

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
Faculty Council Minutes (“IFC”): January 16, 2007
CALLED MEETING
Wynne Courtroom of Inlow Hall: 3:00 – 5:00 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 3:06pm. Some action items were delayed until 3:40pm, at which time the meeting achieved quorum.

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

Due to a lack of quorum when the meeting was convened, the order of business for the day was not formally adopted.

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

Ng gave background and comments about a meeting with Chancellor Bantz to discuss the Faculty Board of Review process; the meeting was called when concerns were raised that recent Boards’ recommendations have been disregarded by the administration. Ng and the Chancellor are reviewing the possibility of additional and cleared guidelines for the process. Ng will keep the IFC informed. Professor Subah Packer suggested that a follow-up or explanation be issued to Board of Review grievants from 2004-06 discussing why the Board recommendations in their respective cases were not accepted.

Agenda Item IV: Question/Answer Period.

Dean of Faculties Uday Sukhatme reported that the Signature Center Proposals (which were due in late October 2006) have been reviewed by faculty fellows, his office, and others.

Professor Martin Spechler asked after the status of the suggestion to the Presidential Search Committee that the final stages of the search be open. He expressed concerns about reported and “secretive” interviews with Presidential candidates in Chicago. Bart Ng assured the IFC that he continues to reiterate the IFC’s suggestion that the final stages be open and added that he believes the Chicago interviews were, simply, initial meetings with ten candidates (not finalists).

Professor Andre De Tienne asked if there were any updates on the proposed Journalism-SLA merger, supported by the IFC in a December 2006 resolution. Bart Ng replied that he has not heard any updates, but understands that the President was not initially aware of conflicts between the new Dean (based at IUB) and the IUPUI Journalism Associate Dean and faculty. Ng surmises that the President feels system schools are working well and is hesitant to dismantle one. Ng cautioned, though, that this is his understanding only and involves “serious paraphrasing.”

A brief discussion about system schools ensued. Librarian Nancy Eckerman remarked on the “system-wide and un-system-wide nature” of librarians and how IUPUI librarians recently voted in support of discontinuing the routing of their dossiers through IUB. Their resolution “passed every level but has stalled.” Dean Michael Patchner reminded the IFC that some systems schools, such as Social Work and Nursing, are based in Indianapolis. Professor Henry Karlson closed the discussion by wondering aloud if it is “time for a Declaration of Independence” from system control.

Agenda Item V: Call for any FC or UFC Standing Committee Reports.

No discussion.

Agenda Item VI: [ACTION ITEM] 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).

Three-Year Review

De Tienne went over the changes made since the December 2006 reading. He thanked Professor Betty Jones for providing comparative data re: current review practices across nine schools. He also thanked Professors Subah Packer and

Bill Schneider for their input and help.

The changes were as follows:

- (1) Substitution of “tenure-probationary” (a more common phrase).
- (2) **“In schools or units where faculty-approved policies or guidelines for conducting the REVIEW already exist, those policies or guidelines should be followed to the extent that they do not seriously conflict with the general procedures set forth below. If there is conflict, especially regarding due dates and required documentation, such schools or units ought to resolve it by either revising their policies or guidelines accordingly, or negotiating special arrangements with the Office of the Dean of the Faculties.”**
- (3) Addition of footnote to “only:” **“Some schools require far more than this (e.g., list of potential reviewers, summary of pre-IU professional activities, previous annual reviews, letters from students, or even a dossier that is identical in substance and format to that which they will submit for the actual review two years later). The present policy does not encourage premature requisites or burdensome requirements.”**
- (4) Addition of **“preferably in accordance with the *Dean of the Faculties’ Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers.*”**
- (5) Addition of last sentence: **“The tenure- probationary faculty member is not limited in the use of the REVIEW. “**

IFC members shared the following comments:

BERBARI: by reiterating the point about limitations, it seems that faculty member is guaranteed to keep position it diminishes this as an opportunity for guidance.

KARLSON: The idea of this formative review is to give advice/aid as opposed to be used for “un-tenuring.” The limitations are the key to the spirit of the policy.

WOKECK: Spell out the distinction: it is in the third year of appointment

SPECHLER: Will vote against, because he thinks it has become complicated and time-consuming. Now is the time to be more selective and this is biased against that. This should be an oral, confidential process. This policy deprives deans of responsibility

PACKER: All reviews do need to be somewhat predictive.

AKAY: A three-year review is important. It should be a Promotion & Tenure “dress rehearsal.”

BALDWIN: Annual reviews for probationary faculty are already in place; that is the dress rehearsal for Promotion & Tenure.

Packer then moved to substitute her alternative document for the draft read by De Tienne. Professor Terry Baumer seconded the motion. Following a brief discussion in which Professor Linda Adele Goodine suggested that Packer’s document be used by the School of Medicine to supplement the policy [as proposed by De Tienne] and create their own internal practices.

Vermette called the question. The motion failed.

After remarks from Professors Marion Wagner and Nancy Eckerman in favor of the policy, Vermette called the question on the policy as presented by De Tienne. The motion carried and the policy passed.

Agenda Item VII: Unfinished Business?

Ng presented the latest draft of the open letter to the next President of IU and the Trustees. After thanking the IFC for the feedback he’s received since the January 9th IFC, Ng explained that he wanted the discussion to inform the document, but that someone could move for vote of endorsement by IFC today. The IFC could also vote on the letter via e-mail. He also plans to seek out the endorsement of school governance bodies.

The IFC was generally in favor of the draft but made the following suggestions and revisions:

MEISS: Does the “IUB and IUPUI are two equally strong” bit invite tallying?

Meiss moved that the sentence be revised to read “two strong and effective research campuses.” Professor Anne Belcher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

BALDWIN: Is the Trustees’ quote in Paragraph 3 missing something?

WOKECK: “Punching it up” could be a good idea, as suggested by Professors Bob Sutton and Martin Spechler, but we should be cautious of living up to the rumor of an inferiority complex.

AKAY: Shouldn’t we specify what kind of structure we want?

FORD: Do we use the term “urban” too often and confuse the issue?

MCDANIEL: We must carefully edit and only use the word “urban” when we talk about the campus location and not our constituency.

Ng announced that he would like to take a straw poll at the meeting, then revise the document, and call for electronic vote. However, as quorum had been lost since the last action item, no action was taken.

Following the meeting a series of revisions were made. The final version of the open letter, approved on January 22, 2007 by an electronic vote of 70 to 2, is embedded below.

“AN OPEN LETTER FROM THE IUPUI FACULTY TO THE NEXT PRESIDENT AND TRUSTEES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Throughout IUPUI’s thirty-eight year history, its faculty has been of one mind in striving to build a strong and cohesive campus that offers first-rate undergraduate, graduate, and professional educational opportunities in the largest population center of the State. IUPUI has become a national force in higher education with a substantial and growing national and international reputation. It is recognized as being one of the nation’s top producers of graduate professional degrees and has received national honors for its innovations in serving first-generation undergraduates.

IUPUI’s role within Indiana University has changed dramatically over the past two decades. As one of two major research campuses of Indiana University and the place of intersection for a wide range of IU and Purdue programs, IUPUI has had the ability and flexibility to innovate and to shape its core academic programs in Liberal Arts, Science, and Engineering to complement and enhance its professional programs. This in turn has led to the creation of several exciting new fields of study and many successful research programs that are truly interdisciplinary and highly collaborative across many areas and specialties, including prominently the life and health sciences. Through the discovery and application of knowledge, teaching at all levels, and engaging and building partnerships with the communities it serves, IUPUI has become a major driving force in the economic and cultural development and the internationalization of central Indiana. Indeed, the faculty in Indianapolis firmly believes that IUPUI’s role in the future of IU is set by its mission as the life and health sciences campus of the University; by its urban location in the business, geographic, political, and media center of Indiana; and by its energetic, collaborative and entrepreneurial culture that thrives on innovation and change.

There is every reason to be optimistic about IUPUI’s future, given its past achievements and its abundance of opportunities for even greater accomplishments. In response to the IU Board of Trustees’ announcement of its AGENDA FOR A FUTURE OF DISTINCTION for Indiana University in January 2006, the IUPUI faculty affirmed its unequivocal support for the Trustees’ desire to advance the University’s research endeavors, especially in the life sciences and related disciplines, to ensure that IU will be counted among the “great research universities” worldwide. The IUPUI faculty has also been supportive of the Trustees’ effort to enhance IU Bloomington’s mission and build on its strengths and assets. The Trustees, however, also stated that “IUPUI should become a top-rated university in its own right, mainly in the areas supporting its current strengths ... [while] other areas of IUPUI will support its current urban university [mission] serving a large urban student body.” This statement seems to suggest that the Trustees believe an effective strategy for Indiana University to achieve distinction can be crafted by relying solely on the research strength of the Bloomington campus and that of the IU School of Medicine on the Indianapolis campus, while other academic units of IUPUI will be relegated to chiefly teaching local students. The IUPUI faculty respectfully rejects this view.

IUPUI is an integrated campus with many of its core academic programs generating significant external research funding, alone and in collaboration with its professional schools. The potential for research growth on the IUPUI campus is unparalleled. This growth must not be curtailed by a vision of the campus that limits growth to predefined areas and excludes the integration of research with undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. Citizens of Indiana in general, and the city of Indianapolis in particular, deserve a strong and integrated urban campus of Indiana University where world-class

research and undergraduate and graduate education not only thrive, but act synergistically to increase the quality and breadth of the University's research and education missions. Also, the most effective way to strengthen the professional schools on the IUPUI campus, including the IU School of Medicine, is to enhance the research base and t

increase the already high degree of collaboration among all academic units on the IUPUI campus.† The next IU President and the Trustees must therefore recognize that IU Bloomington and IUPUI are two strong and complementary research campuses, each with its own identity and mission. In order for Indiana University to achieve greatness, both campuses must be recognized, valued, and supported as equal partners.

Since the announcement of the AGENDA, the Trustees have made a number of changes in the administrative structure of Indiana University—including the addition of the title of CEO of IU Bloomington to the President's portfolio—ostensibly to bring it in line with other public universities that have only one major campus, and to provide greater leadership focus for IU Bloomington. The IUPUI faculty urges that the next President be given the freedom to examine afresh IU's administrative structure as well as academic practices. Questions must be raised whether IU's recent move towards increased centralization at a single geographical location is the best way to serve the long-term interests of the entire University. A case in point is the plan currently under discussion to create a highly centralized grants and contracts administration. Given the size and strength of IU Bloomington and IUPUI, we believe that the University would be better served with a more flexible campus-based structure designed to be responsive to the distinctive needs of the faculty on each campus. Efficiency requires that the leadership of administrative and academic units be located where there is the greatest concentration of activities and opportunities. The resulting new structure of IU must provide *all* campuses with the freedom for creative and efficient growth responsive to, and serving the needs of, their respective constituencies and communities.

The next President must measure achievements not by historical status or past accomplishments, but rather by the ability of each campus or academic unit to seek out new challenges and collaborative opportunities to advance the interests and prestige of Indiana University. This will require resisting a sense of entitlement of any one campus or segment of the University. Indeed, IU's future greatness depends on how successful the next President and the Trustees can be in supporting the missions of *all* IU campuses and developing fully the combined potential of the Bloomington-Indianapolis core.

We thus respectfully request that the next President, at the first opportunity available after his or her appointment, engage with the Indianapolis faculty and administration in an earnest conversation on how IUPUI can contribute, as a partner with IU Bloomington, to A FUTURE OF DISTINCTION for Indiana University. We also request that the next President make it one of his or her highest priorities to examine the current administrative structure and academic practices and work to remove all impediments that would stand in the way of IUPUI becoming all that it can be.

The entire IUPUI faculty, across all disciplines, sincerely wants the next President to succeed. We therefore stand ready to help leverage the complementary strengths of IU's founding campus in Bloomington and its vibrant urban campus in Indianapolis for the greater common good of the University and the State of Indiana.

† For a snapshot of the breadth of interdisciplinary collaborations at IUPUI, see the recently announced list of projects (http://www.iupui.edu/administration/acad_affairs/07_01_funded/signaturecenters.pdf) receiving funding under the Signature Center Initiative.”

Agenda Item VIII: New Business?

This action item was completed prior to the approval of the Three Year Formative Review Policy. Hearing no objections, the IFC December 5, 2006 minutes stood as written and were entered into record.

These minutes are available to view online at <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/minutes/fc070109html.htm>

Agenda Item IX: Adjournment.

Vice President Vermette adjourned the meeting at 5:01pm.

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

[Attachment for IFC 1-16-07 Minutes]

ATTACHMENTS NOT CONTAINED IN ELECTRONIC MINUTES

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) **Faculty Council (IFC)** Meeting
Wynne Courtroom (Inlow Hall Room 100) / Tuesday January 16, 2006 - 3:00-5:00 pm
Called Meeting
A G E N D A (IFC: January 16, 2007)

I.	*	Welcome and Call to Order.	Rosalie Vermette (IUPUI Faculty Vice-President, 4.0064, rvermett@iupui.edu)
II.	*	Adoption of the Agenda as the Order of Business for the Day.	Rosalie Vermette
III.	(10 minutes)	Updates/Remarks from the IFC President. - Updated Report on Faculty Board of Review Activity for 2005-06.	Bart Ng
IV.	(5 minutes)	Question / Answer Period.	Rosalie Vermette
V.	*	Call for any FC or UFC Standing Committee reports.	Rosalie Vermette
VI.	(15 minutes)	[ACTION ITEM] 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, adetienn@iupui.edu)
VII.	(30 minutes)	Unfinished Business? - Open Letter to IU's Next President.	Rosalie Vermette
VIII.	(5 minutes)	New Business?	Rosalie Vermette
IX.	*	Adjournment.	Rosalie Vermette

Next Faculty Council Meeting: Tuesday February 6, 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 / <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil>