

IUPUI Faculty Council Committee Annual Report 2013-2014

Committee Name: Faculty Affairs Committee

Chair: Josette Jones

Members: Babler, William J; Bigatti, Silvia M; Coates, Heather; Fedorikhin, Sasha; Frank, Mary Ann; Hook, Sara Anne; Keller, Deborah B.; McGrew, John H.; Schilling, Katherine; Stiffler, Deborah; Walker, Marquita R; Wittberg, Patricia A; Wokeck, Marianne S. (representative EFC); Koskie, Sarah; Garetto, Lawrence P.; Hornback, Sally Jean; Stanton-Nichols, Kathleen Ann

Ex Officio: Paydar, Nasser H.; Lavitt, Melissa R

Action Items:

Action Item(s)	Status
Revision of Statement of Faculty Work: Revised throughout 2012-2013. Reviewed and revised based on feedback from deans, IFC-EC, and campus administration.	Finalized document presented to and approved by IFC February meeting
Review of campus Post Tenure Review policy (<i>Faculty and Librarian Review and Enhancement</i>)	FAA proposed to EFC (March) remedial document, FAA proposes approaches for post-tenure review/ mostly clarification on issues.
Discuss the grievance process and the Board of Review procedures	<p><i>Ongoing discussion:</i> Theme of grievance = due process</p> <p>Remaining questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good cause= not defined in Bylaws • Full time =100% or benefit eligibility (eligible for re-appointment-regular)? • What is grievance process for part-time faculty? Type of employment - serve at will (administrators, PT) • Adjunct faculty = freelance contract? <p>See handbook 2006 needs further investigation / Bylaws p 18</p>
Faculty Behavioral Issues	<p>Developed guidelines for departmental chairs/ not performance review</p> <p>Revised Credo</p> <p>Suggest adding (Civility Statement.pdf)</p> <p>Submitted to EFC for approval</p>
Academic Misconduct – procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code of Academic Ethics that pertains to teaching, scholarship, librarianship, and academic administration: http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/academic-faculty-students/conditions-academic-employment/Code-of-Academic-Ethics.shtml • The Principles of Ethical Conduct were approved by the Board of Trustees on December 5, 2013. They were first approved by the University Faculty Council in October 2013. You can find them here: http://principles.iu.edu/index.shtml

IUPUI Faculty Council Committee Annual Report 2013-2014

<p>Evaluation of FAR</p>	<p>Summary report and memo submitted to EFC - March</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major revision of FAR needed/new systems – buy or create We suggest to explore and pilot test www.DigitalMeasures.com (is also considered at Purdue University)tweaking is at FAA • Requirement of Annual Reporting system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Flexibility enough to be used among schools and agencies a ○ Underlying database/ interacting modules (see granting agency example) for report and/or CV generation ○ Define clearly the purpose. The potential audiences. ○ Minimize effect on faculty by avoiding duplications
<p>Representation of NTTF in campus committees</p>	<p>Memo to Executive Committee – March:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of NTTF is warranted in campus committees and ad-hoc workgroup as it related to curriculum development and teaching • We suggest a representation of NTTF on appropriate IUPUI committees respecting the ratio Tenure Track/Non Tenure Track as suggested in the Academic Handbook. <p>The committee support on voting representation/office of NTTF on IFC.</p>
<p>Rank of Teaching Faculty</p>	<p>Memo submitted to EFC –June</p> <p>The Professor of Clinical (field) is primarily, if not exclusively, used in the IUSM for clinical titles; there is a comparable classification for researchers and scientists/scholars; for schools other than Medicine. The committee agreed that it is desirable to have a comparable classification with the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor for faculty with a teaching appointment</p> <p>Description: Professor of Teaching (field) {examples: English; Math; Medical Humanities; History; etc. → Professor of Teaching English}</p>
<p>Revision Undergraduate Affairs Committee</p>	<p>FAA approved document as written.</p>

Action Items to be carried over to 2014-2015:

Action Item(s)	Status
Discuss the grievance process and the Board of Review procedures	In progress

Suggested new action items for 2014-2015:

Action Item(s)	Status
Definition of tenure status	
Policy for Adjunct Faculty promotion	

Please attach any completed documents, minutes, or recommendations made by your committee during this report year. One copy of this report and supporting documents will be sent to the IUPUI University Archives.

Report due: June 30, 2014

Submit to*: Karen Lee
Faculty Council Office
UL 3115N
IUPUI
klee2@iupui.edu

***Preferred submission method is via email.**

INTER-CAMPUS MEMORANDUM

TO: WINDSOR JACK, PRESIDENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FROM: JOSETTE JONES ON BEHALF OF FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: FAR
DATE: MARCH 26, 2014
CC: LEE, KAREN

Please find included the summary of a (quick and dirty) faculty survey using IdeaScale

Concerns:

- Transparency on how the information in the reports is used
- Lack of clarity of FAR objectives (reporting, merit review, CV generation, ... accreditation reports, ...)
- Time consuming and not intuitive leading to inconsistencies in reporting
- One related concern is that there may not be enough of developmental feedback.

Suggestions to Executive Committee:

- Major revision of FAR needed/new systems – buy or create
We suggest to explore and pilot test www.DigitalMeasures.com (is also considered at Purdue University) tweaking is at FAA
- Requirement of Annual Reporting system
 - Flexibility enough to be used among schools and agencies a
 - Underlying database/ interacting modules (see granting agency example) for report and/or CV generation
 - Define clearly the purpose. The potential audiences.
 - Minimize effect on faculty by avoiding duplications

Respectfully submitted,

Josette Jones

Summary Report of FAR Feedback

Organizers: Josette Jones, Melissa Lavitt, Carol McGarry, and Kristi Palmer

Submitted: March 20, 2014

Introduction

To facilitate quick collection of data the web-based, freely available tool, IdeaScale was employed. This tool allows users to submit ideas, feedback, etc. in a free form and then for other submitters to agree/disagree with submitted ideas as well as comment upon those ideas. This mechanism was useful for two reasons:

1. The necessarily quick turn around time for data collection halted the organizers ability to develop an in-depth survey which included well constructed, specific questions, with an equally considered prepopulated answer set. IdeaScale allows the user to supply the ideas.
2. All users get to see all other user's ideas. Instead of relying on the ideas of the 4 organizers, the community of respondents can respond to one another's ideas.

While a useful tool, IdeaScale is not without its faults. We did receive negative feedback on the tool primarily related to: 1. Forced registration with the tool and 2. Using a system that was not IU controlled (with particular references to the recent IU data breach)

An email was sent on March 11, 2014 on behalf of Melissa Lavitt to all faculty at IUPUI, from medical and non-medical schools. The organizers decided to create separate feedback mechanisms for medical and non-medical faculty as a means to see if varied concerns arose.

Summary

CV Connection to FAR

The single most requested functionality of medical and non-medical faculty alike was automated connectivity to the curriculum vitae. Most were interested in a faculty annual review mechanism that was automatically populated by a machine read CV. Others suggested that the information flow would be useful in the other direction, with a CV being easily generated from the FAR.

General Automation

More automation overall was the next most oft requested functionality including:

- FAR for current year prepopulated with all data from previous year
- FAR prepopulated with data already housed in other university systems (course data, grants data, ScholarWorks)

- FAR prepopulated with data from external systems particularly article databases for publication information

Increased Flexibility

Faculty commented upon the need to be able to customize the FAR per school/department. Several commenters shared that they are required to fill out a separate review form for their school because the FAR does not adequately pool the data needed by that school.

Too Much Structure, Not Enough Structure?

Reported was overall complexity of the form. Terms are too narrow and/or not well defined. Terms/fields are lacking for some aspects of the form. One example, what constitutes Lecture vs. Seminar vs. Discussion Hours. Confusion expressed over why such fine-grained detail is collected about particular areas. This connects directly to confusion over the intended use of FAR data. The complexity of the current structure makes FAR completion an unnecessarily time consuming process.

Report Generation

Another oft stated need was the ability to run more robust reports from the collected data. Related to report running, many expressed concern over what entities within the university are able to run reports/have access to the cumulative data and for what purpose was this data being used. Clarification over the purpose of the FAR and use of the FAR data was requested.

Mentoring Reporting (Med School)

18 respondents indicated the need for a section devoted specifically to reporting mentoring activities.

[Side note KP: I think this already exists so perhaps the problem is making the mentoring section more obvious]

Specific Alterations Suggested

- Ability to reorder lists after entered.
- Dropbox feature that allows one to send an email which results in the content of that email auto populating a field in FAR.

IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement

IUPUI's faculty and librarians represent its most important resource. The development and maintenance of every faculty member or librarian's professional expertise must be among the highest priorities of the institution. An overwhelming majority of faculty and librarians are professionally competent, productive, and contribute to fulfilling the mission of IUPUI. Thus, Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement is designed to focus on two small groups of faculty and librarians - those who seek a change in career direction or emphasis and those who are failing to meet minimum levels of performance or productivity. Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement provides a structure for the preparation and implementation of faculty/librarian development plans to meet the needs of these two groups of individuals. The policy is intended to complement, but not duplicate, policies covering dismissal for incompetence and misconduct, and is not a mechanism to deal with faculty or librarians who have health problems, issues related to drug and alcohol abuse or behavioral issues. The complete policy can be found in Appendix B.

Appendix B

IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement

IUPUI's faculty and librarians represent its most important resource. The development and maintenance of every faculty member or librarian's professional expertise must be among the highest priorities of the institution. An overwhelming majority of faculty and librarians are professionally competent, productive, and contribute to fulfilling the mission of IUPUI. Thus, Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement is designed to focus on two small groups of faculty and librarians - those who seek a change in career direction or emphasis and those who are failing to meet minimum levels of performance or productivity. The policy is intended to complement, but not duplicate, policies covering dismissal for incompetence and misconduct, and is not a mechanism to deal with faculty or librarians who have health problems, issues related to drug and alcohol abuse or behavioral issues. Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement provides a structure for the preparation and implementation of faculty/librarian development plans to meet the needs of these two groups of individuals.

Background to original document

In preparing this document, a subcommittee of the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee studied post-tenure review plans from many other institutions. Based on this study and from discussion with members of the faculty, a draft document was prepared by the subcommittee for consideration by the full committee. In consultation with William Plater, Executive Vice-Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties, the final form of the document was approved by the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee and forwarded to the IUPUI Faculty Council. Since that time, input has been gathered through a variety of forums. The subcommittee revised the document using this input, as well as advice from the IUPUI Library Faculty, and the policy has been approved with its current language by the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee.

The proposed plan is a cost-effective way of addressing the issue of the unsatisfactory performance by faculty and librarians, as well as a logical step in assisting faculty and librarians who seek a change in career direction or emphasis. However, any attempts to deal with these two groups of faculty members or librarians will fail without an adequately planned and funded faculty/librarian development program that provides both the direction-changer and the under-performer with the opportunity for new challenges through a structured faculty development plan.

Although there are many high quality faculty/librarian development offerings on campus, there have not been comprehensive mechanisms to assist faculty or librarians who request a change in career direction or a new emphasis in or balance between teaching, research, or service, in the case of faculty, or performance, professional development, and service, in the case of librarians. Similarly, little has been done to identify and revitalize the careers of faculty and librarians whose performance has been unsatisfactory or whose efforts do not translate into adequate contributions to the mission of the department, school, or university. There must be a way to link these individuals to the faculty/librarian development process. Because of the diverse needs of faculty and librarians,

basic foundational programs may be required, as well as programs which are innovative and at the cutting edge of educational theory and practice. In addition, there must be coordination between faculty/librarian development at the school level and the campus level. Some subject areas can only be addressed within the context of a school or department, while others require the scope and perspective of a campus or university-wide program. Continuous learning is expected of all faculty and librarians, but this can only happen when there are good programs and support at all of these levels.

Rights and Responsibilities

Faculty members and librarians have the responsibility to optimize and deploy their talents and expertise in a way that furthers the mission of the University, the school, and the department, as well as their own careers. Faculty and librarians must ensure that they demonstrate professional competence and that, at the least, a minimally satisfactory contribution is consistently made in all areas of faculty or librarian performance. Tenure requires mutual responsibilities and when faculty and librarians accept tenure, they also accept the obligation to grow and develop professionally, to keep current in their disciplines, and to meet the evolving needs of the University. Most faculty members and librarians meet and most exceed this standard. Prior to the tenure decision, the burden is on the faculty member/librarian to prove that tenure should be granted. However, once tenure has been earned, the burden shifts to the institution to show why the faculty member or librarian should no longer have tenure.

The University has the reciprocal responsibility to provide faculty members and librarians with the environment and resources needed for them to be as productive as possible, particularly providing strong protection for academic freedom. This includes not only meaningful faculty/librarian development programs and opportunities, but also the structure and administrative support so that faculty and librarian efforts can be seamlessly translated into achievement. In addition, administrators must be willing and able to make difficult decisions when individual faculty or librarian performance remains below minimally satisfactory levels.

Guiding Principles

- Each school and/or department should develop and implement performance plans that not only make expectations for performance and productivity explicit to faculty and librarians, but that also provide clear and timely feedback about performance and assure due process before the review goes to the campus level.
- Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement must be clearly aimed at performance enhancement rather than designed as a punishment for performance inadequacies. The ultimate goal is to revitalize faculty members and librarians without jeopardizing academic freedom. The program should include an opportunity for faculty members or librarians to pursue new directions throughout their careers without penalty. Intermediate sanctions prior to dismissal, which have been developed at the school level with faculty input, should be sought only after all practical attempts at performance enhancement have been exhausted.
- Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement must recognize the diverse cultures of faculty and librarians, including the potential differences in those who are more recently hired from those who have been on the faculty or in a library for many years, those from teaching-oriented and research-oriented schools and programs, and the differences in mission of the various schools or libraries.

- Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement is not for purposes of programmatic change.
- For faculty, the review process should take into consideration all facets of faculty performance, including the distribution of effort among teaching, research, and service, while recognizing that a particular faculty member's contributions may be weighted more heavily towards one area or may shift, depending on the mission and needs of the department or school. For librarians, the review process should take into consideration all facets of librarian activities, including the distribution of effort between performance, professional development, and service, while recognizing that a particular librarian's contributions may be weighted more heavily towards one area or may shift, depending on the mission and needs of the department, school, or library.
- There should be a formal linkage between faculty/librarian review and faculty/ librarian development. Sufficient resources must be available for faculty development awards and assistance.
- The faculty/librarian development program must be coordinated with the review process so that programs specific to the needs of faculty or librarians who wish to enhance performance are offered and are coordinated with faculty/librarian development programs already in place. There must be ongoing analysis of current faculty/librarian development strategies and a determination of whether they are adequate to meet the needs of all faculty, but particularly those who are subject to a faculty/librarian development plan under Plan B.
- Since administrators play an active role in faculty or librarian success, deans, program directors, library directors, and department chairs should be provided with training programs on leadership and personnel management. These individuals are responsible for providing an environment and formulating policies which promote faculty/librarian success. They must be able and willing to make the difficult decisions in the rare instances where corrective measures are necessary. Review of administrators' abilities in leadership and personnel management should be incorporated into the regular administrative review process.
- The program should incorporate as much of the review mechanisms already in place to minimize the creation of duplicate processes. Peer review must be part of the process. For example, the existing process for annual reviews and/or reviews for salary recommendations could be used as an initiating mechanism to identify those faculty members or librarians who require an enhancement plan. The initiating mechanism should be designed to identify only those faculty members or librarians who, through annual reviews or feedback from annual reports, have been informed of persistent substandard performance over time that cannot be explained by illness or other factors outside of the control of the faculty member/librarian (e.g., at least two consecutive annual reviews), rather than those with a single year of reduced productivity or lack of effectiveness.
- The process must carefully balance the potential good from the program with the cost of the program, particularly since the percentage of faculty members and librarians needing an enhancement program is expected to be quite small. Continuous learning and development, however, are expected of all faculty members and librarians. There must be adequate opportunities and resources to support this commitment.
- Schools shall be required to determine what constitutes "unsatisfactory performance." This definition and mechanism for measuring who has "unsatisfactory performance" shall be determined with faculty input and

with full written notice to faculty upon the implementation of Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement in the school. For librarians, the definitions and mechanisms for measuring shall be determined by IUPUI Library Faculty documents, with written policies available to all librarians. However, the definition of "unsatisfactory performance" must include the concept of lack of effort, such that there is no evidence that the individual is trying to improve, rather than merely lack of results, which must take into account mitigating circumstances, such as a competitive research environment. Schools shall provide a copy of the policies to the Dean of Faculties' Office.

- The first implementation of the review and enhancement process in a school should take place after a sufficient time for schools and libraries to develop criteria and guidelines, but not later than one year after the adoption of this policy by the IUPUI Faculty Council.
- Due process must be assured.
- A corollary of this policy is a fair and equitable retirement system which provides faculty members and librarians with the opportunity to retire from their positions in a dignified manner.

Plan A: Voluntary. The Faculty Member or Librarian Requests the Preparation of a

Faculty/Librarian Development Plan

This process is strictly voluntary for the purpose of assisting the faculty member or librarian in evaluating his or her career and in the preparation a faculty/librarian development plan. For faculty, the focus of the review is on the faculty member accomplishments, research agenda, teaching efforts, and service contributions, relating these to the stated criteria for performance developed by the school, the school and/or department's mission, or the faculty member's desire for a change in career focus. For librarians, the focus of the review is on the librarian's accomplishments, professional development agenda, and service contributions, relating these to the stated criteria for performance developed by the school, the school and/or library's mission, or the librarian's desire for a change in career focus.

No documents or results of this voluntary review may be used in any other university evaluation process, except by explicit consent of the faculty member or librarian.

1. Tenured faculty member or librarian requests assistance in the design of a faculty/librarian development plan. The request will contain a statement of the rationale for the request, including why a plan is needed and how the plan fits within the mission and goals of the school, the department, and/or the library. The individual to whom the request is submitted is identified in school-specific or IUPUI Library Faculty guidelines.
2. For faculty, the review will be conducted by an elected faculty review committee composed of a minimum of three tenured faculty members and excludes administrators at the level of department chair and above. Details of the election process are provided in school-specific guidelines. The faculty member has the right to reject a committee member in the case of a perceived conflict of interest. For librarians, the review will be conducted by an appropriate elected body, as specified in IUPUI Library Faculty documents.

3. The department chair, or in the case of schools without department chairs, the dean, the library director, or his or her designee, informs the faculty member or librarian of the nature and procedures of the review.
4. The faculty member or librarian and the department chair, or equivalent, prepare a review dossier, which includes the following at a minimum:

For Faculty:

- a current vita
- a statement on teaching or a teaching portfolio
- a statement on current research or creative work
- a statement on current service

For Librarians:

- a current vita
- a statement on performance
- a statement on current professional development activities
- a statement on current service

5. The department chair or equivalent:

- may add any materials relevant to the review, including prior evaluations and other documents
- must provide the faculty member or librarian with a copy of each item added

6. The faculty member or librarian may add materials to the dossier at any time during the review process.

7. Based on a review of the request for preparation of a faculty/librarian development plan and the dossier, the review committee shall decide whether the request is reasonable, particularly if the goals of the faculty member or librarian are inconsistent with the mission of the school, department, and/or library.

8. The review committee, in cooperation with the faculty member or librarian, will prepare a faculty/librarian development plan. This plan will provide specific guidance and advice to help the faculty member or librarian more effectively achieve his or her revised career goals.

The plan should:

- identify specific strengths and weaknesses related to the faculty member or librarian's future goals and the extent to which these goals fit within the mission of the school, department, or library
- define specific activities and programs that could help the faculty or librarian achieve these goals

- set appropriate timelines for the completion of these activities
 - indicate appropriate benchmarks which the faculty member or librarian could use to monitor his or her progress
 - identify the source of any institutional support, such as assigned time or new research equipment, based on discussions with the dean or library director
9. In the development of the plan, the review committee shall consider whether the resources required to achieve the faculty member or librarian's goals are reasonable or an appropriate long-term investment.
 10. The faculty/librarian development plan shall be signed by the faculty member or librarian, the dean, library director, or designee, and the department chair or equivalent.
 11. Since participation in the review process and preparation of a faculty/librarian development plan is voluntary, the faculty member or librarian may stop the process at any time, up until the point that the plan is agreed to and signed.

Plan B. Involuntary. A Faculty Member or Librarian is Identified as Needing a Review and the Preparation of a Faculty/Librarian Development Plan.

For faculty, the purpose of the review is to identify a faculty member's unsatisfactory performance, to re-affirm or change the division of efforts between teaching, research, and service, to structure a development plan to remedy any deficiencies, and to monitor the progress towards achievement of the plan. For librarians, the purpose of the review is to identify a librarian's unsatisfactory performance, to re-affirm or change the division of efforts between performance, professional development, and service, to structure a development plan to remedy any deficiencies, and to monitor the progress towards achievement of the plan.

The faculty/librarian development plan is an agreement indicating how specific deficiencies in a faculty member or librarian's performance shall be remedied. The generation of a plan is a collaborative effort among the faculty member or librarian, the review committee, and the dean or library director and should reflect the mutual aspirations and intentions of the faculty member or librarian, the department, and the school or library.

1. The review process is initiated at the school level when at least two consecutive annual reviews indicate that a faculty member or librarian's performance is unsatisfactory, as defined by his or her school or library. It is important to note that nothing precludes a Dean or Department Chair from taking action sooner when there is a substantial decline in productivity or performance during a given year as revealed through the annual review process or other evidence. Indeed, addressing performance and productivity issues swiftly is beneficial to faculty and librarians as well as to institution. However, a minimum of two consecutive years of unsatisfactory performance are required for pursuing post-tenure review under the Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement Policy. Moreover, it should be re-emphasized that this policy is intended to complement, but not duplicate, polices covering dismissal for incompetence and misconduct and is not a mechanism to deal with faculty or librarians who have health problems, issues related to drug and alcohol abuse or behavioral issues.

2. The Dean or library director notifies the faculty member or librarian being selected for review and informs him/her about the nature and procedures of the review.
 - For faculty, the Dean may grant an exemption to a faculty member subject to review if there are extenuating circumstances, such as health problems, which contributed to unsatisfactory performance, or in the event of impending retirement.
 - For librarians, the appropriate administrator may grant an exemption to a librarian subject to review if there are extenuating circumstances, such as health problems, which contributed to unsatisfactory performance, or in the event of impending retirement.
3. For faculty, the review will be conducted by an elected faculty review committee composed of a minimum of three tenured faculty members and excludes administrators at the level of department chair and above. Details of the process to elect and replace committee members are provided in school-specific guidelines. The faculty member has the right to reject a committee member in the case of a perceived conflict of interest. For librarians, the review will be conducted by an appropriate elected body, as specified in IUPUI Library Faculty documents.
4. The review committee can terminate the process if it finds that there is no basis for the review.
5. The findings of the review fall within three categories:
 - Some strengths, no deficiencies. If the committee determines that the faculty member or librarian has met the minimum level of performance, as set by the school or library, the faculty member or librarian and dean or library director will be informed and the review process terminated.
 - Some strengths, some deficiencies, but deficiencies are not substantial or chronic. If the committee identifies some deficiencies in the faculty member or librarian's performance as compared to the minimum level of performance set by the school or library, but these deficiencies are not judged to be substantial or chronic, the committee shall state its findings in writing, including the specific deficiencies identified. The findings shall be sent to the faculty member or librarian and the dean or library director. The faculty member or librarian should be offered the opportunity to have a faculty/librarian development plan through the review committee process described under Plan A: Voluntary.
 - Substantial chronic deficiencies. If the committee determines that there are substantial chronic deficiencies in the faculty member or librarian's performance that have lasted at least two years and are predicted to persist without intervention, as measured against the school or library's minimum level of performance, the committee shall state, in writing, the specific deficiencies identified. The findings shall be sent to the faculty member or librarian and his or her dean or library director.

6. The faculty member or librarian and the committee shall work together to draw up a faculty/librarian development plan. The plan will provide specific guidance and advice to help the faculty member or librarian remedy the identified deficiencies. The plan should:
 - identify specific strengths which should be enhanced
 - identify the specific deficiencies to be addressed
 - define specific goals or outcomes that are needed to remedy the deficiencies
 - outline the specific activities and programs that should be completed to achieve these goals and outcomes
 - set appropriate timelines for the completion of these activities
 - indicate appropriate benchmarks to be used in monitoring progress
 - indicate the criteria for annual progress reviews
 - identify the source of any ~~funding~~ or institutional support, such as assigned time or new research equipment, based on discussions with the dean or library director
7. The plan becomes final upon the signatures of the faculty member or librarian, the dean, library director or designee, and the department chair or equivalent. The signatures indicate that the formulation of a faculty/librarian development plan has been completed and is ready for implementation. It does not imply a faculty member or librarian's agreement with the findings. Rights of appeal are provided as described under #8. If a faculty member or librarian refuses to cooperate in the creation or implementation of a development plan, the dean may initiate a range of sanctions (see item 12). If a faculty member or librarian initiates an appeal, sanctions shall be suspended pending completion of the appeal processes.
8. The faculty member or librarian shall have the right of appeal as specified in the IU Academic Handbook, the IUPUI Supplement to the IU Academic Handbook, or the appropriate IUPUI Library Faculty documents.
9. The faculty member or librarian and the review committee shall meet at least annually to review the faculty member or librarian's progress towards remedying the deficiencies. A progress report will be sent to the faculty member or library and the dean or library director.
10. If progress is not made based on the specified timelines and benchmarks which are part of the faculty/librarian development plan agreement, the dean or library director may employ a variety of sanctions which have been developed at the school level with faculty input, as defined within school-specific guidelines or in IUPUI Library Faculty documents.
11. When the objectives of the plan have been met, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the development plan, the review committee shall make a final report to the faculty member or librarian and the dean or library director.

12. Failure to successfully complete or demonstrate progress towards completion of the faculty/librarian development plan may result in significant sanctions for the faculty member or librarian, including initiation of dismissal proceedings based on alleged professional incompetence or alleged misconduct, as specified in the IUPUI Dismissal Procedures for Tenured Faculty and Librarians.
13. The procedures for dismissing faculty for misconduct or incompetence are separate from these policies and may be invoked, when appropriate, at any time; dismissal policies supersede the Policy for Faculty and Librarian Review and Enhancement.

Developed by the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee, June 6, 1997

Forwarded to IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee, June 26, 1997

Revisions: April 10 and April 21, 1998

Recommended for Approval by the Executive Committee, April 23, 1998

Approved at the IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting, May 7, 1998

Accepted by IUPUI Chancellor, July 1, 1998

Revisions Approved at the IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting, May 6, 1999

Revisions Approved at the IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting, December 2, 1999

Adopted/Approved by IUPUI Faculty Council, May 4, 2010; updated 2011-2013

Working Document: Per approved policy updates since May 7, 2013)

Updated: July 10, 2013

INTER-CAMPUS MEMORANDUM

TO: WINDSOR JACK, PRESIDENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FROM: JOSETTE JONES ON BEHALF OF FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: REPRESENTATION OF NON TENURE TRACK FACULTY (NTTF)
DATE: MARCH 26, 2014
CC: LEE, KAREN

The committee reviewed and discussed the emails and notes received RE the representation of NTTF in campus committees

Suggestions to Executive Committee:

- Presence of NTTF is warranted in campus committees and ad-hoc workgroup as it related to curriculum development and teaching
- We suggest a representation of NTTF on appropriate IUPUI committees respecting the ratio Tenure Track/Non Tenure Track as suggested in the Academic Handbook.

The committee support on voting representation/office of NTTF on IFC.

Respectfully submitted,

Josette Jones

INTER-CAMPUS MEMORANDUM

TO: WINDSOR JACK, PRESIDENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FROM: JOSETTE JONES ON BEHALF OF FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: TEACHING FACULTY
DATE: JUNE 26, 2014
CC: LEE, KAREN

The committee reviewed and discussed in the the Teaching Faculty Classification: in their April meeting

Rationale

The Professor of Clinical (field) is primarily, if not exclusively, used in the IUSM for clinical titles; there is a comparable classification for researchers and scientists/scholars; for schools other than Medicine. The committee agreed that it is desirable to have a comparable classification with the ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor for faculty with a teaching appointment

Description:

Professor of Teaching (field)
{examples: English; Math; Medical Humanities; History; etc. → Professor of Teaching English}

Expected Qualifications:

Ph.D.; Ed.D.; MFA; JD, or terminal degree

Initial Appointment:

1-3 years

Subsequent Appointment:

Long-term contract, 3-7 years

Termination Notice Due:

1st yr = 3 months; 2ⁿ yr = 6 months; thereafter = 12 months

Promotion:

By preparation of dossier to be reviewed at unit, school, campus, and system levels
(independent external peer review)

Excellence in teaching; satisfactory in service

Record of publically disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of teaching

Grievance Process*

For full-time appointees, through Faculty Council, by presentatioin to the Faculty Board of Review

Respectfully submitted,

Josette Jones

Faculty Work

2014

Two primary documents - *Indiana University Academic Handbook* and *IUPUI Supplement to the Indiana University Academic Handbook* - set forth university and campus policies on the assignment of faculty work. Authority to set policies derives from the Board of Trustees. Although Faculty Council actions and campus administrative practices may come to be regarded as having the effect of policy, both are subject to review by the trustees and may be affected by their actions. Nothing in this statement, therefore, should be construed as speaking on behalf of the trustees.

An example of the trustees' interest in faculty work relates to their request that the campuses develop teaching capacity models. Individual schools and/or type of appointment may vary in the average numbers of course sections taught per faculty member. However, the IUPUI average has been seen by trustees to be six course sections per year, with allowances for individual assignments for research, service, and administrative responsibilities. Sections may be taught within a schedule that suits both faculty and school.

Academic freedom ensures that faculty can pursue their scholarly interests, but only insofar as they may meet their responsibilities to their unit. "The teacher and librarian shall have full freedom of investigation, subject to adequate fulfillment of their academic duties." (Academic Handbook) Faculty teaching responsibilities include regular attendance at classes, holding required office hours, assuring class coverage in the event of their absence, and securing approval from the unit administrator (chair, division head, etc.) for any planned travel that may impact teaching.

To respond to the trustees' request, each school should have a faculty workload policy. The dean of each school in collaboration with the faculty is expected to develop and administer policies for faculty work that ensure that responsibilities are met and individuals are treated fairly and equitably. The campus chancellor and the chief academic officer, in turn, are responsible for the effectiveness of deans in following this principle across the campus. Faculty should expect to receive, upon request, an explanation for work assignments. (If there has been consultation and shared understanding of faculty responsibilities, explanations will rarely be required.) The explanation must bear scrutiny by peers in the contexts of university, campus, school, and departmental missions. Instead of setting forth detailed work rules, therefore, administrators in each unit are expected to interpret and apply general policies in accord with the special missions of their units.

No one definition of an equitable faculty workload can meet the unique needs of each unit. Nevertheless, any definition of faculty workload should address research and creative activity, teaching activity, service expectations, and percentage of time/effort for these activities according to type of faculty appointment. For example, lecturers generally teach additional sections over what is taught by clinical faculty. Each school

should define faculty workload expectations for its needs and the faculty categories it employs. In response to questions raised by faculty members, the remainder of this statement deals with these areas.

Research and Creative Activity

Each unit should address its research responsibilities and expectations in its mission statement and should periodically reaffirm or revise its statement. Although some faculty specialize in research or clinical assignments (as described in the Academic Handbook), tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to combine teaching, research, and service at performance levels that their departmental and unit peers regard as satisfactory or better. It is assumed that tenure-related faculty members spend some time in research, appropriately balanced by teaching and service. If time spent in research will impinge on expectations of effort in the other two areas beyond what is considered normative, the faculty member must obtain the consent of the administrative officer. It is further assumed that faculty members' research relates to the unit's mission, documented by such measures of accountability as individual faculty annual reports.

Tenure-track faculty members are encouraged (in some schools expected) to actively seek and acquire the kinds of support needed to carry out and support their research programs. The type of support needed can vary across disciplines and faculty members. Some schools or programs expect faculty members to work towards obtaining externally funded teaching/research grants and awards. These kinds of support would sustain a faculty member's research and scholarly activity, promote teaching graduate students, post-docs and fellows, nurture the research infrastructure of the university and generate high-skilled workforce for the Indiana and national economy. For a higher learning institution, the effort by the faculty to secure research support should be appropriately recognized by the university.

Although some schools have developed a practice that faculty have, as a right, one day a week for research, no or campus policy states this assignment of time. Exceptions could be made by the chair or dean within the context of a faculty member's overall responsibilities with an expectation of demonstrated outcomes.

Teaching Assignments

Assigning faculty to specific courses is complex and reflects the best aspects of mutual responsibility between faculty and unit administrators. The process must be based on a faculty's collective responsibility. An individual has a right to fair and equitable treatment that withstands review among peers and within program expectations, however no absolute right exists with regard to assignment or effort distribution. Peers within a department should ideally reach consensus on assignments, but when consensus is not possible the chair must decide, using a pre-specified procedure for conflict resolution when appropriate.

It is always in the best interest of the unit to take advantage of individual faculty members' competencies, strengths, and interests when matching them to specific departmental needs. Chairs and deans must develop a schedule of classes each term based on curricular requirements, direct and indirect promises of course availability, and student needs. The process should involve the unit's faculty and derive from the faculty's authority to determine curriculum. In acting on behalf of the faculty to implement the curriculum, academic administrators should assume that their peers will scrutinize and review their judgments. They also are expected to give priority to unit needs and responsibilities over those of individual faculty. A balance of interests and programmatic needs is the goal to be reached successfully in the shared process of planning teaching activities.

Faculty workload is not equal to the number of hours spent in the classroom, reflecting the complexity of instruction in higher education today. Appropriate consideration of faculty workload must include various instructional modalities employed in addition to lecture – small group including problem-based learning, laboratory/clinical, and distance instruction including online. It is essential that workload assignments adequately manage individual instruction in the form of capstone experiences or graduate research mentoring. Therefore, it cannot be based solely on course numbers or credit hours.

In response to student and public needs, many academic units of IUPUI have accepted responsibilities to conduct classes at off-campus locations or on the internet (online). Faculty members, regardless of conditions when they began their appointment, take part in delivering courses by methods that the unit deems appropriate at a particular time, considering safe practices and precluding extenuating circumstances of individual faculty. This includes teaching online and at such places as off campus IUPUI learning centers, high schools, corporate or institutional sites, hospitals, shopping malls, other communities within commuting distances, and even other countries based on contracts. Units based in Indianapolis that have program responsibilities at Bloomington, Columbus or other campuses may also involve off-campus assignments, subject to equity and fairness as affirmed by peer review, with possible exceptions for individual hardship.

A frequent issue involves levels of course work and subject areas. In some units, there is a presumption that faculty do not have to teach lower division courses and there may be concerns about eligibility to teach graduate courses. Occasionally, a department chair must ask an individual to teach a course or part of a course beyond the faculty member's expectations or specialization. Chairs and deans must make these decisions, but they also are accountable for the consequences to students and to faculty in providing fairness and equity. At an evolving university, faculty also are expected to grow as scholars and teachers with encouragement and tangible support from their chairs and deans.

Finally, the concept of peer review underlies policies associated with observing and assessing faculty performance. The academic world has long recognized the necessity and value of peer review in research, but has only recently embraced the process as an

inherently valuable aspect of teaching and professional service. Although each unit should develop its own practices in regard to peer review, faculty must also acknowledge the obligation of chairs/deans or their delegates to observe colleagues' teaching activities, in both physical and online teaching environments. Peer review should be formative and allow sufficient opportunity for improvement of performance.

Ten Month Appointments

Faculty members who hold 10 month appointments may engage in compensated activities without accountability to the university during the two months they are not engaged in university business. Moreover, faculty should not be expected to participate in university activities when they are uncompensated but must act in accordance with university employee regulations.

Summer Teaching

Faculty members who teach during the summer are required to be actively engaged in course-related teaching activities from the first day of classes through the day grades are due. Because of the intensive nature of summer teaching and service, faculty teaching full-time in the summer should not expect to engage in remunerated outside activities. Each school should have a summer teaching policy that also addresses service expectations, such as student advising. Before undertaking outside activities, even continuing activities begun during the academic year, faculty should establish expectations in advance of summer work with the chair or dean. Ten-month faculty may engage in summer teaching as an additional teaching load. When this occurs, faculty members taking part in paid outside activities require prior approval of the faculty member's chair and dean as provided in school-specific policies. Faculty should be encouraged to balance summer teaching with requirements for promotion and tenure.

Service

University, campus, school, departmental, and community service responsibilities should be determined equitably among faculty members. Service activities should be coordinated with faculty preferences, areas of expertise, and school and organizational needs. In addition, individual administrative units may have policies concerning service expectations of particular academic appointments (e.g. reduced service expectations for untenured faculty).

Twelve Month Appointments

Outside Work

This section addresses several policies associated with faculty members' obtaining compensation from outside sources. Faculty members with 12-month appointments are

expected to devote their primary professional time and energy to carrying out their administrative teaching, research, and service responsibilities of the university. Faculty members may engage in remunerated outside work in accordance to university policies . (see the Academic Handbook - Outside Activities and Extra Compensation). Faculty members will report outside work to the appropriate unit administrator (chair, division head, etc.) and will insure that such activities do not interfere with their primary professional responsibilities.

The scheduling of vacations must be coordinated with chairs and deans,.. Faculty
Leave of Absence

Leaves of absence without pay are described in the Academic Handbook (Leave Without Pay). Subject to approval of school and campus administrative officers, leaves of absence without pay can be approved that permit a faculty member to engage in remunerated activities. On occasion and for reasons beneficial to the unit, a leave may, with the dean's and chief academic officer's approval, be extended beyond a year. Such leaves are not a right and are not guaranteed by this document.

Final Faculty Appointment

Conditions at time of initial appointment vary Letters of appointments, While letters of offer must be reviewed carefully and while the university, campus, and school are each committed to honoring them, faculty must recognize that conditions of work can change. Individual faculty member should expect to contribute proportionately to program departmental or, school norms for the faculty -. In some units, research and/or teaching expectations differed when some faculty members were initially appointed. Accordingly, those faculty members should expect to accept added responsibilities that bring their overall level of contribution to the program, departmental or school norm.

Conflicts of Interest

Faculty workload shall be consistent with the policies on Conflict of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment Involving Outside Professional Activities as stated in the Academic Handbook (Policy on Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research and Policy on Conflicts of Commitment Involving Outside Professional Activities).

Faculty Complaints

Individual faculty have the right to request a hearing before peers with regard to the decisions of deans and chairs through school grievance procedures and, if not resolved on that level, through the Faculty Board of Review process (see the Academic Handbook, which says Boards shall consider complaints of faculty concerning, among other things, "the nature or conditions of work"). Similarly, an appeals process is provided for contesting administrative decisions with regard to conflicts of interest. Peer review by a Faculty Board of Review helps assure faculty that their administrative

officers will act in accord with the best interests of the unit, campus, and university and will exercise their authority fairly and equitably.

Faculty who disagree with work assignments should first communicate this to the person making the assignment and, if unsatisfied, to that person's superior. Schools have created procedures or committees to address grievances, and this immediate recourse, if available, is likely to be most satisfactory. If there is no administrative remedy, then the faculty member should request a hearing by a Faculty Board of Review to avoid any possibility of misconduct charges. While protesting, the faculty member should meet assigned duties and responsibilities. If there is concern about adverse consequences of delay, the faculty member should seek a Board of Review as quickly as possible, while still carrying out assignments.

Summary

Through collaborative decision-making involving the faculty whom they are charged with leading, deans and chairs have the authority to assign individual faculty to specific duties that have been identified and accepted explicitly or implicitly by agreement on mission and collective responsibility. Responsibility and authority for management and use of university resources are inherent functions of administrative officers, in equal collaboration with faculty and according to the principles of fairness and equity.

As a Member of the IUPUI Community, I aspire to

Give priority to:

- Supporting students in all of their academic endeavors
- Treating all people with dignity, respect and compassion
- Recognizing that every member of the IUPUI community makes important contributions

Conduct myself professionally by

- Broadening my knowledge of the diverse cultures of the individuals with whom we interact,
- Adhering to campus and departmental policies on professional conduct
- Promoting an atmosphere conducive to learning and work
- Practicing civility and responsibility in all communications
- Continuing to enhance my skills and ability to serve
- Striving to maintain personal well-being and a balance of work and personal life

Safeguard privacy and confidentiality by

- Informing myself of current policies and regulatory requirements, and acting accordingly
- Discussing confidential matters only in private with those who need to know
- Protecting written and electronic information
- Observing the privacy of the personal and work spaces of colleagues and staff

Demonstrate a sense of ownership by

- Taking any concern (real or perceived, big or small) seriously, and seeking resolution or understanding
- Seeking help if the concern is beyond my ability or scope of authority
- Approaching those who appear to need help, and assisting or directing them appropriately
- Taking personal responsibility for the physical environment of IUPUI and notifying the appropriate offices to keep the campus clean and safe
- Optimizing the use of resources while delivering exemplary teaching, research and service

Communicate effectively by

- Recognizing that body language and tone of voice are important parts of communication
- Remaining calm when confronted with or responding to pressure situations
- Actively listening and responding appropriately (being present in the moment with others)

Revised: 3/24/14

Demonstrate a commitment to my colleagues by

- Treating them with dignity, respect and compassion; valuing and respecting their differences (e.g. background, experience, culture, religion, ethnicity)
- Contributing to my work group in positive ways and continuously supporting the efforts of others
- Recognizing and encouraging positive behaviors