

P&T Faculty Discussion, IUSSW—March 26, 2010

Attendees: M. Adamek, B. Barton, B. Bennett, C. Black, B. Cournoyer, C. Cotten, M. Crouch, J. Daley, C. Davis, L. Duggan, C. Hostetter, K. Khaja, H. Kim, K. Lay, L. McGuire, M. Nicholson, M. Ramsay, T. Roberts, P. Sullivan, J. Thigpen, B. Vernon, S. Williamson

Via VIC: K. Byers, D. Lynch, M. Thomas

Facilitator: B. Vernon, Chair, Faculty Senate

OPENING: Thank you to B. Cournoyer for writing the initial document. Thank you also to B. Barton and C. Pike and others for subsequent comments shared by email. (Vernon)

ISSUES: (Vernon)

1. What criteria do we want for IUSSW? Same for SW and LS?
2. How do we protect faculty who are coming up?
3. What is our jurisdiction vs campus jurisdiction?

ANNOUNCEMENT: (McGuire)

The Constitution Committee finalized the IUSSW Constitution this morning with a refined section on the P&T Committee. The new Constitution proposes a 7 member P&T Committee: 5 SW, 2 LS members. Each discipline nominates its own slate of candidates. Will move voting to fall semester. If approved, the new Constitution would go into effect *after* the upcoming P&T election (slated for April 2010).

CAMPUS vs. SCHOOL P&T GUIDELINES:

New IUPUI 2010/2011 P&T Guidelines approved at campus level March 25, 2010. (K. Lay)

Key Issue: Should the unit set P&T criteria or do we have to go by campus-imposed guidelines? (M. Crouch)

The campus P&T committee at IUB follows the school's criteria. Let's register a protest if the IUPUI guidelines are imposed on us (K. Byers)

There have always been campus guidelines. Our first Redbook was crafted based on IUPUI guidelines. The original campus guidelines were a template with broad parameters. This trend of greater specification has been happening for many years. (P. Sullivan)

Campus guidelines have become increasingly prescriptive with more checklists. List of unsatisfactory performance especially in teaching seems counter to academic life. Need a general statement that every item on the checklist is not meant to apply to every candidate. (B. Barton)

IUPUI document not approved by faculty--it comes from campus administration. There will be an electronic template for P&T portfolio submissions from now on. Medicine already uses electronic submissions. There is also an external reviewer form that Medicine uses. Any school that wants to can extend the tenure clock to 9 years. Could hurt us with recruiting if we don't approve the extension (Lay)

CAMPUS LEVEL REVIEW:

- rigorous review of dossiers even with school support (C. Black)
- avoid double-dipping --putting same evidence in 2 categories (B. Bennett)
- higher standards with demonstrating creativity with teaching ; our overall teaching evaluations are high (B. Bennett)
- not a guarantee that if you have favorable support letters that the dossier will be favorably reviewed (J. Daley)
- your dossier needs to be put together well and have proper documentation (J. Daley)
- Is the candidate having an impact? Do they have a body of work that is progressing and does the scholar have a national reputation? (J. Daley)
- do not want to be seen as a rubber stamp (B. Bennett)

Guidelines need to be sensitive to new Labor Studies hires. Can they be grandfathered in? (L. Duggan)

We need to translate campus criteria into SW and LS criteria. We need to determine what is negotiable (from the campus level) and what is not negotiable (L. McGuire)

Historically, our SW candidates have been successful in securing tenure. However, the challenge remains in going for full professor. Makes the school look bad if we have a lot of women sitting at Associate level. (C. Hostetter)

That issue was brought up in Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council b/c people are not motivated to go up for full. Not enough incentive. (K. Lay)

No grandfathering. You have to meet the current guidelines.

At Bloomington, if there is a substantial change in P&T criteria, a candidate has the option to go by the criteria in place when they were hired. (K. Byers)

Not a change in criteria but a change in how you put forth the evidence. (L. McGuire)

What can help more SW and LS faculty go up for full professor? Who can we invite from campus to discuss these issues with us? (K. Khaja)

Perhaps the laundry lists in the campus guidelines are intended to be helpful examples, not expectations for every candidate. If the campus level committee is evaluating the whole body of work and impact of the work, then the laundry lists are likely just examples. (M. Adamek)

We need to consider teaching load and its impact on scholarly productivity of our candidates (L. McGuire)

Feedback from Campus P&T Committee to Dean: consider teaching load, discourage summer teaching by Assistant Professors, pursue teaching awards.

We need to fund Associate Professor to network nationally and internationally. (J. Daley)

RECOMMENDATIONS TO IUSSW P&T Committee:

1. prune back list of criteria for unsatisfactory
2. eliminate securing grant support as a bar for unsatisfactory
3. encourage LS faculty to come up with examples of LS scholarly works and add LS relevant criteria to the Redbook
4. look at criteria for promotion to full—what do we want the criteria to be?
5. clarify whether the campus level laundry lists are proscriptive or suggestive

NEXT STEPS:

M. Adamek will prepare and distribute minutes.

The P&T Committee will bring a revised proposal to a future Faculty Senate meeting- - April 9th or May 7th.