

# IUPUI Faculty Council Committee Annual Report 2008-09

**Committee Name:** FACULTY AFFAIRS

**Chair:** ANDRE DE TIENNE

**Secretary:**

**Members:**

Name	Affiliation	Email	Phone
<b>Members with Term Expiring June 30, 2009</b>			
Jan Beckstrand	Nursing	jbeckstr@iupui.edu	4-4120
Bonnie Blazer-Yost	Science: Biology	bblazer@iupui.edu	8-1145
André De Tienne, <b>Chair</b>	Liberal Arts: Philosophy	adetienn@iupui.edu	4-2033
Dean Hawley	Medicine: Pathology & Lab Medicine	dhawley@iupui.edu	491-6491
Elizabeth Hughes	Dentistry	eahughes@iupui.edu	4-7801
Deb Lahiri	Medicine: Psychiatry	dlahiri@iupui.edu	4-2706
Lisa McGuire	Social Work	lmcguir@iupui.edu	4-6736
Kent Robertson	Medicine: Pediatrics	krobert@iupui.edu	4-8784
Marianne Wokeck	Liberal Arts: History	mwoeck@iupui.edu	4-5820
<b>Members with Term Expiring June 30, 2010</b>			
Yaobin Chen	Engineering and Technology	ychen@iupui.edu	4-4032
Steve Fox	Liberal Arts: English	sfox@iupui.edu	8-2054
Jennifer Hehman	University Library	jhehman@iupui.edu	4-0488
Jaena Hollingsworth	University Library	hollingj@iupui.edu	8-4230
Robin Hughes	Education	roblhugh@iupui.edu	4-6817
Robert Yost	Science: Biology	ryost@iupui.edu	8-1147
<b><u>Liaisons for 2008–10 or Ex Officio</u></b>			
Lisa Riolo, <b>Executive Committee Liaison</b>	Health & Rehabilitation Sciences: Physical Therapy	lriolo@iupui.edu	8-1875
Uday Sukhatme, <b>Administrative Liaison</b>	Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties	sukhatme@iupui.edu	4-4500
Mary Fisher, <b>Dean of the Faculties Liaison</b>	Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Associate Dean of the Faculties	mlfisher@iupui.edu	8-1846

**Action Item:**

Action Item	Status
NTTF Representation on IFC	Finalized (with Constitution & Bylaws Committee). Passed by IFC. Constitution & Bylaws amended.

**Discussion Items:**

<b>Discussion Items</b>	<b>Status</b>
Examination of OEO's revised complaint procedures	Done.
Faculty Diversity	Subcommittee set up; see Appendix 2
SRUF	Two suggestions from FAC (see below)
Extension of probationary period to 10 years (IUSM)	See extensive report below. IFC Executive Committee discussion need. IFC discussion recommended. Follow-up regarding advice from University Counsel needed.
Examination of system-wide review of baseline P&T procedures	Finalized.
TTF vs. NTTF ratios at IUPUI	Subcommittee set up; see Appendix 1. Meeting between FAC and Dr. Bodgewic to take place.
IUPUI Honors College	Discussion finalized.
Students' evaluations of teaching	Subcommittee set up. See report in Appendix 3. IFC discussion recommended.

**Action Items to be carried over to 2009-2010:**

<b>Action Item(s)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Creation of Ombudsperson faculty positions	Study
IUPUI P&T Guidelines	Subcommittee to begin examining their evolution and repercussion thereof on candidates.
Trustees' Teaching Awards	Subcommittee to examine IUPUI's misguided interpretation of the Trustees' policy.
Revision of "Review of Administrators Procedures"	Subcommittee to revise the handbook language.

**Discussion Items to be carried over to 2009-2010:**

<b>Discussion Item(s)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Examination of OEO's revised complaint procedures	Look at its rewording when completed by University Counsel.
IUSM extension of tenure-clock to 10 years	Continued involvement in discussions.
Student feedback surveys	Continuation of study.
TTF vs. NTTF ratios	Continuation of study.
Faculty diversity	Continued monitoring of issue

## ISSUES DISCUSSED BY THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN 2008–2009

The Faculty Affairs Committee met as a whole seven times during the academic year 2008–2009: on 9/17/08, 10/09/08, 11/17/08, 2/20/09, 3/26/09, 3/27/09, and 4/24/09. In addition, various subcommittees met separately to fulfill their own assignments and report afterward, while the chair participated in numerous meetings with several parties for collateral discussions.

### **1. REVIEW OF DUE PROCESS PROCEDURES PROPOSED BY THE OFFICE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY [DISCUSSION ITEM]**

Acute problems having surfaced within the Office of Affirmative Action, the Chancellor launched a review of that Office, and the FAC had occasion to be heard at the end of April 2008 during a meeting with consultant Barbara Mawhiney. At IFC President Simon Atkinson's subsequent request, FAC met with Kim Kirkland, the new director of the renamed Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO), to discuss her new set of due process principles and procedures. (Kirkland reports directly to Chancellor Bantz, not to the Assistant Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.)

Kirkland acknowledged the long list of perceived problems within the former Affirmative Action Office regarding communication, diversity, office credibility, and complaint and investigation processes. She explained how she was overhauling the complaint handling and investigation process and described the steps of a more formal investigation. To FAC's several questions on hiring and vetting procedures, Kirkland answered that OEO does a great deal of vetting and has developed a Faculty Applicant Monitoring process (FAM), which is not strongly implemented yet since it is an in-house-conceived database sitting on one computer (there are plans to make it web-based and campus-wide). She described how OEO oversees the composition of search committees and looks at lists of prospective interviews with a critical eye for diversity. OEO is supposed to approve all search committees, but that has not been happening: her office staff is small (six employees) and many people don't know the rules. OEO needs to approve all search committees. FAC suggested that new department chairs and school deans be trained in the principles of an affirmative review of the hiring process because they often do not observe the rules. We also broached the matter of retaining minorities once they've been hired: procedures of fairness need to be in place not only at hiring time but during the probationary period. Kirkland agreed that greater integration of such hires in the day-to-day academic process was important. Training of all faculty and other employees regarding discrimination of any kind needs to be done. She also acknowledged that the OEO website was in great need of being updated and they were working on it. As far as the complaint process was concerned, a document delineating the entire procedure in detail is being prepared with the help of Associate University Counsel Joseph Scodro. FAC will get to see that document when ready, she said—this has yet to occur.

**FAC SUGGESTION:** It would be good for IUPUI to create one or more ombudsperson faculty positions who could serve as a mediator between faculty and different levels of administration whenever sensitive problems emerged.

### **2. FACULTY DIVERSITY [DISCUSSION ITEM]**

The IFC Executive Committee asked that FAC participate in a discussion initiated by the Campus Planning Committee (chaired by Jack Windsor) on the issue of faculty diversity at IUPUI. Since faculty hiring is a school prerogative, what the IFC could do in that regard that could be useful may be unclear. Yet, the issue of faculty diversification deserves campus-

wide reflection and merits FAC's attention. FAC, therefore, did two things: one was to set up a subcommittee in charge of studying relevant issues in conjunction with the Campus Planning Committee, and the other was to examine EVC Sukhatme's SRUF initiative (Support for Recruitment of Under-represented Faculty), which has benefited several schools.

**A. SRUF Policy.** The initiative provides start-up funds (\$50,000) the first year (as part of the salary base of a SRUF hire), and an additional \$25,000 the second year. Each hire must be given a mentor within the school. The program has been very successful even though it doesn't seem to have been widely advertised (to the benefit of those units that were informed of its existence); and there may also be an effect of the eligibility condition: SRUF was available to a department if the current percentage of any gender or race in it was "less than 15% of the total tenured and tenure-track faculty" in that department and "the nationally available pool of candidates in that discipline was also less than 15%." Still, unit chairs and school administrators could have been made more aware of the program. SRUF represents a very significant commitment on the part of IUPUI toward recruitment and retention of minority faculty and thus improve faculty diversity. Thirty-eight hires have been made since October 2006, distributed across eleven schools. The program, however, has run out of funds, and Chancellor Bantz indicated at an IFC meeting that AO really wanted to continue subsidizing SRUF as much as possible, but that the current global crisis was not particularly favorable.

FAC was told that the program could not have been extended to NTTF. It was limited to permanent faculty because of the trouble we already meeting hiring goals within the tenure-track ranks. FAC believes that some level of support for lecturers would be helpful; the administration doesn't disagree but says that it is principally a resource issue. In the School of Medicine, both NSF and NIH set aside money for under-represented staff hires that are part of funded grants. The School of Medicine had benefited a great deal from the SRUF initiative but is paying for it with its own funds, not with AO money. SRUF strengthens IUPUI because without it the campus might not be in a position to get certain national grants (like from the Ford Foundation). It helps the campus meet new accreditation standards, and it is therefore very much needed. Besides, the Office of Equal Opportunity vets all job searches to ensure that under-represented candidates be given a fair chance.

**FAC SUGGESTION 1:** The IFC could issue a recommendation that faculty governance in each school look at hiring procedures. Schools may already have diversity committees, but not necessarily ones set up through faculty governance.

**FAC SUGGESTION 2:** Another possibility to contemplate is what the Illinois General Assembly has implemented: the "Diversifying Higher Education Faculty in Illinois Program" ([DFI](#)). It is a fellowship program that encourages minority students to pursue and complete graduate degrees at Illinois institutions in order to increase the number of under-represented faculty and staff in Illinois institutions of higher education and higher education governing boards.

**B. FAC SUBCOMMITTEE ON FACULTY DIVERSITY.** Chair: Lisa McGuire. Members: Yaobin Chen, Jennifer Hehman, Debomoy Lahiri, Kent Robertson. See the subcommittee report in APPENDIX 2 below. It describes a presentation by Dr. Kenneth Durgans (Assistant Chancellor for Diversity) made on 1/12/09 at a joint meeting with the Campus Planning committee. In discussing that report, FAC made the important point that discussion of diversity should also include something often neglected: the diversity in lines of inquiry, which is essential to the meaning and good health of academic freedom. It is important that a good working definition of "diversity" be established to clarify a wide range of discussions, and that diversity should indeed also be that of viewpoints. FAC appreciates Dr. Durgans's initiatives; it is good to emphasize the academic successes of underrepresented minorities. IU-

PUI has a commendable “diversity vision” suffused with a spirit of pluralism. Trying to increase the number of minority faculty would be insufficient, however, if that effort is not accompanied by sustained professional development aimed at “growing them.”

FAC will continue to monitor and encourage the campus’s efforts toward faculty diversification.

### **3. EXTENSION OF THE TENURE PROBATIONARY PERIOD TO TEN YEARS—IUSM PROPOSAL [EXTENDED DISCUSSION ITEM]**

The School of Medicine has asked that the tenure probationary period in that school be extended from seven to ten years. There is a national trend sustaining the probationary period extension momentum: top-tier medical schools have been implementing this measure. IFC President Atkinson asked that FAC made the discussion of that issue a high priority. IUSM’s Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs Steve Bogdewic and his team wrote a white paper, “Flexibility in the Tenure Clock: Why the Time is Right to Adopt a 10-Year Tenure Probationary Period at IUSM,” which FAC studied carefully—as well as another document provided later: “Response to Commonly Asked Questions about Proposal to Extend Tenure Clock.” AAUP’s official position is to retain the seven-year tenure clock with the option of extending the clock twice under certain conditions. At IUPUI those conditions include the birth of a child, health problems, or submission of a grant that hasn’t been funded yet.

The IFC Executive Committee’s position regarding this issue is cautious: some of its members believe that this type of change should be system-wide and cannot apply to a single school. It might take years to get it through the board of trustees and all the levels below that. There is concern about the friction the change would create among schools on this campus and between this campus and Bloomington. A recommended solution is to stop the clock if clear criteria can be articulated that would increase the flexibility of the existing stop-the-clock policy.

FAC believes it necessary to frame the entire issue in a broader and deeper context, that of the ethical philosophy that has historically been driving the tenuring process in the university, especially the American university, as an institution that works, not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole, but toward the common good, whether of the city, the region, the state, the nation, or the world of today. Within that context, the conception of tenure takes on a significant social dimension, which the AAUP originally framed in terms of the free search for truth and its free exposition upon which depends social progress and the common good. The AAUP defines tenure as a means toward two fundamental ends: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities; (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Both are indispensable to the success of the university as an institution that needs to fulfill obligations toward its students and to society.

The conception of tenure is in crisis today in this country’s medical schools. This is due in largest part to the corporatization of that institution, which has led it to be entangled within a complex web of conflicting roles and responsibilities: medical research is very expensive, the school does not get much support from the State, the faculty as a result must be entrepreneurs constantly trying to raise very large amounts of money, and that interferes with all the traditional roles of faculty in academia. What tenure means in the medical school has become a hard question to answer, from the two standpoints of academic freedom and of economic security. And the road toward tenure has become increasingly more difficult, time-consuming, and stressful.

FAC conducted several discussions of the IUSM proposal, and heard Dr. Bogdewic and Megan Palmer directly on the matter. The FAC chair met independently with Dr. Bogdewic

and his team as well, and later on again with Dr. Bogdewic, Mary Fisher, and Associate Counsel Joe Scodro. Issues or problems that have been raised include the following.

- (1) **CONCURRENT SYSTEMS.** Whether there could be two different tenure clocks in the university. The Dean of the Faculties Office has been wavering about this, from a negative position toward a positive one. FAC is divided about it: the majority is not favorable to it, but some members think it worth turning it into a pilot program for the university. Other schools than IUSM (e.g., Science, Engineering, Health and Rehabilitation) have similar funding problems but are not asking for that solution. A system that allows different tenure clocks within a same institution may not be fair; and it isn't clear that IUSM has considered alternatives (such as a tenure insurance system). Would there be any danger that the extension policy might spill over to other schools? Could it be contained only to the Med School under strict conditions? Would that be even feasible?
- (2) **ARGUMENT BY IMITATION ("OTHERS ARE DOING IT").** The white paper compares the situation with other top medical schools in tabular form, but does not summarize through what kind of discussions and governance process those other universities came to split the tenure-clock length among their schools. The strategy appears merely to imitate others in the wishful hope that those others, by virtue of their prestige, have done all the required thinking. That's not likely to be the case, though. One sign of it is that the general line of the argument is not fully compelling, for it creates problems.
- (3) **WHAT ABOUT THE EXISTING IUPUI POLICY ON STOPPING THE TENURE CLOCK?**

*Under unusual circumstances an untenured probationary faculty member or librarian may request in writing an extension of the time preceding his or her tenure review. Such an extension is ordinarily not to exceed one calendar year. Either a professional or a personal emergency (e.g., a substantial change in one's health or work environment, or in one's public service or care giving responsibilities) may be an appropriate reason for requesting such an extension. (Within each academic unit, faculty may also recommend unit-specific policies and procedures.) Any probationary period extension must be approved in writing by one's department chair (if applicable) and academic dean and by the Dean of the Faculties, and is to be recorded as an addendum to the faculty member's or librarian's "Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment." This policy is separate from policies regarding leaves of absence without pay (or with partial pay). (Approved by the Faculty Council 1994)*

IUSM insists that the existing stop-the-clock policy is not a sufficient solution. But FAC feels that IUSM has not offered a credible argument against the current policy. A little modification of it could get them all the mileage they need. The argument that a stigma gets attached to those who request that extension is ethically unacceptable and logically invalid: one must refrain from turning a moral deficiency on the part of stigmatizers into one that supports the proposed new policy. The probationary period extension will cause the same stigmas if the culture within IUSM, if that was the culture, does not change. In addition, whether the 10-year clock could itself be extended for the same reasons that apply to the seven-year clock (the existing stop-the-clock policy) is unclear. Presumably not, but that has not been stated. In any case, FAC believes that a simple amendment of the existing stop-the-clock policy to allow for extra-time to get a major grant may be sufficient; it would be easier to implement and far less problematic to the university. Faculty who need an extension make the request to their department chair who forwards it to the school's dean, whose prerogative it is to ask the Dean of the Faculties for such an extension in individual cases (faculty have the right to file a grievance in case their dean refuses to forward the request). The amended policy could provide new faculty who obtain an

- excellent score on a grant application that falls short of funding the guarantee that they would receive a tenure-clock extension. This would be better than stringing along lesser-performing faculty for nine or ten years without serious prospect of increased chances toward tenure.
- (4) **INFREQUENT USE OF THE PROBATIONARY EXTENSION.** IUSM admits that only a very few faculty are not getting through the current tenure process. Extension of the probationary period would apply not to current hires but to future hires, most of whom are expected to be able to get tenure within the traditional seven years. Even so, IUSM thinks it worthwhile to extend the period by three years, so that those who cannot make it in seven years will have no reason to fret about it. FAC thinks that changing a major policy for the sake of a few exceptions that could be handled through an improvement of the existing stop-the-clock policy may not be economically wise.
- (5) **LOSS OF MEANING OF TENURE.** There has been no sustained attempt, it seems, within IUSM, to rethink fundamentally what they mean by tenure. IUSM has only recently defined what are its tenure criteria, without discussing the actual benefits of and reasons for obtaining tenure in their school. The two principles behind tenure (academic freedom and economic security) have undergone drastic corrosion in medical schools because of the corporate model they have all been forced to embrace: tenure no longer means the conjunction of a reasonable guarantee of income with the exercise of academic freedom: research faculty must find ways to refund a very large portion of their own salaries through grants (on which the income of many other people depends), and those grants often force them to adapt their research agenda not to what the process of inquiry would demand but to federal opportunities and the fashion of the day. Medical schools don't appear to be willing to discuss the effects of that corrosion on their ability to pursue a genuine academic agenda, unfortunately. The important element of a mutual commitment between the university and its medical faculty seems to be missing, especially coming from the university.
- (6) **IMPERILED ORIGINALITY.** The fact that only medical researchers with a knack for getting money have an academic future, at least as long as they are lucky to continue getting large grants, is troublesome. It prevents other types of researchers, more gifted for pure research but less for fundraising, from contributing to original and significant discoveries, and that's a great loss for the university and for society. There is much extraordinarily valuable research that is at first obscure and unpopular, and whose value gets acknowledged years or decades later. Their authors wouldn't stand a chance of getting hired in a medical school because of existing criteria, or because the topic of their research suddenly falls out of favor at NIH or elsewhere. Tenure should not be market-dependent, especially because what the market wants is not necessarily what is best, and it is essential for society that a university's intellectual independence be preserved.
- (7) **ONE-SIDED FLEXIBILITY.** The only flexibility IUSM is interested in introducing is lengthening the time for its faculty to obtain tenure. IUSM shows no desire to introduce flexibility in the tenure criteria themselves, which remain rigidly traditional. The desire to lengthen the probationary period stems directly from that unwillingness. The main issue for IUSM is not that of assessing the scholarly excellence of the medical research faculty—in principle, that can be done in five years of observing candidates—but that of assessing their fundraising (or grant-obtaining) excellence. Excellent researchers are not infrequently let go because they failed at the NIH lottery through no fault of their own intellectual powers. IUSM seeks to mitigate that situation by giving faculty more time to prove they can fund their research. Medical

schools seems to discount excellence of scholarly achievements to the benefit of excellence in competing against others, even though the research funding pool has shrunk nationwide. We are told that harsh reality makes it unthinkable to separate scholarly excellence from funding excellence, but the skills for scholarly excellence are not the same as the skills for getting money, and there is something immoral about making the skills for getting money the trump card. Even if this is not how it is conveyed in IUSM's P&T documents, it is how it works in practice, since it is enforced by department chairs, whose main concern is the bottom line. It is that practice that makes it necessary to give faculty more time to show they can compete on the grant market. And it is that imperative, which, strictly speaking, is not an academic but an economic concern, that makes IUSM stand apart from some other schools.

- (8) **COMPETITIVENESS.** IUSM also wants to be more competitive in attracting faculty by granting them the assurance that they will have as much probationary time as they would in other top-tier schools. And IUSM wants especially to appear more attractive to the new generation of faculty who demand more humane workloads or more flexible schedules, especially the female faculty who have always been clearly disadvantaged in a system designed mostly for men. FAC agrees that one cannot ignore how competitive the market place has become in the academic medical world. There are only 125 medical schools in the country, and all are vying for the same small pool of excellent faculty, finding it difficult to retain them, especially women and minorities. Most of the top 25 med schools have extended their probationary period to ten years or more, and that would seem to make them more attractive to the new cohort of faculty who expect more career flexibility. IU says it is behind in that trend. The proposal's main motive is to enhance recruitment of new faculty; it is turned toward the future, not the past or present. It takes more and more time for faculty to make their mark in their field of research at a national level. Only 10 to 12% of NIH grant applications are successful, and they are in average granted at later and later ages to faculty. The School makes large initial investments in new hires (in average, \$800,000 per hire), and it is thus in the School's interest to preserve that investment by ensuring that new hires succeed. These new hires are very carefully selected so that their profile matches what the institution can offer. The proposal would allow IUSM to offer an opportunity to new faculty that matches what they could find elsewhere in top schools, making the tenure-track MD career option more attractive, especially also to dual career individuals. FAC thinks that IUSM may be able to attract more faculty thanks to the new policy, but whether these new faculty would be able to survive in conditions where tenure criteria remain inflexible and the meaning of tenure is thin is dubious.
- (9) **FEAR OF EXPLOITATION.** FAC remains concerned that ten years is a long period of life. Having to wait for that long before getting one's first promotion despite enormous workloads and personal sacrifices, that doesn't sound wonderful. The institution claims to be trying to be more sympathetic by providing more flexibility, but is it sympathy or cold economic calculation? After all, one main argument is that the institution doesn't want to have to let go too quickly faculty in whom it has already invested large sums of money (start-up costs, etc.). Lengthening the probationary period is a way to increase the probability of greater return on the initial investment. But FAC wonders whether this does not amount also to lengthening the period during which researchers are more vulnerable to exploitation by their supervisors and chairs. The extension could sometimes force researchers into temporary clinical activities, thus interfering with their academic mission, and it might also unnecessarily

- prolong their agony should they not be as excellent as expected. If the extension is seen as a strategic tool to enhance recruitment of tenurable faculty, one needs to gauge what advantages tenure brings to them that are so worthwhile that these researchers are ready to commit themselves to longer years of inordinate stress, insecurity, overwork, fear of displeasing supervisors, all of that with the risk of getting nothing in the end. If the idea is to make the tenure track more attractive, perhaps humanizing the entire process might exercise greater attraction than merely prolonging it.
- (10) AD-HOC REACTION. An important reason to extend the probationary period is that it is increasingly difficult to get very large grants because of shrinking federal budgets. It takes more and more time for young faculty to secure an R01 grant for instance—a major P&T benchmark. But FAC wonders whether the extension would really solve the problem, and whether the proposed policy could be subject to revision whenever the NIH budget increases or decreases.
- (11) COMPREHENSIVE VS COSMETIC SOLUTION. FAC thinks it important to get a fuller picture of the larger problems in order to ensure that whatever fix the extension proposal constitutes be not simply a Band-Aid covering a deep wound in order to hide it while the infection festers underneath. A merely cosmetic solution will not prevent a general stampede toward the cliff. IUSM should take the opportunity to look at the tenure crisis more deeply in order to come up with systemic solutions that are more far-reaching and thus more likely to remain effective in the longer term, independently of varying economical climates. IUSM insists that the only reason why compromise is necessary is the lack of sufficient state funding: if the School had the money, the extension issue would never have surfaced. FAC doesn't want to ignore the plight of the probationary faculty and the latter's own strong support for the extension. Our standpoint is empathic, but goes beyond the narrower scope of IUSM's interests to extend it to the campus as a whole. It is important to consider the longer term and the wider horizon.
- (12) EDUCATING THE LEGISLATURE. FAC wonders whether the school or the campus are being aggressive enough in trying to persuade the state, or educate legislators, about the goodness of preserving and investing in the independence of universities. One may doubt the state's willingness to invest more in the university, but perhaps that "fact" of life is simply an invitation for the university to change it, since it is not cast in stone, but only in uninformed minds.

FAC believes that the policy change sought by IUSM is not merely an IUPUI issue but a university-wide issue, for IUSM is on every campus, even though it only answers to the IUPUI administration and to no other campus administration. The reason is that the very nature of the issue is of interest to every other school, and one must not neglect the fact that there are cross-appointments between IUSM and other schools, which complicates the whole situation. One cannot simply ignore the fact that extending the probationary period is a move that has implications beyond the Medical School.

Dr. Steve Bogdewic has strongly indicated his desire to press on. He called for a meeting with Associate University Counsel Joe Scodro, which took place on May 8 with Mary Fisher and André De Tienne attending. At that meeting Fisher reversed most of her former positions and indicated she was now favoring doing everything she could to help IUSM extend the tenure probationary period. Scodro explained that he was all in favor of the IUSM initiative and suggested that there would be ways to make it happen while bypassing the IFC entirely, by striking an agreement between IUSM and the upper administration directly. De Tienne cautioned that such a move would be deeply impolitical and entirely discourteous: it would signal complete disrespect of the faculty governance process and chill relations be-

tween faculty and administration. Administrative flippancy about decisions as grave as those that pertain to tenure policies would be unwise. More time needs to be given to the clarification of the stakes of the issue and to the exercise of an imagination more fertile than it has so far been.

#### **4. EXAMINATION OF SYSTEM-WIDE REVIEW OF BASELINE P&T PROCEDURES [DISCUSSION ITEM]**

IFC President Atkinson asked FAC to monitor the development of a document by a system-wide joint faculty/administrative committee that President McRobbie charged with coming up with a set of recommendations defining baseline P&T procedures on all IU campuses. De Tienne was a member of that joint committee and kept FAC apprised of the main issues that emerged during the system-wide discussion. FAC members gave useful feedback on several occasions that De Tienne shared with the joint committee. At a later stage, the joint committee's recommendations were edited by the UFC leadership, and the new document was again discussed and criticized by FAC, which shared its objections with the IFC. This led to yet another revise, the result of a compromise that the FAC examined and determined was acceptable. Most members were comfortable with how the principles had been phrased and found them to be a good compromise that was worth testing over the first year of implementation.

FAC provided several additional comments, including the following two: (1) The committee would like the significant relationship with a co-author to be limited to the last 3 to 5 years, as the case may be. This is especially important in those disciplines where papers are produced by teams of authors and collaborators from various centers and disciplines, sometimes numbering up to 20 people, and it would not make sense to exclude all of them from the reviewing pool, especially when the collaboration was merely occasional and wasn't repeated. Similarly, FAC thinks that not all classmates have automatically a "significant relationship" with a candidate by virtue of having merely been in the same classroom at some time. Only those people who have had a personal or professional relationship with the candidate that is such that they could not exercise proper neutrality regarding the candidate's fate (success or failure) should be discouraged from being solicited to review the dossier.

(2) Regarding President McRobbie's memo of December 5, 2008, FAC is concerned that an executive review might be driven by considerations that are wholly external to a dossier, especially economical or budgetary considerations. Faculty committee reviews have a high level of transparency, while executive reviews are opaque, and opacity naturally tends to raise disquieting questions. The president will not entertain requests for reconsideration of the results of an executive review except upon the positive recommendation of the appropriate administrator under him. FAC believes that the likelihood that such an administrator would make that kind of positive recommendation to the current president is infinitesimally close to zero. It would be good if the upper administration recognized the legitimacy of faculty discomfort regarding their proposed methodology.

#### **5. NTTF REPRESENTATION ON IFC [UPDATE]**

The Constitution & Bylaws Committee finished its work and found a way to incorporate the spirit of last year's successful FAC motion in the IFC Constitution and Bylaws, with the constant input of the FAC chair. In February 2009 the IFC passed the revision of both the Constitution and the Bylaws unanimously. Thereafter the IUPUI faculty voted to approve the changes through an electronic ballot.

## 6. TTF VS. NTTF RATIO AT IUPUI [DISCUSSION ITEM]

One result of last year's debate around the representation of NTTF on the IFC was the emphasis on the problem developing in certain schools, particularly the School of Medicine, caused by an over-hiring of NTTF compared to regular tenure-track faculty. The line between TTF and NTTF is getting increasingly blurred. Tenure is a career option that is fast losing any traction in the School of Medicine because the responsibilities attached to it are far too onerous on faculty while the NTT clinical and research faculty can get long-term appointments and get promoted without the weight of these nerve-racking commitments. Another aspect of this issue is the fact that part-time faculty are in total limbo. FAC decided to begin studying the complex set of issues in order to help diagnose correctly the nature and extent of the TTF vs. NTTF problem, sorting out false problems from genuine issues. A subcommittee was set up for the purpose, chaired by Dean Hawley, with Jan Beckstrand, Bonnie Blazer-Yost, Elizabeth Hughes, Lisa Riolo, and Marianne Wokeck as members.

Hawley and his subcommittee began the process by focusing on the NTTF situation in the School of Medicine. They met on 29 January and produced a document that is reproduced in APPENDIX 1 below. It will be important for the subcommittee to broaden the debate to the situation of other schools. In a subsequent discussion with the whole committee, it was remarked that it was up to the faculty body to decide what the ratio of NTTF vs. TTF ought to be. The AAUP has made a number of recommendations in that regard (see *Policy Documents & Reports, tenth edition*, on "On Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Appointments," and "Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession"). A special meeting to discuss these issues (distinct from the other one) with Dr. Bogdewic will take place some time in the fall.

## 7. IUPUI HONORS COLLEGE [DISCUSSION ITEM]

FAC is one of several standing committees that the IFC Executive Committee tasked with examining the IUPUI Honors College proposal. FAC invited Kathy Johnson, Professor and Chair of the Department of Psychology in the School of Science, who was one of the authors of the [IUPUI Honors College vision paper](#), to come and present the main lines of the proposal. Johnson explained that the vision paper began to be written early last winter and went through several revisions as the Honors Program Committee consulted with campus academic and administrative units and visited other universities. IUPUI had already launched a search for a dean because that person would be largely responsible for improving the vision and implementing it while raising funds to maintain and expand it. Dean candidates were scheduled for lengthy campus visits so that they could speak to many stakeholders and get a sense of needs and priorities. Johnson pointed out the Faculty Fellows program, which will expand the cadre of honors faculty by negotiating 3-year contracts with departments in order to help increase the number of honors courses taught regularly. The aim is to have one Faculty Fellow per department, and it will be a position open only to post-P&T faculty: senior lecturers and associate/full professors. Lecturers and assistant professors will not be eligible so as not to detract them from the promotion process. The Honors College would enhance recruitment, enrollment, and retention, while raising the bar for students. FAC debated the proposal extensively and subsequently produced a document, "Formation of the IUPUI Honors College: Recommendations and Concerns from the Faculty Affairs Committee" which is found in APPENDIX 4 at the end of this report.

Subsequently, FAC members met with two of the three candidates who came to the campus for interviews during sessions also attended by members of the Campus Planning and Academic Affairs Committees. And later on we were pleased to learn that candidate Jane Luzar was appointed to become the first Dean of that College.

## 8. STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

FAC continued the discussion of students' evaluations of teaching begun the previous year. A subcommittee was set up to pursue its investigation: the subcommittee on "Student Feedback Surveys," actively chaired by Robert Yost. Members included Jan Beckstrand, Steve Fox, Jaena Hollingsworth, and Robin Hughes, plus two external members: Howard Mzumura and Jackie Singh, who are co-chairs of the ad-hoc PRAC subcommittee.

Yost's subcommittee met very regularly for five months, and recruited two students who worked with Howard Mzumura. The subcommittee examined feedback questions (faculty-, class-, and student-oriented questions) from six different schools, and compared the surveys. The intention was to examine how to develop a good evaluative instrument and to clarify questions regarding the actual purposes of surveys, what they do as far as faculty development is concerned, and what kind of "student satisfaction" they reflect. The subcommittee also paid attention to online feedback surveys, one of whose main related issues is student compliance (getting students to actually use them). The value of these surveys depends on many factors, including the time students are given to fill them. It is important that faculty keep the upper hand in defining the purposes and methods of these surveys. The subcommittee submitted a full report of its activities at FAC's April meeting. It is enclosed as APPENDIX 3 in this report.

PRAC members Mzumura and Singh explained how they developed the template that was used to analyze and compare the different surveys received from certain schools: they took into account several categories of evaluands in order to identify different categories of questions put to students: those regarding course architecture, students' commitment to learning, their perception of the instructor's commitment to teaching, their perceived success at learning, etc. The template sought also to align questions with the PULs (this did not work very well), and to gauge what questions were centered on student satisfaction, or on learning outcomes, or learning applications, or impact. The analysis sought to identify the main concept or purpose driving each of the questions, and to compare that with standard lists of criteria, as well as with the IUPUI mission statement. They found that the majority of questions were centered on student learning and student satisfaction, and little else. Criteria that drive the surveys are pretty easy to identify, but they are generally scattered with little organization. Survey instruments are constructed very differently, and they are usually designed to fulfill too many different purposes that are not compatible and thus not well served by being grouped in the same instrument. The principal purpose, in general, appears to be summative rather than formative. When surveys get tallied, they generate a global score that is then used as a basis of comparison with scores established at various levels (departmental, school, campus), even though those other scores are often established according to different scales and derive from surveys that are disparate and designed to fulfill other purposes. Scores are thus frequently getting compared with other scores that have nothing in common with them, leading to conclusions that are baseless. Comparison procedures are therefore fatally flawed.

FAC discussed several related issues: what are our institutions getting from those surveys, what can they really tell us that justify our intellectual, monetary, logistical, and time investment in them? These surveys offer pretty gross indicators of what might be problematic in certain classes, but they don't seem to be refined enough for much more than that, given their many weaknesses in formulation of questions, overall purposes, interpretational ambiguities, and lack of meaningful thresholds for gauging and mapping performance levels. The subcommittee recommends that an entirely new set of instruments be developed, with more probing questions that are better organized. FAC suggestions included developing a large bank of questions, classified under a whole range of purposes (but developing a variety of surveys may make their machine-processing very onerous), having survey questions exam-

ined by experts, and requiring administrators who use surveys to pass judgment on faculty to take workshops that teach them how to analyze these forms and what their limitations are. Fisher suggested that this complex issue be brought for discussion at a meeting of the IFC. She is interested in developing instruments that are clearly linked to the PULs (important for the 2012 accreditation).

Alternative ways of surveying students, especially when the purpose is to judge the performance of tenure-track faculty, are essential, since the ratio of completed online surveys is abysmal. Whether it is truly important that all students be forced to answer surveys is a valid question. The remark was made that many surveys seem to be set up in ways that are punitive rather than positive. Such a comment is symptomatic of the general spirit in which surveys are perceived by faculty: with deep inner skepticism mixed with outward admission that they might be serviceable if well designed and well used.

The subcommittee did exemplary work on a very challenging issue, not hesitating to approach it by paying scholarly attention to statistical theory, whose principles have helped bring to light a lot of problematic inconsistencies in how surveys are constructed, administered, analyzed, compared, and interpreted. Their report may help craft a solid argument toward a major overhaul of student feedback surveys from the ground up. That will be a discussion and a task for the next academic year.

## **9. OTHER ISSUES**

FAC set up other subcommittees to examine other issues.

(a) The “P&T Guidelines” subcommittee, chaired by André De Tienne (with Bonnie Blazer-Yost, Yaobin Chen, Mary Fisher, Steve Fox, Jaena Hollingsworth, Lisa Riolo, Marianne Wokeck as members) never met because the IUSM tenure-clock issue ended up taking all of De Tienne’s available time. Still, the issue to be addressed by this subcommittee is significant. The campus P&T guidelines have evolved a great deal over the last few years as a result of much work being done in the Office of the Dean of the Faculties, which has been consulting the members of the campus P&T committee exclusively. FAC has not been consulted for many years regarding those guidelines even though our charge specifies that we advise the council on matters involving tenure and promotion policies and procedures. It is high time that FAC gave a close look at the guidelines from the perspective of faculty going up for P&T, to counterbalance the campus P&T committee’s or the Dean of the Faculties’s own standpoints. This is something to be taken up next year.

(b) TRUSTEES’ TEACHING AWARDS. Members: André De Tienne, Elizabeth Hughes. The matter is to examine how IUPUI has been implementing the Trustees’ policy on teaching awards. Analysis suggests that IUPUI’s interpretation is misguided and causes unfair practices.

(c) REVISION OF REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS PROCEDURES. Members: André De Tienne, Jennifer Hehman. The matter here is simply to update the text in IUPUI’s Supplement to the Handbook.

APPENDIX 1

**Faculty Affairs Committee  
Subcommittee on Non-tenure Track Faculty Expansion**

Meeting, January 29, 2009 10AM

Members present: Beckstrand, Riolo, Blazer-Yost, Hughes, Hawley (Chair)

Members absent: none

**Agenda:**

**1. Review of charge to Subcommittee: “Investigate” and collect data to determine the overall consequences for the IUPUI faculty on the School of Medicine proposal to increase the NTTF. Consequences for discussion are to include faculty governance, faculty grievance, Promotion and Tenure, structure, accreditation standards for the institution, and other issues as deemed appropriate.**

**2. Review of data:**

**Per IFC 2008 Revision of Motion : There are currently 1056 NTTF (592 Clinical, 252 Research, 174 Lecturer, 38 Academic Specialist)**

**Per Steve Bogdewic, EAD for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development at SoM:**

**As of the first of December 2008 there were 641 tenure track faculty, 634 non-tenure track faculty (508 clinical track, 119 scientist track, 7 lecturer track), 216 full-time affiliate faculty, 115 part-time faculty, 1763 volunteer faculty, and 65 visiting faculty (just threw them in as a bonus).**

A review of the available data for faculty titles, job descriptions, promotion and contract procedures and payroll was entertained. There is insufficient information from the School of Medicine web sites to determine which faculty are being paid by Indiana University. The faculty titles are not consistent with other Schools at IUPUI, and not specified in the Faculty Handbook. It was not clear to us which of these faculty titles are being reported by SoM as NTTF faculty, as opposed to being neither NTTF or TTF, but some separate designation. An investigation was conducted by Riolo to find accreditation standards for ratios of TTF to NTTF for the Liaison Committee on Medical Education, and the North Central Assoc of Colleges and Universities Higher Learning Commission. No specified ratio is cited among the web resources for these agencies.

A base problem is the lack of understanding of what the School of Medicine is reporting as “NTTF.” The School reported 641 TTF, 634 NTTF, and then a list of additional faculty positions which the School describes as “part-time faculty,” “volunteer faculty,” and “visiting faculty.” These additional “faculty” account for over 1800 persons, apparently not reported as either NTTF or TTF, and at least some of them have requirements to submit pro-

motion dossiers to the School P&T Committee for vetting by the faculty for promotion. These people are not vetted as initial hires, or for 3-year review, only for promotion. A recommendation was made by Blazer-Yost, who has encountered this issue on the campus P&T committee, that it would be helpful to know which of these folks are getting compensated by IU, as that might help lead to a clearer understanding of their appointment when they come to the IUPUI committee. Also, it would clarify faculty status with respect to the proposed IFC revision of holding elected faculty governance offices, and for participation on committees at the School and Campus levels. Beckstrand stated that the Nursing School uses the designation "Honorary" to describe unpaid teaching partners.

The Subcommittee unanimously expressed agreement with the statement made by the IFC in its proposed revision of faculty governance to offer seats to NTTF, which states that the ratio of TTF to NTTF is eroding yearly. The Subcommittee unanimously observed that this apparent erosion is detrimental to the campus, but we struggled to find documentation in accreditation standards or bylaws that actually specify a recommended ratio. Further, a basic misunderstanding about the actual status of many School of Medicine faculty prevents us from drawing conclusions about recent rapid expansion in NTTF faculty.

We devised a set of questions we would like to pose to Executive Associate Dean Steve Bogdewic, who has already graciously agreed to meet with the FAC to answer questions.

- 1. For each faculty title as specified on the "IUSM Faculty Titles" page of the IUSM Faculty Development web site, which of these faculty are paid by IU, and which of these faculty "count" in the view of the SoM administration as NTTF?**
- 2. Would it be possible for the School of Medicine to use some title other than including the word "Professor" for faculty who are not employed by IU, and are not counted by the SoM as NTTF?** Beckstrand mentioned that here the Nursing School is using the title "Honorary Faculty." Streamlining this language is not necessary if these faculty never seek committee or governance roles and never apply for Promotion, but when such faculty do present across campus via Promotions committee or Departmental appointment to faculty committees, a streamlined faculty title system would be beneficial. Blazer-Yost did express that there is a sense of betrayal among IUPUI faculty that unpaid volunteers in the medical community are permitted to use a title including "Professor," even when warned to specify "Volunteer Professor," because the job title "Professor" is deemed substantial by the IUPUI faculty. Riolo expressed that there is a broad sense that the title is misused or deliberately misrepresented at IU and at many other institutions.
- 3. Would it be possible to remove the Promotion (via School and Campus P&T Committee) process for faculty who are not paid by IU and not counted by SoM as NTTF?** A Campus P&T committee member thought that the term "Adjunct Professor" meant a person with a full time tenure-track appointment at a different school at IU, and a secondary appointment in Medicine, and therefore should not be processed through Promotion in the non-primary department. Members were surprised to learn that SoM is using this designation for people who seemingly have no TTF appointment at all.
- 4. Would it be possible for the administration of the School of Medicine to specify a target or desirable ratio of TTF to NTTF in terms of academic standards and accreditation needs?** Establishing a goal or target ratio would help the IFC define a role for NTTF in faculty governance.

With permission from the Faculty Affairs Committee, we would propose submitting these questions, even this complete dialog, to EAD Steve Bogdewic well in advance of the planned meeting with him before the full committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Dean A. Hawley, M.D.  
Tenured Professor of Pathology

\*\*\*\*\*

APPENDIX 2  
**Report to IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**Lisa E. McGuire, Chair**  
**Subcommittee on Diversity**  
February 18, 2009

Per suggestion from Andre De Tienne, Chair of the Faculty Affairs committee. I contacted Jack Windsor, Chair of the IUPUI Campus Planning Committee. This committee was also concerned about issues of faculty diversity and it would make sense that we combine our efforts. After making contact with Jack Windsor, he invited members of our subcommittee to join the IUPUI Campus Planning committee for their January meeting on 1-12-09 from 3:30 to 4:30, where Dr. Kenneth Durgans, the newly-appointed Assistant Chancellor for Diversity, was making a presentation.

Despite the short notice from me, we had excellent representation at the meeting with Deb Lahiri, Jennifer Hehman and Kent Robertson all attending. Dr. Durgans gave a comprehensive presentation covering his portfolio of assignments in the position of Assistant Chancellor for Diversity, as well as an initial assessment of IUPUI situation on campus diversity and the current efforts underway.

Dr. Durgan's office has oversight of the IUPUI Directory of Multicultural Affairs, with responsibility for the Multicultural Center which will provide space for affinity groups on campus as well as a developing library. He is also responsible for IUPUI Adaptive Educational Services and the Director of Diverse Community Partnerships. Of particular interest to the Faculty Affairs Committee is the Director of Multicultural Academic Affairs, in conjunction with the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs.

Dr. Durgans shared his initial perceptions of diversity initiatives at IUPUI are further along than many other schools, in terms of infrastructure and planning. This exceeded his expectations and he is encouraged about the many initiatives currently under way. He discussed the President's Initiative, to which IUPUI sent 5 projects, 2 of which were funded. However, both projects funded were focused on retention of students.

Four initiatives were identified as current efforts. The first was faculty diversity and the efforts are currently focusing on the STEM programs (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics). There are five potential candidates and Dr. Durgans has been working closely with Deans and Department Chairs to link candidates and eventually, the new faculty with supports already present in the university. Closer linkages with IUSM Associate

Dean for Diversity will begin in June. He has again been quite encouraged that the Deans and Department Chairs have been very open and accommodating in working with him. Later in the presentation, he acknowledge that the SRUF program was an excellent resource and is clearly a successful incentive. He reported that it is an “absolute necessity” to continue the success of this program, as well as the importance of working with the Office of Academic Affairs to support and retain these candidates.

The second initiative was a seminar/speakers series that will bring noted faculty and other speakers of national note to make presentations on diversity issues. The third initiative presented was faculty mentoring for new faculty of color, in conjunction with the office of Academic Affairs. His office would be responsible to support and increase existing efforts. The final effort is in conjunction with the Office of Women, co-sponsoring activities and events.

In general, his approach seemed to be to work WITH existing efforts to enhance what already exists at IUPUI. There are many resources in place on which to build and multiple reports/plans at the campus as well as the university level. (for more information, visit the diversity@iupui site at <http://www.iupui.edu/~divrsity/> . There is also a Diversity Cabinet which is charged with the implementation of these efforts.

Despite the positive efforts, the questions from the joint committees asked about the current efforts toward enrollment shaping which may impact the diversity of students as out-of-state and international students are considered. It was also noted by committee members that there is a significant amount of difference between and among academic units as to the embracing of faculty diversity and the importance of working with ALL units to build connections.

It is my recommendation that the Faculty Affairs carefully consider what our role might be in encouraging and supporting faculty diversity at IUPUI. There are multiple efforts currently underway at both IUPUI and Indiana University. The existing Diversity Cabinet is in place and the January 2008 campus report from the Chancellor should be carefully reviewed to determine whether current efforts are appropriate and whether we believe that a different course is necessary.

\*\*\*\*\*

### APPENDIX 3

#### **FAC Subcommittee on Student Satisfaction Surveys Submitted to Faculty Affairs Committee**

4/24/09

The subcommittee on student satisfaction surveys has met monthly from December 2008 through April 2009. Our meetings were primarily focused on discussing and evaluating the effectiveness, the purpose, the timing, the delivery, the credibility, and the content of the surveys. The FAC committee members were joined by Jacqueline Singh and Howard Mzumara co-chairs of the PRAC subcommittee on course evaluations. The committee also recruited two upper level undergraduate students, Danielle Fulayter and Kyle Huerkamp, to assist in conducting an item analysis of several survey forms used on campus. Forms were obtained from the School of Liberal Arts, the School of Science, and the School of Public & Environmental Affairs.

For brevity and clarity of what the committee discussed, we have used a bullet point summary list.

#### Subcommittee findings

- Most student evaluation instruments capture student satisfaction. The majority of evaluands fall under course architecture and instructor/teaching, with very few addressing student self-assessment and student commitment to learning. Therefore the use of these evaluations in faculty reward (P&T, salary, re-appointment, etc.) is not adequate.
- In general, most survey items do not align with PULs.
- Global scores across schools are not comparable. The global score is reflective of overall ratings for specified/selected survey question items within a designated instrument. This varies from school to school. Because schools' global scores are based on different criteria, it's like comparing apples and oranges.
- An overall score confounds the information contained in multidimensional assessment. Aggregating data from different dimensions and creating an overall score is inappropriate.
- One instrument cannot serve all the purposes we want it to serve. It can't answer all the questions we have about the effectiveness of our teaching. The purpose of evaluations should be effectiveness of teaching, but we're using it for promotion and tenure. The measures should be reflective of all that comprises teaching effectiveness. The inferences being made with evaluation data are too diverse and are beyond the scope of what is being captured.
- There's a tendency for these evaluations to be pro forma. There's not a consistent use of these instruments. There's no encouragement for reflection.

#### Subcommittee recommendations

- The committee's impression is that there's a mixture of summative and formative use that isn't always appropriate to the way the evaluations are designed.
- Although there are issues with these evaluations, all faculty (tenured, tenure-track, lecturers, adjunct faculty) who teach a course should do student/course evaluations. These evaluations need to be uniformly administered (there are issues with this, too). They allow students to provide feedback about their experiences (gives students' a voice in their own education).
- Majority of evaluands (the focus/object of the evaluation) within each instrument fall under course architecture and instructor/teaching, with very few addressing student self-assessment and student commitment to learning. Therefore the use of these evaluations in faculty reward (P&T, salary, re-appointment, etc.) is not adequate.
- Multiple data sources should be used, especially for summative reviews. Peer observations, external experts, focus groups, follow-up questionnaires, longitudinal case studies, and open-ended questions can provide additional information to give a more complete picture of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness.
- Establish a critical class size threshold for meaningful analysis of data.
- Create a positive environment.
- Unintended consequences of survey instruments need to be investigated. (One example: it doesn't motivate students to want to fill them out.)
- Create opportunities for faculty to utilize experts (survey research center, poll center, IU Public Opinion Lab, etc.) through workshops, colloquia, or other means. Re-

- ardless of what instrument is used, those evaluands should be looked at by experts in survey and sampling design. This should be done with faculty input.
- Faculty and administrators who use this type of information should be required to attend a workshop on appropriate use of this data.
  - Establish a mechanism to help faculty interpret the survey results
  - Improve the way the surveys are administered and interpreted

Respectfully submitted by:  
Robert Yost, Chair  
Steve Fox  
Jenna Hollingsworth  
Jan Beckstrand  
Jackie Singh  
Howard Mzumara

\*\*\*\*\*

#### APPENDIX 4.

### **Formation of the IUPUI Honors College Recommendations and Concerns from the Faculty Affairs Committee**

---

1. While agreeing that the formation of an Honors College at IUPUI is a great initiative because of its potential to enhance recruitment, enrollment, and retention, while raising the bar for students and energizing the campus's educational and research mission, the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) shares the reservations and endorses the recommendations coming from the Academic Affairs Committee.
2. The FAC expresses the following concerns, several of which center on faculty-related issues.
  - a. Central to the Honors College concept is the Faculty Fellows program, which will expand the cadre of honors faculty by negotiating three-year contracts with departments in order to help increase the number of honors courses taught regularly. The aim is to have one Faculty Fellow per department, and it will be a position open only to post-P&T faculty, i.e., senior lecturers and associate/full professors. Lecturers and assistant professors would not be eligible so as not to detract them from the promotion process.
    - i. FAC believes that the Faculty Fellows program should not be restricted to non-probationary faculty. Teaching honors-only courses is a most valuable additional way for probationary faculty to build their teaching portfolio and make a case toward teaching excellence. Far from detracting them from the promotion process, it would incentivize them, and provide appropriate recognition to those of them who teach undergraduate and even graduate courses open to honors students.

- ii. FAC is very concerned with the budgetary calculation involved in the three-year contracts to be negotiated with departments to hire away Faculty Fellows. The amount of money provided in return to the unit would only enable it to hire contingent faculty to teach the Fellow's non-honors courses with lesser competence. Hiring more contingent faculty is not a desirable situation because of the difficulty and the time involved in finding appropriate candidates willing to take on a precarious and poorly paid position, and because of the impact on students generated by the decrease in experienced teacher-scholars in non-honors classrooms.
  - iii. It might be better to create and fund a permanent honors line in each department, with rotating faculty holding the position at the department's discretion. This would also decrease the risk of creating two tiers of faculty (honors and non-honors). At any rate, conditions for recruiting and compensating honors-teaching faculty and their departments will need to be negotiated in a joint administrative/faculty committee.
- b. FAC is also concerned with the modest start-up funding of the initiative (\$1M), which essentially suggests that IUPUI will be asking overworked faculty to stretch themselves even more thinly than they already are.
- i. Probationary or not, faculty are already very busy meeting increasingly demanding criteria for professional advancement, and many work twelve-hour days, mentoring students, directing graduate theses, developing service-learning courses, teaching heavy course loads, conducting research, organizing or attending conferences, applying for grants, fund-raising, managing all sorts of projects, serving the university in myriad ways, engaging themselves in the community, etc., much of it with little resources, little merit recognition, and no matching compensation or rewards. The concept of an Honors College implies considerable faculty investment in the development and teaching of a varied, high-standard curriculum to students that will demand special, time-consuming attention.
  - ii. Although this is evidently an attractive and stimulating prospect that many faculty would cheerfully welcome, it should not be implemented at the expense of our other central missions. Initiatives of this kind always suffer when they begin with an insufficient investment scratched from the bottom of drawers, including the CTE funds dedicated to improving graduation rates, or the enrollment-shaping initiative which forces some schools whose enrollment kept increasing without help from the initiative to share tuition dollars with other schools.
- c. FAC is afraid that the Honors College would mean yet another proliferation of costly administrators. Even though the initiative is advertised at the moment as not costing anything to the Schools, there is no guarantee that, as the College gets developed and takes on a life of its own, schools won't be assessed some extra tax to support it. Adequate planning is essential to make sure that any expansion of the student body and of the cadre of administrators be not done at the expense of overstretched faculty. Any new mandate should come with a realistic development plan guaranteeing its full funding in the short and long term. Lots of marvelous initiatives have taken place that falter for lack of resources. The Honors College is such an important initiative that the Administration is not likely to let it falter, but any effort at shoring it up

- in times of need shouldn't be made at the expense of other existing and well established programs
- d. FAC believes that the time has come to rethink very seriously what exactly constitutes an adequate teaching load, because traditional ways of calculating it do not do justice to a far more complex and varied situation than used to be the case, spurred by the increase in graduate programs, the RISE initiative, implementation of learning communities, service-learning courses, and undergraduate research projects, corresponding increase in student-mentoring, distance-learning, computer-based courses, etc. The Honors College initiative, in adding a new layer of complexity to that calculation, provides an opportunity to reconsider it.
  - e. FAC recommends that the impact of the Honors College initiative on University Library operations be more thoroughly analyzed, not only in terms of housing the College within the Library, but also and more fundamentally in terms of what it would mean for its librarians and collections. There would have to be one or more librarians appointed to be a liaison with the Honors College. CTE money used to enable UL to increase its collections, but not anymore even though UL needs to support more and more programs. It is not the case that library resources that serve graduate students would serve honors students just as well. IUPUI has more and more graduate programs, but there has not been any corresponding budget increase for new library needs. The outlook for UL's next five years is grim, given that the materials budget is likely to remain flat.