

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis  
**Faculty Council Minutes (“IFC”): November 7, 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 3:30pm.

**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] IFC 10/3/06 Minutes.**

Hearing no objections, the IFC October 3, 2006 minutes stood as written and were entered into record.

*These minutes are available to view online at <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/minutes/fc061003html.htm>*

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

Chancellor Bantz could not attend the meeting but will update the IFC at future meetings.

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

Ng reported the following:

- An IFC meeting has been called for November 21<sup>st</sup> from 3:30-5:30pm in the University Library Auditorium. The agenda will feature action on the revised Intellectual Property Policy, the minutes of the called October 17, 2006 IFC meeting, and the IU Presidential search. Presidential Search Committee member and IUPUI Dean Marion Broome will attend, as will Simon Atkinson (*Presidential Advisory Committee*), John Hassell (*Presidential Advisory Committee*), and Ted Miller (*IUB Faculty President/UFC-Co-Secretary/Presidential Search Committee*).
- Discussion of the merger of the IUPUI School of Journalism into the IUPUI School of Liberal Arts has been slated for the December 5<sup>th</sup> IFC meeting. But for one lingering structural question, the merger is relatively uncontroversial.

- Referring to the proposed three-year review policy, Ng noted that Dean Uday Sukhatme is very committed to ensuring that Promotion & Tenure procedures are followed at every level. Ng hopes the IFC will support the Dean in his efforts.
- The Board of Trustees met Friday. Trustees are pleased with IUPUI's progress on their August charge to define General Education at IUPUI. The Trustees were especially interested in the work of IUPUI's Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and their forthcoming website explaining the status of General Education at IUPUI.
- Trustees approved a new Chancellor Review Policy on Friday, but did not approve the version drafted by the UFC. The primary differences between the UFC document—yielded by four years of work—and the approved policy are: review committees are to be half faculty versus a majority faculty; it is preferred but not required that faculty on said review committee are tenured; and if comments from faculty are to remain anonymous, a multiple choice survey form must be used. Ng and Ted Miller voiced their “strenuous objection” to the policy's passage. UFC is currently drafting a response to the Trustees. In response to faculty questions, Ng notes that he is researching whether or not Chancellor Charles Bantz's system-wide title and status preclude his review under the new policy.

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

No discussion.

#### **Agenda Item VII: [FOURTH READING] Revised Intellectual Property Policy: Simon Atkinson (Chair – Research Affairs Committee, 8.0435, [satkinso@iupui.edu](mailto:satkinso@iupui.edu)).**

Atkinson gave the fourth reading of the revised Intellectual Property Policy (*the draft read is available to view at <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/circulars/U5-2007.doc>*). Atkinson first explained the motivations for revision: to make a clear and readable policy for the creators of intellectual property; to review the revenue distribution scheme to make it more favorable to creators; and to address online course materials as intellectual property. He then explained a rewrite done over the summer to address the issue of software, which the revised policy would treat the same as other copyrightable materials except in the case of patentable features.

A few questions were raised about the draft linked above prior to the IFC meeting, so University Counsel is currently making further revisions. The intent of the policy (as linked above) is unlikely to change). Atkinson will share the newest draft as soon as it is available with an eye towards IFC action on November 21<sup>st</sup>.

#### **Agenda Item VIII: [FIRST READING] Three-Year Review Policy: Designee for Andre De Tienne (Chair – Faculty Affairs Committee, 4.2033, [adetienn@iupui.edu](mailto:adetienn@iupui.edu)).**

Faculty Affairs Committee Member Jennifer Hehman (*for Chair Andre De Tienne*) gave a first reading of the proposed three-year review policy (below).

## **“PROPOSED POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THREE-YEAR REVIEWS October 31, 2006**

### **Background**

Three-year reviews were first instituted at IUPUI in the early 1990s. These comprehensive and cumulative reviews are conducted at the school level. **Their primary purpose is to provide a frank and formative assessment of each tenure-track faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure near the mid-point of the probationary period of their academic career.** They are intended to be constructive in nature, with concrete suggestions on how to progress successfully toward promotion and tenure.

In 2006, for the first time, schools were asked to forward the three-year reviews to the Academic Affairs office, where they received an additional reading. Responses were written to the dean of each school on the comprehensiveness, frankness, and potential helpfulness of the review. To clarify and formalize this procedure, after consultation with the Deans and the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council, the following policy has been formulated:

### **Policy**

*During the spring semester of their third year at IUPUI, all tenure-track faculty members will undergo a comprehensive review at the school level of their cumulative progress toward promotion and tenure. This review will be forwarded to the Office of the Dean of the Faculties on or before the final day of spring-semester classes.*

### **Implementation Procedures**

In order to be as informative and helpful as possible to faculty, three-year reviews should include the following:

1. an explicit statement that it is a three-year review which evaluates cumulative progress in all three areas (teaching **or performance**, research, and service) in relation to the department’s norms (for example, how do the candidate’s teaching evaluation scores relate to departmental norms on some key questions? how does the candidate’s publication or performance record relate to the department’s expectations for quality and quantity? what are the department’s expectations for service for tenure-track faculty?);
2. a clear evaluative statement of progress toward promotion and tenure;
3. concrete suggestions for the candidate to progress successfully
4. if and when applicable, 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
5. a current vita.

Since the primary purpose of the three-year review is to provide a frank evaluation of the faculty

member's progress toward promotion and tenure, and to make appropriate recommendations for successful progress, the primary audience for the three-year review is the faculty member. However, a secondary purpose of the reviews is to help deans and chairs have a clear sense of the cumulative progress of their tenure-track faculty, so that they may consider any recommended supports or changes in curricular assignments or service expectations in order to help these faculty members be as successful as possible. Therefore, the committee writing the reviews will need to keep all three audiences in mind: the faculty member (primarily), the chair, and the dean.

The reading by the Dean of the Faculties and the Associate Dean of the Faculties is to provide a campus-level response to the reviews conducted by the school-level promotion and tenure committee. A response to the reviews from each school will be sent to each faculty member as well as to the chair of the promotion and tenure committee of each school, with a copy to the dean, who will forward copies to the appropriate chairs.

It is important to note that the three-year reviews are not to be confused with or substituted **for the annual reviews in the third year** that are conducted within a department by the chair. While the annual reviews provide a department-level layer of support and evaluation, the more comprehensive review in the third year is intended to provide a school-level and campus-level layer of support for our tenure-track faculty colleagues, ensuring that they receive a fair, frank, and helpful evaluation to assist their progress toward tenure and promotion.”

Hehman announced a minor revision: the addition of the word “performance” to each mention of “teaching;” performance—as opposed to teaching—is one of the three components for which librarians go up for promotion and tenure (“P&T”). She and policy author Associate Dean of the Faculties Sharon Hamilton then accepted suggestions for clarification and revision from Richard Meiss and Rick Ward.

IFC members then offered feedback and raised questions:

Q: *Who will serve on the three-year review committee?*

A: Except in the case of librarians (whose P&T structure is unique), the school-level P&T committee will conduct the review.

Q: *Will the timing of this policy's processes be effective? What if reappointment or non-reappointment is already underway?*

A: The feedback from the IFC Executive Committee was that the three-year review should be divorced from the reappointment process, i.e. that this review should not be used to make P&T or appointment decisions.

Q: *If the intent of this policy is to ensure that all Deans follow procedures, why are the school P&T committees made the primary contact between the faculty member and the Dean of Faculties Office? Shouldn't the Deans remain primarily accountable?*

A: This was proposed to address concerns about the reviews being used by Deans in making

certain decisions.

Q: *Is this policy necessary?*

A: The policy seeks not to create but to codify current practice to ensure fairness and adequate P&T mentorship. Hamilton, Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel Chair Giles Hoyt, IFC President Bart Ng, and other IFC members cited recent grievances arising from the surprising circumvention, ignorance, or misuse of P&T procedures and mentorship. This is, Hoyt noted, an important preventive measure. Subah Packer applauded the idea of the policy because of reasons listed above, but also suggested formal follow-up to the three-year review, scrutiny of cases in which a positive three-year review is accompanied by an incongruently negative annual review in the third year. In response to related comments, Packer suggested that faculty use the discussion surrounding this policy as an opportunity to consider whether or not we are in a grant-getting equals tenure-granting climate, so to speak.

Referring to situations in the past in which three-year reviews were misused by an administrator, Jim Baldwin and Henry Karlson cautioned the policy authors and the IFC to be wary of whether or not this policy could devolve into a mini-tenure process.

In closing, Bill Schneider asked that this policy be put forward for action as an IFC policy as opposed to an administrative policy up for IFC endorsement. Others agreed. Vermette asked the FAC to work with Hamilton to revise the policy and return in December, at which time the IFC will formally act on the policy.

### **Agenda Item IX: Unfinished Business?**

No discussion.

### **Agenda Item X: New Business?**

Vice Chancellor for Student Life and Diversity Karen Whitney discussed the recent protest staged by the IUPUI Black Student Union (“BSU”) in response to inequity on campus (as students, community members, and customers). She applauded the BSU for raising such important issues and urged the IFC to use this as a “teachable moment” and a time at which students, faculty, and staff of color should be engaged so that IUPUI can openly discuss and address institutional racism. Aside from inviting the BSU into its conversations—she congratulated the Faculty and Staff Councils for doing so—Whitney suggested that the Black Faculty & Staff Council be engaged by both groups as well. The success of all IUPUI students is the campus’ priority and these issues must be addressed. Whitney’s comments were echoed by Rick Ward, Vice President Vermette, and others. Although the BSU’s leadership was unable to attend the IFC meeting, further invitations will be offered.

Following the meeting, Vice Chancellor Whitney sent the following e-mail:

“Dear IUPUI Family,

Last week, I conducted two town hall meetings to share the current diversity mission and goals and to seek input from students, faculty and staff. While many issues of importance were raised, representatives of the Black Student Union provided testimony reflecting their dissatisfaction with the campus climate, communication between students and campus leadership, the number of faculty and administrators of color, inequities in the distribution of student fees, and a plea for cultural competency training for all university employees. Following the heartfelt and thoughtful testimony, the Black Student Union submitted a proposal articulating their concerns and expectations for change. I accepted the document and issued a response over the weekend.

The dialogue with the campus community is in its infancy and much remains to be accomplished. IUPUI remains committed to building a world class urban institution where exchanges of ideas are valued and all who work, learn, or visit the campus are treated with respect and with dignity. In the months to come, we will continue to gather information and feedback from the campus and the community to build an effective diversity plan. Conversations will continue on campus and in the community to learn more about our opportunities and our weaknesses. Everyone is encouraged to participate in this important effort. To assist communication, a website has been developed to highlight the planning process and providing opportunities for comment. An electronic newsletter will begin by the first of December to keep any and all campus partners involved.

Specific inquiries about the planning process can be directed to me, Diversity Officer (274-8990) [whitney@iupui.edu](mailto:whitney@iupui.edu) and if you become aware of acts of disrespect or discrimination, please report them immediately to the Affirmative Action Officer Lillian Charleston (274-2306) [lcharles@iupui.edu](mailto:lcharles@iupui.edu)

Since the students asked for a response by 8am Monday, many many emails went out from Thursday to Sunday to colleagues throughout the campus in order to develop an honest response to the students. As such many were involved but many were either unable to respond or were not able to be included. In order to honor the students' timeline we worked through the weekend and did the best we could to indicate faculty and staff who would convene groups of faculty, students and staff to address a particular item within a specific time frame. If in looking over the response specific faculty, staff, and students come to mind that you think should be involved please let me know right away and we will include them in the efforts.

**All documents regarding our efforts to plan and improve have been posted to the Diversity website: Diversity Planning & Improvement Site: <http://www.iupui.edu/diversity/planning/>**

Any other comments that would assist in our diversity planning and improvement efforts are appreciated.”

## **Agenda Item XI: Adjournment.**

Vice President Vermette adjourned the meeting at 5:31pm.

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 11-7-06 Minutes]

ATTACHMENTS NOT CONTAINED IN THESE 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)

- I. Welcome and Call to Order: **Rosalie Vermette** (IUPUI Faculty Vice-President, 4.0064, [rvermett@iupui.edu](mailto:rvermett@iupui.edu)).
- II. Adoption of Agenda as the Order of Business for the Day.
- III. (2 minutes) [**ACTION ITEM**] IFC 10/3/06 and 10/17/06 Minutes (*distributed electronically*): **Up for Approval**.
- IV. (15 minutes) Updates/Remarks from the Chancellor: **Charles Bantz** (Indiana University Executive Vice President and Chancellor of IUPUI).
- V. (15 minutes) Updates/Remarks from the IFC President: **Bart Ng** (IUPUI Faculty President & UFC Co-Secretary, 4.8185, [bng@math.iupui.edu](mailto:bng@math.iupui.edu)).
  - A. Called IFC Meeting November 21<sup>st</sup>, 3:30-5:30pm, UL Auditorium. TOPIC: IU's Next President.
- VI. (10 minutes) Question / Answer Period.
- VII. (5 minutes) Call for any FC or UFC Standing Committee reports.
- VIII. (10 minutes) [**ACTION ITEM**] Revised Intellectual Property Policy: **Simon Atkinson** (Chair – Research Affairs Committee, 8.0435, [satkinso@iupui.edu](mailto:satkinso@iupui.edu)).
- IX. (15 minutes) [**FIRST READING**] Three-Year Review Policy: *Designee for Andre De Tienne* (Chair – Faculty Affairs Committee, 4.2033, [adetienn@iupui.edu](mailto:adetienn@iupui.edu)).
- X. Unfinished Business?
- XI. New Business?
- XII. Adjournment.

**Next Faculty Council Meeting: Tuesday December 5, 2006, 3:30-5:30pm, 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>