of averages. We need to look at the appropriate way to calculate the averages – and have strong advice from someone whose expertise is in statistical analysis. If you have a campus-wide evaluation, you need agreement on 4-6 things that apply for all schools and that these questions would be used across the campus (which could then be compared for promotion and tenure purposes). Also there is the question of whether these evaluations are summative versus formative, with a suggestion that formative information/feedback be provided only to the faculty member as a separate document. In other words, the formative feedback belongs to the faculty member, is not shared beyond the faculty member and is not an administrative tool.

Currently, all levels of students are thrown together; there is no differentiation between class sizes, type of course, required course versus elective or lower- versus upper-level course. There needs to be consistency in what faculty members receive. Another concern is the low rate of participation in online evaluations – usually only a small percentage of students respond and these are usually polarized scores. The School of Dentistry makes online evaluations mandatory. Another issue is to ensure students that their participation is anonymous and confidential. If we are going to use student evaluation of teaching data in promotion and tenure, then everyone needs to do it – in other words, no opting out.

FAC members were advised to ask the candidates for the EVC position about their view of this issue and how they have handled this process at the other institutions where they have worked.

Recommendation: Bob will take this section from the FAC minutes and send an electronic version of the materials to Mary Fisher and Jack Windsor. Schools should keep working these issues and any projects they have in redesigning the process, especially larger schools, which will help to move the campus forward.

Discuss the grievance process and the Board of Review procedures with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee

No activity reported.

Faculty Academic Misconduct: The Academic Handbook makes reference to this, but the procedure of how to deal with it is not clear. The FAC is to identify procedures

No activity reported.

Other Items

Proposal to create a three-tier rank for promotion of teaching faculty (Assistant, Associate and Teaching Professor)

There continues to be interest in a three-tiered rank, which is an option in some schools and in Bloomington. One reason is that it would be helpful to emphasize the important role of teaching in the university. The Lecturer/Senior Lecturer rank would not go away, because it would still be needed for people who do not have a terminal degree.

Recommendation: The FAC recommends looking at the option for a three-tier Teaching Professor rank. Questions are how to name this rank appropriately and that it is not a Clinical rank, which should be more narrowly defined. Ask the schools what is in place. There is a need for more clarity in titles and what we can call different positions.

### Task Force on Procedures for Core Schools

Rachel Applegate provided an update. UFC created a Task Force, which produced a report. It will be voted on by UFC and then forwarded to IFC and BFC for their assent.

### Proposed health science campus

The report has not yet been released.

### Vita format

There were concerns with the changes made to the required IUPUI vita format after last spring's campus promotion and tenure process. Although this may be primarily an administrative matter, it caused issues for faculty members, especially those who prepared dossiers for the 2011-2012 promotion and tenure process.

Recommendation: Whenever there is a change to these forms and templates, it should be done in consultation with the schools and school faculty representatives.

### Post-tenure review

This issue was raised recently as part of a package of issues with faculty, including those with ongoing medical issues, those who are unproductive and emergency situations. However, FAC members noted that this was not the intent of IUPUI's current post-tenure review process, which is designed to help faculty reenergize their careers. The chair recently gave a presentation on post-tenure review at a national conference and she will forward her paper to FAC members.  
[DONE]

### Code of Conduct for Students

Undergoing revision. Bob Yost asked whether language requiring the faculty member to meet with students was appropriate. The language is "have a meeting" - which leaves the option open for this to happen online or by telephone (since it may be impossible for students taking courses via distance education to physically come to campus).

### Next Meeting

The FAC will not meet until next fall.

### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Sara Anne Hook, Chair  
IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee