

# IUPUI Faculty Council Committee Annual Report 2009-10

---

**Committee Name:** FACULTY AFFAIRS

**Chair:** ANDRE DE TIENNE

**Secretary:**

**Members:**

Name	Affiliation	Email	Phone
<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
Robert Yost	Science: Biology	ryost@iupui.edu	8-1147
<b>Members with Term Expiring June 30, 2011</b>			
William Babler	Dentistry	wbabler@iupui.edu	8-1410
Jan Beckstrand	Nursing	jbeckstr@iupui.edu	4-4120
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
Deb Lahiri	Medicine: Psychiatry	dlahiri@iupui.edu	4-2706
Lisa McGuire	Social Work	lmcguir@iupui.edu	4-6736
Steven R. Miller	Law	stevmill@iupui.edu	4-1929
Jeff Rothenberg	Medicine: Ob/Gyn	jeffroth@iupui.edu	8-3148
Jane Williams	Science: Psychology	jghodges@iupui.edu	4-2966
Marianne Wokeck	Liberal Arts: History	mwoeck@iupui.edu	4-5820
<b>Liaisons for 2008–10 or Ex Officio</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 Items:**

<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Status</b>
Review Procedures for IUPUI Administrators	Finalized. Passed by IFC, 2/2/2010.
School Tenure-Probationary Period Extension	Finalized. Passed by IFC, 3/2/2010.

**Discussion Items:**

<b>Discussion Items</b>	<b>Status</b>
Students' Evaluations of Teaching (or Students Feedback Survey)	Active subcommittee work. Survey in preparation.
Earlier-than-normal Tenure Policy	Discussion initiated.
Statement of Faculty Work ("Plater document")	Extensive discussion initiated. W. Babler will direct subcommittee (extended to entire FAC) to review or rewrite the entire document.
Boards of Review and IUPUI Senior Academy	Discussion done; conclusions of deliberation to be reported to the IFC EC.
Examination of system-wide review of baseline P&T procedures	Discussion finalized. Schools are in compliance.
TTF vs. NTTF ratios at IUPUI	IUSM conditions have changed. Subcommittee concluded that the issue is no longer pressing.
Faculty Behavioral Concern Task Force	Discussion initiated.
Updating of Faculty Contracts following Promotion or Reassignment	Discussion initiated.
IFC Faculty Diversity Standing Committee	Discussion finalized. Conclusion: there is no need for such a new standing committee; it would be redundant with existing campus structure.
IU Handbook Academic Freedom Policy in light of Supreme Court 2006 Decision	Discussion initiated.

**Action Items to be carried over to 2010-2011:**

<b>Action Item(s)</b>	<b>Status</b>
Earlier-than-normal Tenure Policy	Finalize revision of policy in IUPUI Supplement.
Statement of Faculty Work	Recraft the document and hold IFC discussion.
Trustees' Teaching Awards	Examine IUPUI's misguided interpretation of the Trustees' policy.
Faculty Behavioral Concern Task Force	Examine the policy that will come out of that task force.

**Discussion Items to be carried over to 2010-2011:**

Discussion Item(s)	Status
Timing of Annual Release of Campus P&T Guidelines	Design a flexible school compliance policy when new release is late.
Updating of Faculty Contracts	Examine especially consequences of lack of contract updating on NTTF.
Students' Evaluations of Teaching (or Students Feedback Survey)	Continuation of study. Initial survey of faculty.
IU Handbook Academic Freedom Policy in light of Supreme Court 2006 Decision	Bring this issue to the attention to the IFC EC and UFC. Probably a matter for the UFC FAC.
Quiet week	New item. Determine whether to examine this issue when students ask to alter the calendar in favor of a quiet week before finals
The Plight of Part-Time Faculty	New item. Invite representatives from the Associate Faculty Coalition at IUPUI to a FAC meeting and hear them out.

## ISSUES DISCUSSED BY THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN 2009–2010

The Faculty Affairs Committee met as a whole seven times during the academic year 2009–2010: on 9/25/09, 10/19/09, 11/18/09, 1/20/10, 2/15/10, 3/26/10, and 4/19/10. 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. The present report is based on the minutes of these meetings and summarizes committee discussions as they took place throughout the academic year, without necessarily seeking to sort out what is well grounded in investigated facts from what is mere opinion. The main intention is to apprise the IFC executive committee of what went on at FAC and what people think, correctly or not. Its usefulness is principally to share what is in people's mind.

**SUBCOMMITTEES [ORGANIZATION].** Four subcommittees were appointed, as follows.

- (1) **NTTF EXPANSION.** Chair: Dean Hawley. Members: Jan Beckstrand, Lisa Riolo, Bill Babler. Hawley asked how the subcommittee should pursue its work. De Tienne will provide him with an updated charge.
- (2) **STUDENT FEEDBACK SURVEYS.** Chair: Robert Yost. Members: Jan Beckstrand, Steve Fox, Jaena Hollingsworth, Jeff Rothenberg, plus external members such as Howard Mzumura and Jackie Singh from PRAC.
- (3) **FACULTY DIVERSITY.** Chair: Lisa McGuire. Members: Yaobin Chen, Jennifer Hehman, Debomoy Lahiri, Steven Miller.
- (4) **P&T GUIDELINES.** Chair: André De Tienne. Members: Mary Fisher, Steve Fox, Jaena Hollingsworth, Lisa Riolo, Marianne Wokeck.

### **1. REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR IUPUI ADMINISTRATORS [ACTION ITEM].**

FAC discussed the revision of this policy over the first four meetings of the academic year, following the summer '09 preparatory work by three members. Revisions aimed to achieve the following aims: (1) better identification of administrative officers who need to be reviewed according to what criteria; (2) update the indicative list of such officers at the end of the document (since 1994, the administrative structure of IUPUI has changed drastically and become much more complex); (3) clarify the distinction between school deans and the dean of University Library (who used to be a director) throughout the document; (4) revise the wording to take into account core and system schools; (5) update the titles of listed positions; (6) addition of review questions to enhance the purport and impact of the exercise; and (7) enlarge the constituency that reviewers survey to segments often ignored or under-represented.

Regarding the last point, FAC considered extensively how to solidify the participation of non-tenure-track faculty in the reviewing process, both as members of review committees and as one of the surveyed constituencies. Also raised was the question of how review reports ought to be communicated to faculty in a school whose dean has been reviewed. Summary or executive reports are normally provided to the faculty by the Chancellor, while the full reports are shared only with the IFC Executive Committee.

The matter of reviewing associate deans with core school responsibilities within a campus school led by a dean reporting to the chancellor was also clarified after FAC received a copy of a UFC taskforce document titled “Review Procedures for Core School Deans.” Changes were made throughout the document to (1) remove core school deans from the scope of the policy since they will be reviewed according to the terms of the UFC policy, and (2) add to the list of officials to be reviewed those associate deans that administer the IUPUI branch of a core school whose dean reports to the IUB Provost. Point (2) was the result of much discussion as the Committee came to realize the confusing complexity due to the variety of structures within different core schools that report to different campuses. The variety of arrangements among schools called for flexible wording of the policy, in order to provide review procedures adaptable to variable distributions of responsibilities within decanal offices.

The FAC revise of the policy was given first reading at the January 12 meeting of the IFC, which elicited several concerns and suggestions for changes and additions, especially from Trudy Banta. President Atkinson asked FAC to finalize the document so that it be voted on by the IFC at the February meeting. Our committee discussed all suggestions for changes and settled on a new series of revisions. The document was redone and circulated to the entire committee for a vote (result: 13 yes, 0 no).

Following De Tienne’s presentation of the revisions at the 2 February 2010 meeting of the IFC, the IFC voted unanimously in favor of the policy. It is reproduced in APPENDIX 1 to this report.

FAC SUGGESTION: Many administrative positions (associate vice chancellors and the like) are time-limited (three years or so—thus less than the five years for a periodic view) and subject to reappointment at the discretion of the supervising administrator. The IFC-EC might want to discuss how best to review such administrators and how to get small committees of faculty involved in such reviews when advisable.

## **2. SCHOOL TENURE PROBATIONARY PERIOD EXTENSION POLICY [ACTION ITEM].**

FAC discussed this thorny issue over four meetings (in addition to the 2008-09 meetings). Mary Fisher opened up a way toward a solution when she drafted a policy spelling out the conditions under which a school could make a case to the Administration about extending the probationary period beyond seven years. This smart move broadened the discussion beyond the School of Medicine by generalizing the policy to any school that wanted to extend the probationary period. Its spirit closely reflected the spirit of previous FAC discussions, especially in the thoughtfulness exhibited in its principles.

FAC reworked the document a great deal, improving the language of the policy in several areas: (1) “tenure clock” was replaced throughout by “tenure probationary period”; (2) the question of maintaining the current “stop-the-clock” policy within an extended probationary period was debated and resolved in favor of retaining it; (3) greater involvement of the IFC executive committee in the process was secured; (4) the need for a 3-year and 6-year review was clarified; (5) the adequate percentage of positive faculty votes that need to be gathered in order to either move on an extension proposal to the Dean of the Faculties Office or to rescind it was fixed at 66.6% (two-thirds) of *all eligible* tenured/tenure-track faculty (a two-thirds consensus would not be easy to achieve on either side, requiring a prolonged effort to get out the vote). FAC unanimously endorsed the re-revised document.

Mary Fisher presented the administrative policy at the December 1 meeting of the IFC. Her presentation yielded an extensive debate, the result of which was that the IFC moved

that the policy should come back to FAC so that FAC could recraft the document into an IFC policy and not an administrative policy. FAC then revised the policy and gave a first reading of it at the IFC meeting on February 2. This again yielded an extensive debate. The IFC made a number of recommendations and suggestions that FAC considered carefully. Several issues were raised: the danger of P&T standards getting raised, the effectiveness of the current stop-the-clock policy, knowledge of existing P&T policies among members of P&T committees. The result of the FAC discussion led to further changes, and to our rejecting the two following suggestions.

(1) The first suggestion was that of increasing the proposed nine-year extension to ten years. FAC rejected it for three reasons. (a) The motive behind the suggestion was, we believe, simply the result of a misunderstanding: the representation was made that all medical schools that extended the probationary period had adopted a 10-year or longer probationary period. But it turns out that this is not exact: more than half of those schools actually extended the probationary period to eight or nine years only. (b) We learned that according to University Counsel any extension beyond nine years would require Trustees's approval. This is a much longer and circuitous road that all parties want to avoid.<sup>1</sup> (c) Even though the School of Medicine began by requesting a ten-year period, both the faculty and the administrators we have talked to are perfectly content with the nine years, in part for the legal reason just mentioned.

(2) The second suggestion FAC rejected was that of extending the policy to all current tenure-track faculty who would like to opt in because not doing so would otherwise be "unfair." The Committee examined this so-called "unfairness argument," which from a logical standpoint was not formulated as an argument but as a mere possible complaint. FAC concluded that the new policy may possibly generate some acrimony among a few current faculty, but not real unfairness, for three reasons. (a) The sole principal argument that was made in favor of the proposed policy was to allow the School of Medicine to compete more effectively against other top medical schools in *recruiting new faculty*. The current cohort of tenure-track faculty has obviously already been successfully recruited on the basis of employment conditions they freely consented to when they signed their contract. No doubt their hiring was just as competitive as any other, and they don't need to be recruited again. (b) By signing their contract, those current faculty agreed to abide by its terms. They are bound by them, and the fact that rules will change for future cohorts for reasons of recruitment is not sufficient to proceed to contract revisions. Such revisions would be impractical from several standpoints, including the real unfairness that they would generate across the board within the School and across other schools, and also the legal difficulties, changes of priorities, impact on research plans, impact on funding plans, and the dubious perception regarding the motives pushing faculty to opt in. (c) Any new policy of this kind naturally necessitates a transitional period during which a current cohort needs to be grandfathered. That a few members of the current cohort of tenure-track faculty might feel that the new policy would create inequity is psychologically understandable, of course, but mere perception of inequity is insufficient to make the latter real.

The revised policy was presented at the IFC meeting on March 2, where it was up for a vote. The IFC discussion allowed policy opponents to voice their disagreement. In the end, the vote was taken with the following results: 43 in favor, 19 against, and 2 abstentions. The policy thus passed with a sound two-third majority. It is reproduced in APPENDIX 2 to this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> The reason is that the Trustees have already approved the stop-the-tenure-clock policy, which has a maximum of two years. Counsel Scodro infers that they would have no problem with a nine-year period on that account. But more than nine years would put IUPUI on a legal quicksand, given the language in the IU Handbook that states, p. 64 col. 2, that "the total probationary period may not exceed seven years."

FAC learned subsequently that IFC President Atkinson discussed the policy at the March 23 meeting of the UFC because President McRobbie had several concerns: the policy pushes the limits of the language in the IU Academic Handbook (regarding the seven-year probationary period), and may seem to undercut the authority of the UFC and of the Trustees. President McRobbie preferred having the policy endorsed by the UFC. The UFC meeting went pretty well; in the end the UFC became mostly concerned with harmonizing the Academic Handbook language with the spirit of the extension policy, realizing that the policy was also of interest to certain system and core schools other than IUSM. The latest news is that the UFC Agenda Committee will finalize an enabling statement to be incorporated in the IU Handbook, which the UFC would vote on by email. If the vote is positive, President McRobbie will be in a good position to inform the Trustees about the proposed amendment to the Handbook, and the Trustees, it is felt, are likely to give it a favorable hearing (possibly already at their June meeting).

### **3. STUDENT FEEDBACK SURVEY [DISCUSSION ITEM].**

The subcommittee charged with the discussion of this issue is chaired by Robert Yost, who will provide an interim report at a later time. The FAC subcommittee continued its collaboration with the PRAC subcommittee. The principal conclusion is that survey forms across campus schools, and the very philosophy that presides over their conception, need to be revamped. Discussions have taken place in conjunction with the Center for Teaching and Learning. A survey of national literature shows that there are three main survey areas: faculty performance, course content, and student work/initiatives (the work they put in in the courses they take). It has become apparent that the summative value or global score attached to surveys is not the best way to assess anything: it has simply no valid statistical value in regard to the data. And so one issue is to find out how to make the numbers more meaningful. They have found out that all stake-holders are having similar problems with the design of student surveys and offer similar criticisms regarding how evaluations are conducted.

(1) One main objective is to come up with a number of quantitative questions to help design a survey that examines how data collected in student evaluations reflect what goes on in the classroom. A good strategy is to cluster questions that center around the same type of information aimed at, and to offer a catalog of well-formulated questions that can be used for specific purposes. Having the matter debated at the Moore Symposium is one avenue being pursued. Many IUPUI schools have worked hard over the years to refine their faculty evaluation questions, but much remains problematic.

(2) Another objective is to assess the real evidential value of faculty evaluations by students for the summative purpose of P&T evaluations, notwithstanding the welcome practice that considers evaluation data as just one component in a much larger set of evidence. The problem is that if the data are not well collected, or not compared in meaningful ways with other data that are actually statistically comparable (and this is rarely the case), it becomes completely unclear what kind of conclusions can be logically drawn from the numbers.

(3) A related issue is that of the global score, and how it is arrived at: in most cases it turns out to be meaningless, and we need something far more robust than that. Clarifying the larger base of comparison and making sure it is valid and actually useful is important. Response rates tend to fluctuate through various surveys, and that affects comparison as well.

(4) Another issue is that of the cost of evaluations, something that PRAC is looking into.

(5) And another question is that of training administrators who make use of the evaluation statistics to identify problematic teachers.

#### FAC SUGGESTIONS

(1) Survey reform should be related to the next North Central accreditation initiative, which will emphasize the PULs.

(2) An assessment system needs itself continuous assessment: collection of data leads to its examination and to decisions to make changes that are then implemented and revisited later, in a process of constant improvement. (3) Surveys need to be conducted more in a formative than a summative spirit.

(4) Questions asked to students must be ones they are competent to answer. Students should not get to decide on the quality of the scholarship in the classroom, but peer specialists should.

(5) Not to be neglected is the logistics of the student feedback process, one that ensures high response rates and meaningful answers (web-based returns are paltry and skew results).

(6) A cafeteria approach would be beneficial: compiling a bank of astutely worded questions that could be drawn upon for various survey intentions.

(7) A clear distinction should be instituted between evaluations made in the middle of a semester and those that come at the end of the semester, since they have different goals (formative vs. summative).

(8) What should not be aimed at is a uniform campus-wide evaluation system, in light of the wide set of pedagogical aims and practices across schools and departments.

On the matter of survey organization, school deans, chairs of faculty governance committees, and academic affairs representatives ought to be contacted, and various faculty assemblies should be visited to disseminate information. Setting up a website to centralize information would be useful.

#### **4. EARLIER-THAN-NORMAL TENURE POLICY [DISCUSSION ITEM].**

FAC began examining the 1988 document “Earlier-than-Normal Tenure Recommendations” found in the IUPUI Supplement to the IU Handbook (p. 73) and copies of original memos emanating from former Chancellor Bepko and Dean of the Faculties Bill Plater. We determined that it was time, twenty-one years later, to give a fresh look at that document, since the handbook is getting revised. IFC President Atkinson wants FAC to aim at recommendations for revisions that are consistent with the IU Handbook, unless FAC recommended changes at that level, too. FAC believes that the language of the policy is worth revisiting on several counts.

(1) It does not state whether it applies to candidates with one or more years of credit toward tenure at the time of appointment.

(2) It does not state how “exceptional” it is meant to be: can any faculty automatically ask for it as soon as that person meets tenure criteria, regardless of the state of the school’s budget, since early candidates may strain a school budget by forcing unscheduled salary expenditures at a less than ideal time?

(3) There is an inconsistency between the IU Academic Handbook (which allows early-tenure candidates to withdraw their request at any time prior to a final decision by the University President) and the rule that a tenure-dossier can only be submitted once for review.

(4) Another issue concerns the distinction and sometimes possible intersection between an early-tenure case and a tenure period with one or more years of credit.

(5) And there is also the issue of the timing of letters of non-reappointment vs. that of a P&T dossier submission, and what that can entail regarding the one-year grace period if tenure is not granted.

FAC will work on the revise of this policy in the fall of 2010.



## 5. STATEMENT ON FACULTY WORK [DISCUSSION ITEM].

*Brief History.* This is a major new item that Mary Fisher brought to FAC. The original document was written by former Dean of the Faculties Bill Plater and gave rise to substantial discussions at three meetings of the IFC in the winter of 1996. In the end the IFC moved that FAC continued the examination of the document and its discussion with the Dean of Faculties, analyzed all implications, and advised the IFC EC on how to improve the document, perhaps even by writing guidelines that defined and preserved the balance between administrative prerogatives and faculty rights. IFC minutes in subsequent years do not show any trace of follow-up discussions of the “Plater document.” It is not clear whether FAC did anything or whether the document was at all revised. What is clear is that it was incorporated within the IUPUI Supplement to the IU Academic Handbook under the section “Conditions of Employment,” without having been sanctioned by faculty. The time has come to give the Statement a serious overhaul. Fisher has already suggested many changes to the document (especially by removing a lot of verbose passages), and FAC has been studying that revise, which we could end up foregoing altogether in order to start from scratch if need be.

*FAC Discussion.* The FAC discussion that ensued covered many bases, with members reflecting upon work conditions in their respective schools. The reflection emerged that an IFC-sanctioned document should offer a general framework that encourages and helps schools develop a more detailed document that fits their particular cultures and missions. There is such a wide variety of missions and types of appointments that no general document can hope to encompass all of them. There is far greater variety among the faculty body today than in 1996, and its activities run the complete gamut of possible workload distributions (e.g., teaching workloads vary enormously among campuses, schools, and departments). No one formula or even small set of formulas will find universal applicability. Some professional schools, like Health and Rehabilitation, have fairly flexible practices, where faculty are expected to cover a large percentage of their salaries through grants or tuition dollars, while the remainder is covered by the School. In other schools such a model would wreak havoc (e.g., in the arts and the humanities). A campus policy needs therefore to keep in mind irreducible differences that stem from the nature of academic or professional activities. Also to be kept in mind is the fact that the Plater document was mostly geared toward the traditional tenured/tenure-track faculty, and did not envision the non-tenure-track faculty who have become such a large part of the faculty body.

### FAC PRELIMINARY SUGGESTIONS.

(1) The language in the Supplement should limit itself to stating what should be the bottom line for our campus.

(2) The working out and final form of the policy needs to be the ultimate responsibility of faculty, even if its preparation is one in collaboration with administrators: it is essential that the faculty be involved in the decision-making process, which must remain appropriate to each discipline.

(3) Faculty work of all kinds need to be recognized for their value through a fair process, including the work done by faculty intermittently commuting to distant campuses.

(4) There needs to be a new section that discusses the value and extent of university service. Service commitments are essential for the well-being of faculty governance, but they are of course time-consuming, and the time they take is rarely taken into clear account in calculating workload. Service remains a gray area: we say it is important, but how much of it is necessary for P&T, what part of it is truly or more significant, and how to assess the value of faculty service within an institution that prides itself for its faculty-governance system—those things need to be formulated. We need to find ways to encourage junior faculty to get more involved, and senior faculty to remain involved.

(5) The document should provide a framework that is not only usable at the school level, but that can also serve as a model for other campuses.

(6) On that count, it would be useful to get hold of similar statements produced by other campuses and universities, for inspiration and comparison.

(7) The document could also address such questions as what to do when a faculty member becomes sick; HR policies are generally geared toward staff, and don't translate too well to faculty.

(8) While the existing document speaks a lot about the prerogatives of school deans and department chairs regarding workload assignments, it should also address the prerogatives of center directors who oversee the work done by faculty colleagues. Faculty research work is often divided between their home department and the research center they belong to, and one should therefore include center and program directors in the conversation.

(9) The document shouldn't include anything that is going to be dated, and should seek congruence with the campus P&T guidelines, which are useful to help define workloads. P&T guidelines define excellence toward P&T and are focused on faculty output, while the Statement on Faculty Work is focused on faculty input. The Statement should thus define the workload conditions that ought to be most conducive toward a successful P&T dossier.

(10) A delicate can-of-worm issue is what the "100%" of a full workload represents in terms of the number of hours faculty work per week. Absent a particular number, how do we assess that a person spends half of it on one kind of task, and some other fraction of it on some other task? Faculty are not assigned a number of hours, since theirs are not an hourly appointment. Still, disparities exist everywhere. For instance, the IUSM Department of Medicine states, in a 4 January 2008 document that defines their complex compensation plan, that they (conservatively) assume their faculty to work 55 hours per week. Yet, it seems that as long as the standard number of hours remains vague, the percentage of time allocated to any given task will inherit the same vagueness, and thus be incalculable beyond a raw guess.

FAC member William Babler agreed to volunteer and take charge of the continuation of the discussion via email, communicating with the entire FAC membership instead of a subgroup given the issue's significance. He will research what other campuses and universities have been doing, and keep the discussion going.

## **6. BOARDS OF REVIEW MEMBERSHIP AND IUPUI SENIOR ACADEMY [DISCUSSION ITEM].**

*Brief History.* FAC examined this question following IFC member Subah Packer's suggestion that the IFC Nominating Committee be allowed to select nominees for Boards of review from among the Senior Academy in order to alleviate the problem of finding enough volunteers willing to serve on such boards, which need to be filled according to strict rules of composition defined in the bylaws. FAC determined that over the last two years the Nominating Committee had misinterpreted the bylaw and sought to find twice as many nominees as eligible positions, instead of one and a half as many. Still, the desire remains that a broader pool of eligible faculty and librarians be defined, especially as the number of review cases seems to be increasing. The bylaw already allows one member of the Senior Academy to serve on the Grievance Committee, which is an important step in the grievance procedures that allows for mediation to take place in order for a remedy to be found, short of a full formal board of review process. It certainly makes sense for an experienced and respected Senior Academy member to bring his or her experience in an exercise in mediation. The question is whether it would also make sense to allow some of them to sit on boards of review.

*Discussion.* One worry is that extending board membership to Senior Academy members would weaken the boards, because such retired members would not have the same kind of clout that actively-employed members would. Board recommendations, however, have recently been ignored irrespective of who sat on those boards. Those recommendations are the result of intense work over many meetings across protracted time; cases are often very complex, and board members invariably work very hard and with unquestionable integrity over case-related issues. Serving on review boards is a specially meaningful commitment on the part of faculty, for they are busy reviewing in depth the process colleagues of theirs have been subjected to, and assessing whether that process had been fair or not. The stakes are always high, and their complexity demands experience. From that standpoint the case may be made that it really behooves the active senior tenured faculty to sit on these boards; resorting to the Senior Academy can only be a fall-back position. There is no question that Senior Academy members do good work in mediation processes on grievance committees. They have the time, institutional knowledge, and wisdom, and that makes their input particularly useful. The distinction to keep in mind, though, is that grievance committees are mediatory, while boards of review are not.

One possible solution would be to create a reserve membership. The current pool of 20 active faculty members would not change, but the Nominating Committee would be charged with constituting in addition a reserve of 4 retired members of the IUPUI Senior Academy (two elected each year for staggered two-year terms). No more than one reserve member would be allowed to sit on a board of review, and that only if the IFC Executive Committee found it impossible otherwise to fill a board with the regular members while seeking to comply with board composition rules.

Further FAC discussion, however, emphasized the importance of improving recruitment methods among active faculty. The argument relies on the strong analog of jury duty. It ought to be an expectation of university citizenship that any member, especially tenured, of the faculty, should willingly serve on a board of review when called upon, even if it impinges on scheduled activities. A review board is not like a regular kind of committee; it involves civic duty and accountability. Thus the idea was floated that schools across the campus nominate their own pool of potential board of review members (in a number proportional to the size of the school—perhaps mimicking the N number in use at the IFC to assess the number of representatives from each school. The benefit of the counsel of Senior Academy members shouldn't be neglected, and thus Senior Academy members could stand ready to advise the deliberations of a review board, without having a vote, however.

## **7. PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES [DISCUSSION ITEM].**

A FAC subcommittee was to investigate whether school guidelines complied with the new IU baselines, but other priorities worked against it. At this point, however, the issue may well be moot: the Office of the Dean of the Faculties sees little need for such a study because it has determined that the whole campus was in compliance.

A distinct issue worth addressing, though, is the timing of the yearly release of the new set of campus P&T guidelines, which usually takes place in late March, when the process is already well underway in many schools. The DFO recognizes the problem and allows schools to delay compliance with the latest guidelines by a year when it would cause too much trouble (the P&T process calendar varies among schools). FAC would like a clear policy to be spelled out in that regard for the sake of disambiguation. Another matter to keep watch of is how successful the all-electronic submission of P&T dossiers, already adopted in some schools, turns out to be.

## **8. RATIO OF TENURE-TRACK VS NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY [DISCUSSION ITEM].**

Subcommittee chair Dean Hawley reported that the work it had engaged in had “become moot for the time being”: “The subcommittee objective became a ‘moving target’ with the proposal of a new SoM administrative position to first determine whether non-board-certified physicians would be permitted to join the NTTF at SoM, and then the whole discussion was tabled when the SoM decided to retreat from their process of School expansion, and diminish the enrollment and faculty need. Until the SoM reaches an administrative plan for future growth, the issue is difficult to address, because it is not presently clear what type of research is necessary to study the impact of a future, unclear policy. The simultaneous administrative effort towards the ‘Indiana Clinic’ has not resulted in a net change in NTTF, and that process is now moving forward at an imperceptible pace, so as not to really impact the NTTF/TTF ratio. In the beginning, it seemed important that the FAC provide some level of investigation into the issue, but the issue has gone into coma.”

There are serious NTTF issues in other schools, though, linked to the increase of NTTF hires in certain departments, who work hard in deplorable conditions and are sometimes given responsibilities they shouldn’t have but do get because of a lack of TTFs. Another concern is that it is in part the increasing demands placed on P&T criteria and dossier preparation that discourage many faculty from pursuing the tenure track, pushing them toward clinical or research tracks where they can still get promoted without undergoing the P&T headache. If one wants to get an actual matrix that allows us to determine whether the P&T bar is rising, observing the ratio of tenure-track faculty fleeing toward the non-tenure track would provide a reliable indicator.

## **9. FACULTY BEHAVIORAL CONCERN TASK FORCE [DISCUSSION ITEM].**

Mary Fisher recently set up this task force, which is peopled with several members of the “Behavior Consultation Team” (BCT), and a handful of faculty leaders and school administrators. The BCT was set up some time after the Virginia Tech tragedy. The BCT is chaired by Jason Spratt, consists of large team of people with diverse relevant expertise (including psychologist Julia Lash, people from HR, University Counsel, campus police, International Affairs, etc.), and has a website (<http://bct.iupui.edu/>) with much information, as well as a downloadable and confidential “Concerned Persons Referral Form.” The BCT is going around campus to explain what it is all about.

The goal of the task force is to work on a set of guidelines and best practices that could help administrators, department chairs, colleagues, learn how to deal with faculty in crisis who are manifesting behavioral problems (verbal or physical threats, mental illnesses, disconnection from reality, etc.) that affect negatively their professional life, their classroom performance, their teaching, or their collegiality. Human Resources has a policy in place for staff, and the BCT has one for students, but there are no procedures specific for faculty (and we are not talking about post-tenure reviews). More than a handful of cases emerge every month, and this is thus a real problem needing well thought-out practical remedies. The task force is to draft a document, which will then come to FAC for study and input.

The task force initially met on March 29 (with De Tienne representing FAC); the next meeting took place on April 29 (Babler represented FAC), and a third one is scheduled on June 3. FAC applauds the initiative and its participation in the discussion is essential to make sure that the guidelines respect principles of academic freedom and provide optimal balance in their representations of rights, responsibilities, accountability, norms of professional behavior, remediation procedures, and training recommendations. FAC would like the task force to consider the possibility of an ombudsperson faculty. It will be important to

distinguish condonable from condemnable behavior. And it will also be important to have procedures that emphasize providing help to faculty in crisis (e.g., counseling, administrative leave).

#### **10. UPDATING OF FACULTY CONTRACTS FOLLOWING PROMOTION OR REASSIGNMENT [DISCUSSION ITEM]**

This is a new item FAC began discussing. Member Robert Yost brought up the question of whether the contracts of non-tenure-track faculty, or even of tenure-track faculty for that matter, should be renewed or rephrased after they have been promoted. Initial appointment contracts are rarely revised even though the nature of appointments usually evolves significantly. This entails a lack of clarity regarding the nature or repartition of professional commitments that can easily be problematic, especially in the case of NTTF who are in more precarious situations. Faculty contracts or letters detailing the nature of their appointments (and those letters are not contracts) do not generally get updated or revised when the nature or distribution of assignments (research, teaching, service, clinical) changes, especially following reappointments and promotions. The process is rather informal, although some of it is captured in faculty annual reviews, more so in certain schools (like IUSM) than others. The fact that reassignments don't get written down in clear ways may cause problem especially in case conflicts arise that may lead to a board of review: absence of clear documentation is a liability. On the other hand, informality of arrangements comes with a desirable level of flexibility, which is a feature well worth preserving. FAC may want to survey schools about their practices, or lack thereof, and whether there is a perception that something is problematic.

#### **11. IFC DIVERSITY STANDING COMMITTEE [DISCUSSION ITEM].**

The IFC President asked FAC to ponder the wisdom of creating such a committee. A subcommittee was put into place to examine the question. The conclusion is that there is a campus-wide structure that manages diversity issues really well already. There is no perceived need for an extra faculty committee that would monitor this, with no goal more compelling than what is already being pursued with commendable conscientiousness by others. A new standing committee would only be redundant. FAC therefore opposes the creation of such a standing committee. It instead would like to encourage the Dean of the Faculties to reinstate SRUF funding if possible, given SRUF's great success.

#### **12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AT IU IN LIGHT OF THE 2006 US SUPREME COURT DECISION IN *GARCETTI V. CEBALLOS* [DISCUSSION ITEM].**

*Context.* The AAUP is encouraging faculty in all universities to examine whether existing policies are sufficient to protect shared governance and the full range of academic freedom. See <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/protectvoice/>. AAUP's reason is that "Several lower courts have ruled recently that faculty members who speak out on matters affecting their institutions are not protected under the First Amendment." The FAC chair circulated various excerpts from the IU Academic Handbook and from the IUPUI Supplement relative to academic freedom. FAC needs to ascertain whether they provide sufficient protection.

*Discussion.* FAC acknowledges the importance of this issue, but thinks it needs to be debated at the UFC level. One problem is that no UFC FAC has been appointed over the last four years, and so a push in that direction needs to be initiated from a campus. The AAUP

has chapters at IUPUI and IUB, and their leaders could be brought in to help move the discussion along.

One main concern is that the IU Handbook policy on academic freedom (p. 54) says nothing about the protection of faculty who speak out on institutional matters inside their institutions (as opposed to outside in public). What is at stake is not the narrow whistleblower policy (also found in the IU Handbook), but the protection to be granted to faculty who dare speak their mind to administrators on institutional matters in any university setting. Safeguards need to be enshrined in the University Handbook, to prevent the kind of decisions lower courts have made through a certain way of interpreting the Supreme Court decision.<sup>2</sup> Acknowledging a dissent from Justice Souter, the Supreme Court wrote that “That there is some argument that expression related to academic scholarship or classroom instruction implicates additional constitutional interests that are not fully accounted for by this Court’s customary employee-speech jurisprudence. We need not, and for that reason do not, decide whether the analysis we conduct today would apply in the same manner to a case involving speech related to scholarship or teaching.”<sup>3</sup> Worth noting is that this cautious note addresses only scholarship and teaching, not institutional debates within the university.

FAC decided that the whole issue deserved to be brought to the attention of the IFC-EC and the UFC leadership.

### **13. QUIET WEEK [DISCUSSION ITEM].**

Robert Yost, who is also a member of the Student Affairs Committee, announced that students are again pushing for a change in the calendar and lobbying for a “quiet week” prior to finals. That issue might come to FAC in 2010–11, for it impacts faculty work (but it’s more likely that it would go to Academic Affairs). There already exists a policy urging faculty to be sensitive regarding that week before finals, but it may not be well enforced, and it comes with exceptions.

---

<sup>2</sup> “When public employees make statements pursuant to their official duties, such employees are not speaking as private citizens for *First Amendment* purposes, and thus the *First Amendment* does not prohibit managerial discipline of such employees for such speech.” (*Garcetti v. Ceballos*, 2006 U.S. LEXIS 4341, pp. 1–2)

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

## APPENDIX 1

### IFC FACULTY AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE

1997–1999 IUPUI Supplement  
to the Indiana University Academic Handbook

*Review Procedures for IUPUI Administrators (pp. 34–37)*

December 6, 1990

#### *I. Introduction*

Under the leadership of the Chancellor, senior campus administrative officers and school deans, in conjunction with the faculty, are responsible for advancing the objectives and mission of the IUPUI campus. The Chancellor has specific responsibility for ensuring that the incumbents of these offices perform effectively. Consequently, the Chancellor will arrange for the periodic evaluation of administrative officers holding positions that bear directly on the campus-wide teaching and research mission of IUPUI and of deans with multiple campus responsibilities who report to the Chancellor in the latter's capacity as Executive Vice President of Indiana University. Their performance, and the performance of their offices, will be evaluated regularly by a review process.

The review applies to (1) those officers reporting directly to the Chancellor or the Executive Vice Chancellor of the IUPUI campus, specifically including Vice Chancellors, the deans of schools, the dean of the IUPUI University Library, and the directors of support units organized as responsibility centers;

(2) the associate deans who administer the IUPUI branch of core schools whose dean reports to the IUB Provost—core school deans are to be reviewed through procedures developed at the University level and approved by the University Faculty Council;

(3) those officers reporting directly to Vice Chancellors (including Associate Vice Chancellors, Assistant Vice Chancellors, and some Directors) who oversee critical services that impact research, teaching, or service. Such officers may be reviewed at the same time as the officer they report to when advisable.

In addition, the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council may also recommend to the Chancellor that other campus administrative officers be reviewed, including officers who report to the IU administration but whose responsibilities are principally confined to IUPUI's teaching or research mission.

The purpose of these reviews is to assist the Chancellor and other senior administrative officers in meeting the responsibilities of their respective offices and in advancing the mission of the campus (or campuses) by identifying opportunities for greater effectiveness in a collegial fashion. The processes of the academic community must be characterized by reasoned discourse, intellectual honesty, mutual respect, and openness to constructive change. An important aspect of administrative leadership is the candid exchange of views between administrators and their constituents. Although such discussion should occur continuously, periodic reviews offer a special opportunity to evaluate accomplishments and to renew commitments.

The review process has thus been established to promote the greater effectiveness of administrative officers by ensuring that they understand and reflect the highest goals and aspirations of the academic community. Reviews are conducted in the expectation that incumbents will become more effective in their roles as a result of constructive evaluation.

The review will be conducted at an initial time to be selected by the Chancellor but not later than early in the fifth year in office and in recurring intervals of at least every five years thereafter. Every possible effort should be made to synchronize administrative reviews with program reviews and periodic reviews by accrediting agencies. School and Library deans and most senior campus administrators serve without fixed terms at the discretion of the Board of Trustees on the recommendation of the Chancellor and President. Periodic reviews afford the Chancellor an opportunity to ensure that these administrators and their offices remain effective. The review of administrators within schools (e.g., assistant deans, department chairs, center directors) should be conducted in accord with each school's own internal procedures; the same may apply to associate deans, but, depending on the scope and impact of their responsibilities, they may be included in the review of the office of the dean they serve at the discretion of the unit's faculty governance leaders. The review of administrators (chiefs of staff, directors, assistant vice chancellors, and the like) within the Chancellor's or a Vice Chancellor's administration whose function does not immediately impact the research, teaching, or service mission of the campus should be conducted internally in accord with the Administration's own procedures. This does not preclude their participation or inclusion in a review of the office of the senior administrative officer to whom they report.

## ***II. Committee Selection***

Review committees will be appointed by the Chancellor according to the following provisions.

A. A majority of the members of the review committee will consist of tenure-track and, where appropriate, non-tenure-track faculty. The committee will normally consist of no less than five nor more than eleven members. Review committee size should be kept to a minimum consistent with representing all necessary constituencies. Ordinarily, a dean of comparable rank will be appointed to committees reviewing School deans.

B. In reviews of academic administrative officers of a particular school, a majority of members of the review committee will be chosen from a list of tenure- and non-tenure-track faculty from that school recommended by an appropriate elected faculty body of the school; the list should contain roughly one-third more names than requested by the Chancellor and should not include officers who are part of the reviewed officer's administration. In reviews of the Dean of the IUPUI University Library, a majority of members of the review committee will be chosen from a list of librarians recommended by an appropriate elected librarian body of University Library, and who are not themselves administrative officers; the list should contain roughly one-third more names than requested by the Chancellor. In reviewing administrative officers other than school and library deans, the faculty members will be identified by the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee as noted below. The deans of schools with programs offered on other campuses in addition to IUPUI will be reviewed in accord with the procedures outlined below, except that faculty from other campuses will be included on the review committee in approximate proportion to the degree they comprise the faculty of the school. The elected school body should make its recommendations in accord with this principle.



- C. The IUPUI Faculty Council's Executive Committee will submit a list of prospective review committee members for the balance of the faculty or librarian committee membership in the case of school or library deans and for the full faculty committee membership in the case of campus administrative officers; other members may be appointed as noted below. The list should contain roughly one-third more names than requested by the Chancellor.
- D. In addition to receiving nominations for the review committee from the IUPUI Faculty Council, the Chancellor may solicit nominations from representative student and staff bodies as well as other constituencies, as appropriate, including representatives from other campuses when the deans of core or system schools are being reviewed.
- E. The Chancellor will appoint the review committee chair, ordinarily from among the faculty or librarians. With rare exceptions, the chair of the review committee should be a senior, tenured faculty member or librarian who is a current extra-mural peer administrator.
- F. The Chancellor may appoint external consultants with the advice of the review committee to prepare reports which would assist members in their work and provide a national perspective on the unit under review.
- G. Before being finalized, the composition of the review committee shall be examined by the administrator under review, who may object to any nominee for cause. The Chancellor shall give appropriate weight to these objections in forming the review committee.
- H. Review committees will normally be established early in the fall semester and each review process will normally be completed early in the succeeding spring semester, or before. Most reviews should take only a matter of weeks or a few months to complete, but each review committee will be assured of enough time to complete its work in a manner consistent with its charge.
- I. Each spring the Chancellor will confer with the Faculty Council Executive Committee about the administrators to be reviewed during the next academic year; a tentative list of officers to be reviewed will be announced by the Chancellor at the last meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council in the spring.
- J. The Chancellor and President of the Faculty Council will confer with their counterparts on the Bloomington or other campuses as necessary to ensure that review committees of system school deans with multicampus responsibilities are constituted and charged in a manner consistent with the respective deans' responsibilities.

### ***III. Committee Charge***

Although reviews are conducted to assist the Chancellor in evaluating the effectiveness of senior administrators, faculty (pursuant to the IUPUI Faculty Constitution, Article II.A.) and other constituents have an interest in both the review process and the results. To ensure that the broad interests of the faculty are adequately and routinely addressed, the Chancellor will confer with the President of the IUPUI Faculty Council about reviews. Specifically, the Chancellor and the President of the IUPUI Faculty Council will convene the committees for reviews; in the case of deans of system schools, the president or secretary of other relevant campus faculty councils may be asked to participate if the Chancellor deems that circumstances warrant it, consistent with existing university guidelines or procedures.

The Chancellor will provide the review committee with a description of the duties and responsibilities of the administrator under review and reports of previous reviews. Individuals to be reviewed will provide a statement of their own goals and objectives. The Chancellor will assure that the administrator under review meets reasonable requests by the review committee for information as well as arrange for reasonable and adequate staff and financial support for the activities of the review committee. The review committee will establish its own procedures, provided that it responds with data to the following questions as a minimum:

- A. Has the administrator exercised appropriate leadership of the unit in establishing, maintaining, and facilitating clear goals and objectives?
- B. Has the administrator provided evidence of the achievement of the unit's goals and objectives?
- C. How effectively does the administrator represent the unit to persons outside the unit, including peers nationally?
- D. How successful has the administrator been in managing the human and financial resources of the unit in the face of competing pressures or uncertainty?
- E. How is the unit perceived by its faculty and staff? How is the unit perceived on campus, system, state, and national levels?
- F. How is the administrator perceived by the unit faculty and staff as well as by relevant constituencies?
- G. How effectively has the administrator led the unit in carrying out unit and campus policies, including affirmative action plans and the unit's five-year plan?
- H. What are the administrator's strengths and weaknesses and their impact upon effectiveness?
- I. How successful has the administrator been in responding to suggestions for change and improvement expressed in the previous review if there has been one?

All tenure- and non-tenure-track faculty or librarians (or employees of a service unit) should be given an opportunity to comment on the administrator's effectiveness by responding to a survey that includes the above questions (among others developed by the committee) and by providing additional narrative comments. Other University officials with whom the administrator interacts routinely should also be asked to comment, particularly in the case of system school deans or core school associate deans, or of administrators whose campus and University responsibilities are closely intertwined. Administrators being reviewed must be given access to survey results and to other materials considered by the review committee along with an opportunity to respond or to comment before the committee prepares its report.

Review committees will not consider anonymous submissions and will develop procedures ensuring that all relevant constituencies be given an opportunity to convey their comments, whether solicited or unsolicited, in a manner that protects their absolute confidentiality. Surveys should be administered in accord with customary practices designed to ensure

the integrity of the process and to protect the identity of respondents by removing the names of respondents before survey results are released to the administrator under review, the Chancellor, or others.

#### ***IV. The Report***

Prior to submitting a final report to the Chancellor, the review committee should meet separately with the official being reviewed and then with the Chancellor to discuss the findings of the report. The administrator under review should be given an opportunity to respond to the committee's findings before the committee meets with the Chancellor. The review committee then should make its report in writing to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will respond in writing to the review committee, noting any actions to be taken as a result of the committee's findings and recommendations. The Chancellor will provide the official reviewed with a copy of both the review committee's report and of the Chancellor's response. The review committee's report should consist of a narrative and critique, a representation of survey response rates, a summary of the committee's findings, any external consultant's reports, and recommendations. In the case of campus administration officers, the Chancellor will meet with the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee in executive session to discuss the report. In the case of school deans and core school associate deans, the Chancellor will provide a summary report to the faculty of the school. In the case of the Dean of the IUPUI University Library, the Chancellor will provide a summary report to the librarians. The IUPUI Faculty Council will post a copy of the summary report on its website.

NOTE: The language of the introduction and of paragraph II.I. has been designed to mandate the periodic review of certain campus administrative officers while permitting flexibility in including other campus officers as circumstances warrant. The following list is *indicative* of officers who would be eligible for review under the procedures proposed for adoption. The Chancellor and core school Deans are already covered by University Procedures and thus are not included. Administrative positions subject to periodical review under this policy are defined primarily by the extent of their responsibilities and the significance of their impact on the campus's research, teaching, and service missions, not by the terminology or hierarchical level reflected in their titles. Individual titles that are listed may be combined for the purpose of a review at the discretion of the Chancellor and the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee.

Executive Vice Chancellor/Dean of the Faculties

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Associate Dean of the Faculties

Assistant Dean of the Faculties

Associate Vice Chancellor for Lifelong Learning

Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Academic Planning and Evaluation

Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration

Vice Chancellor for Research

Vice Chancellor for Student Life/Dean of Students, including Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Life and Learning, Assistant Dean of Students

Assistant Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Vice Chancellor for External Affairs

Associate Vice Chancellor/Executive Director, Enrollment Services

Deans of campus and system schools reporting to the Chancellor or to the Executive Vice Chancellor (including Associate Deans as appropriate)

IUPU-Columbus's Vice Chancellor and Dean

Associate Deans of the IUPUI branch of core schools whose Dean reports to the IUB Provost

Dean of the IUPUI University Library (including Associate Deans as appropriate)

IUPUI Associate Vice Chancellor for International Affairs/IU Associate Vice President for International Affairs

Director, Office of Equal Opportunity

Director, Graduate Office/Associate Dean, IU Graduate School

Athletic Director

*Revised 6/13/94; 01/20/2010*

*Approved by IFC, 02/02/2010*

## APPENDIX 2

### IFC FACULTY AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE

#### School Tenure Probationary Period Extension Policy

IUPUI recognizes its responsibility to provide tenure-eligible faculty members a fair and reasonable probationary period. It also recognizes the pressures that changing work environments place upon some disciplines and professions. IUPUI will continue to offer tenure-eligible faculty the seven-year probationary period recommended by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and to consider appeals for extensions of the tenure clock from individuals who find themselves in exceptional circumstances. IUPUI will also allow schools to offer longer probationary periods to all newly appointed faculty members after the school has successfully made its case for such an extension to the Dean of Faculties and the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee by following the steps in this policy.

**Policy:** The IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculties will entertain approving extension of the tenure probationary period to up to nine years for all new tenure-track faculty in a School if certain conditions are met. This policy applies only to faculty hired after the approval date of the School's request. The nine-year probationary period would have to be clearly expressed in the initial appointment letter and acknowledged by the appointee by signature. Extension of the School's tenure probationary period does not alter the existing school performance expectations for tenure in place at the time of appointment. Schools retain the right to update their faculty performance expectations in the future in keeping with campus and University guidelines, while faculty retain the right to be evaluated for tenure under the written standards in effect at the time of appointment.

**Conditions for a school to meet if it wants to offer automatic extended probationary periods of up to nine years to new faculty whose primary tenure will reside in that school:**

- (a) Develop a comprehensive report that demonstrates good cause for an extension (including a discussion of root causes, existing protected-time policy and practice, and alternative solutions with potential consequences) and that also reviews the current situation nationally to determine if extended probationary period for tenure is a trend for similar schools.
- (b) Obtain the clear support of the school's faculty governing body for extending the tenure probationary period for the school (e.g., school's faculty steering committee).
- (c) Obtain the clear support of the administrative authority for that school (e.g., dean and school executive committee). Notify the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee (IFC-EC) and the Dean of the Faculties (DOF), and keep them informed throughout the process.
- (d) School faculty governance leaders and administrators will set up a forum to encourage broad discussion of the proposal and its pros and cons within the school, using all means necessary to disseminate information and allow the free exchange of ideas. The forum may be conducted online and/or through town-hall meetings or other means to ensure broad participation. The forum should be held prior to the joint meeting described in (e).
- (e) Have the proposal presented at a joint meeting of the IFC-EC, the DOF, and the school's faculty governance leaders for a thorough discussion.

- (f) School faculty governance leaders, in consultation with the DOF and IFC-EC, will design and conduct the referendum vote of the school's faculty as outlined in (h).
- (g) Obtain authorization to conduct a referendum from the DOF and the IFC-EC.
- (h) Hold a referendum (or the substantial equivalent) on the issue of extending the tenure probationary period in which all tenured/tenure-track faculty vote. Such a referendum may occur only once per academic year. A positive vote equaling at least two thirds of all eligible tenured/tenure-track faculty is required to move the proposal forward to the IFC-EC for endorsement and to the DOF for decision. (Either an electronic or paper vote is acceptable.)
- (i) Provide a statement that, consistent with current university policy, individual faculty will be free to submit their dossiers for promotion and tenure at the sixth year point or early when appropriate, or at the seventh or eighth year point, it being understood that a dossier can only be submitted once for tenure, and that administrators may not disallow or discourage faculty from following a standard seven-year schedule.
- (j) Provide a statement that, consistent with current university policy, the promotion and tenure criteria and standards will remain identical for all school faculty regardless of the length of their probationary period.
- (k) Provide a statement that, consistent with current university policy, individual faculty will be free to seek their own extension ("stop-the-clock") requests for life issues as governed by existing policy.
- (l) Prepare a plan for systematic appropriate mentoring of tenure-track faculty (e.g., formative reviews at 3 years, and at 6 years if the faculty member has not petitioned for promotion and tenure by that time).
- (m) Submit that plan to the DOF for approval and to the IFC-EC for endorsement.
- (n) Once the school's petition is tentatively approved, alter the school's P & T documents that guide tenure probationary faculty to accommodate the new time lines prior to implementation.

**Conditions for a school to meet if automatic extended probationary periods of up to nine years for new faculty are approved:**

School administration must track and report, to the DOF and IFC-EC, annually and cumulatively for the number of years requested in the proposal all of the following:

- (a) Number, gender, and race of tenure-track faculty in each year's cohort.
- (b) Number, gender, and race of tenure-track faculty going up for promotion and tenure earlier than the new extended number of years in the tenure probationary period.
- (c) Number, gender, and race of tenure-track faculty receiving promotion and tenure earlier than the new extended number of years in the tenure probationary period.
- (d) Reasons for receiving promotion and tenure earlier than the new extended number of years in the tenure probationary period..
- (e) Trend of success rates for initial promotion and tenure cases, by gender and race.
- (f) Trends of retention rates, by gender and race, for all initial tenure-track appointments up to the time of tenure being granted.
- (g) Reasons for tenure-track faculty turnover.
- (h) Number of and reasons for any individual requests for extension of the tenure clock beyond that of the school's new extended probationary period.

**Evaluation of the extension of the tenure probationary period for a school:**

The DOF and the IFC-EC will annually review the School's report referenced above. This annual report and its review will be shared with the School's faculty and the IFC.

**Faculty options to rescind the request:**

Faculty in the School may vote at any time to rescind or reverse the vote to request tenure probationary period extension for the School. This action requires approval of at least two thirds of all eligible tenured/tenure-track faculty. Such a vote should be conducted by the president of the School's faculty in consultation with the DOF and IFC president.

Approved by IFC: March 2, 2010