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Section One: Overall Structure and Governance of IUPUI

A Brief History of IUPUI

IUPUI formally began as a campus in 1969 and will end its existence under that name in the summer of 2024.

IUPUI was the product of efforts by generations of visionary Indianapolis citizens to give public higher-education opportunities to city residents. These efforts developed on two parallel tracks: one for broad-based educational enrichment for the community, and the other to provide professional training. Beginning in the 1880s, progressive voices led by noted educator and women’s rights activist May Wright Sewall pushed Indiana University administrators in Bloomington to have a presence in the state’s main city. The first public lecture course by IU faculty in Indianapolis began in 1891; it was in economics and more followed. In 1916, IU established an Extension Center in downtown Indianapolis, offering an array of courses in the humanities and sciences. Over time, these courses developed into the departments that form the IU Schools of Liberal Arts, Business, Education, and others.

In tandem with those efforts, around the turn of the twentieth century, Indiana University reacted to the growing need for professional medical training. Superseding private, proprietary medical schools in the city, in 1903, the university established its School of Medicine. Starting in 1914, IU developed a Medical Center by collaborating with city philanthropists to build hospitals to provide clinical care to patients. Commencing with Long Hospital to serve the general population, hospitals for children (Riley Memorial) and pregnant women (Coleman) followed. Along with training physicians, IU established a Training School for Nurses and a Department of Social Service, which became respectively the Schools of Nursing and Social Work. In addition, programs arose to train physical and occupational therapists, dietitians, and other health professionals. In 1925, IU took over a private Indiana Dental College to form the IU School of Dentistry, and in 1933, located it in proximity to the School of Medicine. This Medical Center campus grew on Indianapolis’ near-west side and later became the core of the IUPUI campus.

IU ventured into other areas of arts and professional education to broaden its portfolio in Indianapolis. In 1967, the university merged with the John Herron Art Institute, established in 1902, to create the IU Herron School of Art and offer degree programs at its campus at 16th and Pennsylvania Streets. Similarly, in 1944 IU merged with the Indiana Law School, a proprietary school with roots in several law schools dating from the nineteenth century. In 1968, the Indianapolis division of the Bloomington-based IU School of Law became autonomous from Bloomington and soon moved into a new building on the IUPUI campus. Up until that point, it had offered part-time evening courses in downtown Indianapolis. It later was named the IU Robert H. McKinney School of Law. As well, in 1941, IU merged with the Normal College of the American Gymnastic Union, a physical education school dating from 1866, and located in Indianapolis since 1907. In 1946, IU administrators folded it into the Bloomington-based School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. However, in 1971, it became an autonomous School of Physical Education, was known as the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management. The school merged with the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences in 2018 and is called the School of Health and Human Sciences.
Purdue University, a state land-grant institution with notable programs in agriculture and engineering located in West Lafayette, ventured into Indianapolis during World War Two (1939-1945). Responding to demand for technical training in war-related industries at the urging of the United States government, Purdue offered engineering and technology courses in the city. After war’s end, Purdue’s presence in Indianapolis continued, initially cooperating with the IU Extension Division to offer humanities courses to Purdue students, but later developing its own broader liberal arts and social sciences curricula. The Purdue University-Indianapolis Extension also deepened its engineering and sciences offerings. In the 1950s, Purdue purchased property and in 1961, opened facilities on east 38th Street opposite the Indiana State Fairgrounds.

Over the years, the IU Extension Division increased its undergraduate and graduate degree offerings and occupied a variety of buildings in Indianapolis’ downtown, developing a significant presence in the city. Along with the programs located in the Medical Center campus on the near-west side, by the late 1960s, IU had schools located all over downtown and other parts of Indianapolis. The physical education program was located on the far north side, and Herron at 16th and Pennsylvania. During that decade, political and business leaders in the city saw the piecemeal and irrational public university presences in Indianapolis—both IU and Purdue—as a drawback. They argued that a growing city needed a great research university offering a comprehensive curriculum. In 1968, Indianapolis Mayor Richard Lugar broadcast a radio speech calling for such a university. Behind the scenes, political leaders made clear to university administrators in Bloomington and West Lafayette that if the latter did not or would not act, Indianapolis leaders would push legislation through the Indiana General Assembly to create a new, independent state university to serve the city.

IU and Purdue administrators reacted quickly. The two universities had already quietly coordinated efforts for several years and had talked in desultory fashion about shared facilities. In December 1968, Purdue president Frederick L. Hovde and IU president Joseph L. Sutton met and agreed to a unified institution in the city under IU management (Purdue was given control over a similar joint campus in Fort Wayne). In January 1969, the Boards of Trustees of both universities quickly ratified the handshake deal and announced it to the public. IUPUI was born as a way to fend off the creation of an autonomous state university in Indianapolis.

Since 1969, IUPUI developed and expanded rapidly. The Purdue faculty in the arts and social sciences merged with their IU counterparts; Purdue engineering and science departments moved to the downtown campus into new facilities, forming the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology and the Purdue School of Science. Similarly, Herron and the School of Physical Education relocated downtown. In a reorganization of IU’s eight campuses across the state in the early 1970s, administrators designated IUPUI as a core campus with IU-Bloomington, and its chancellor made executive vice president of IU. Enrollment at IUPUI grew apace, from about 13,000 in 1969 to nearly 30,000. IUPUI in 2023 offers more than 200 degree programs—more than any other university in Indiana—across seventeen schools. IUPUI administers a campus at Columbus, Indiana (IUPUC), which reaches students in a large rural region. In 2016, the Indiana General Assembly recommended a split of the Indiana University and Purdue University campuses in Fort Wayne (IPFW). The change was implemented on July 1, 2018, with two separate universities being formed—Indiana University Fort Wayne and Purdue Fort Wayne. The IU Fort Wayne campus focuses on the health programs of dentistry, health sciences, medical imaging and medicine, nursing, and social work.

In addition, IUPUI has relationships with research universities across the globe, bringing international students to campus and sharing IUPUI expertise around the world. Graduate education has grown, with
numerous Ph.D. programs producing scientists and researchers for academia and industry. IUPUI operates on a budget of more than $1.2 billion. Hundreds of millions of research dollars flow into IUPUI annually to support the development of intellectual, scientific, and medical advances and inventions that benefit the world.

IUPUI consolidated its role as the center of medical education and care in the state in 1997 by merging its Medical Center hospitals (University Hospital and Riley Memorial Hospital for Children) with Methodist Hospital to form what is now called IU Health. One of the largest medical networks in the country, IU Health features a statewide network of hospitals and clinics to serve the medical needs of Indiana’s citizens and train physicians, nurses, and other healthcare providers.

From its beginnings, IUPUI has existed to serve the intellectual and research needs of people. At first, Indianapolis citizens clamored for knowledge and skills and found it in public higher education. Over the decades, IUPUI has widened its scope to address worldwide needs for intellectual and scientific advances. IUPUI stands today as a dynamic, growing force for positive change in the world.

In August 2022, the Trustees of Indiana University and the Trustees of Purdue University announced a realignment in which the Purdue-mission programs would return to solely Purdue control, and the remainder of IUPUI would become IU Indianapolis, with a final date of summer 2024. Please see this page for realignment information.

Written by Stephen E. Towne; updated 2023 by Rachel Applegate
Associate University Archivist
IUPUI University Library
May 2016
Updated May 2020 Faculty Guide Committee
Updated May 2021 Faculty Guide Committee

IUPUI Campus Information

IUPUI Campus Website: http://www.iupui.edu/
About IUPUI: http://www.iupui.edu/about/
More information about IUPUI can be found in the IUPUI Quick Facts: https://www.iupui.edu/about/rankings-statistics.html
IUPUI Mission, Vision, and Values: http://www.iupui.edu/about/vision-mission.html
IUPUI Strategic Plan (Vision 2030): https://strategicplan.iupui.edu/
IUPUI Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: http://diversity.iupui.edu/
IUPUI Academic Schools and Departments: http://www.iupui.edu/academics/schools.html
IUPU Columbus: http://www.iupuc.edu/
IU Fort Wayne: https://www.iufw.edu
Indiana University Principles of Ethical Conduct: https://principles.iu.edu/
Community Engagement (Centers and Institutes, and Other Academic Programs)

https://www.iupui.edu/city/engagement.html
Office of Community Engagement https://engage.iupui.edu/
Bachelor of General Studies https://www.iupui.edu/academics/degrees-majors/degree/general-studies-bgs-iupui-genstbgs1
IUPUI and Ivy Tech Office of Coordinated Programs: Passport Office https://ctas.iupui.edu/
Honors College: http://honorscollege.iupui.edu/
IUPUI ROTC: https://rotc.iupui.edu/

Accreditation of IUPUI

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools accredits IUPUI as a whole in terms of its mission, educational programs, governance and administration, financial stability, admissions and student services, institutional resources, student learning, institutional effectiveness, and relationships with internal and external constituencies.

https://irds.iupui.edu/reports-presentations/accreditation.html

The HLC oversees the processes of academic evaluation and approval for the campus as a separate unit and as a component of the Indiana University and Purdue University multi-campus systems.

Some degree programs receive additional accreditation by various national agencies with relevant review and approval responsibilities in their fields. A list of accredited programs can be found at:
https://uap.iu.edu/accreditation/program/iupui.html

The IUPUI campus was first accredited by the North Central Association in 1972, and decennial approval has been conferred subsequently in 1982-83, 1992-93, 2002-03, 2012-13, and 2022-23.

Office of Academic Affairs, July 2023

Governance of IUPUI

Constitution of the Indiana University Faculty
University Policy ACA-04 “Constitution of the Indiana University Faculty”

IUPUI Organization in the IU Context

Despite IUPUI having a distinctive history arising from its origins in two separate state universities, its governance is relatively straightforward. Since the deal worked out between the Indiana University (IU) and Purdue University (PU) presidents in December 1968 to create a joint campus in Indianapolis, IUPUI has been administered under the IU system. IUPUI is one of eight campuses in the IU system. As part of a university-wide reorganization in the early 1970s, the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses—the two largest—became core campuses in the system. The campuses in South Bend, Gary, Kokomo, New Albany,
and Richmond are designated as regional campuses. IUPUI also administers the educational centers at Columbus, Indiana (IUPUC), which reaches students in south central Indiana, and IU Fort Wayne (IUFW) where IU programs focus on the health sciences. (See https://www.iu.edu/about/locations.html.)

In January 1969, the Boards of Trustees of IU and Purdue approved the creation of a joint campus in Indianapolis to be under IU. The IU trustees have ultimate authority over IUPUI and the other IU campuses, making decisions about policies, faculty appointments, property, and other matters. Because some IUPUI departments offer Purdue degrees, the trustees of Purdue have concurrent responsibilities for those degree programs and promotions of IUPUI faculty in them. The IU trustees hold meetings at all of the campus locations.

The chief officer of IU is the president, who provides central leadership to all IU campuses. The president is assisted by several vice presidents in charge of various academic and administrative portfolios: finance; human resources; information technology; international affairs, etc. Increasingly, certain administrative functions of the eight campuses are centralized in offices located in Bloomington.

The highest-ranking officer of IUPUI is the chancellor (who is also executive vice president of IU, the second-highest ranking officer in IU), who reports to the president of IU. A number of vice chancellors oversee executive functions for IUPUI, including finance and administration, diversity, student affairs, enrollment management, and others. The chief academic officer, the executive vice chancellor who ranks second in the IUPUI administrative constellation, has responsibility for curriculum, appointments and promotions of faculty, and related matters.

Each IUPUI school (as well as the Honors College, University College, and University Library), is headed by a dean (or other similarly titled leader), who is responsible for advancing each unit’s academic mission. Most schools are subdivided by departments for each academic discipline, which are led by departmental chairs. The deans offer significant guidance to the chancellor through the Council of Academic Deans.

Faculty governance is an important feature of IUPUI. At the campus level, the IUPUI Faculty Council has a central role in providing faculty leadership and input in the administration of the campus (a University Faculty Council—UFC—has representatives from all eight IU campuses; the heads of the IUPUI, Bloomington, and Council of Regional Campuses are joint co-chairs of the UFC). Each IUPUI school and academic unit also has a faculty governance body. In addition, the IUPUI Staff Council represents the professional, technical, and clerical staff in campus administration; which is equivalent to staff in the Individual Contributor Non-Exempt, Individual Contributor Exempt, and People Leader Exempt under the new Job Framework Redesign (2021).

An IUPUI Board of Advisors, made up of community leaders in Indianapolis government, industry, and non-profits, offers significant guidance to the chancellor in harmonizing IUPUI’s academic efforts with the needs and wishes of the metropolitan area. The board is appointed by the IU president.

Written by Stephen E. Towne
Associate University Archivist
IUPUI University Library
May 2016
Updated February 2019; May 2021
The Indiana Commission for Higher Education
https://www.in.gov/che/
The Indiana Commission for Higher Education (ICHE), appointed by the governor, coordinates the planning and development of post-high school public education throughout the state. The commission was legislatively established in 1971 and advises the governor, the State Budget Committee, and the General Assembly. It has authority to approve establishment of new campuses or new degree programs. It also reviews and makes recommendations on proposed budgets of the state’s seven public institutions of postsecondary education (Ball State University, Indiana State University, Ivy Tech Community College, Purdue University, Vincennes University, and the University of Southern Indiana). Members of the commission include individuals from each of Indiana’s 12 Congressional districts and a faculty representative appointed by the governor.
Reports and analysis: https://uirr.iu.edu/compliance/iche/index.html

IUPUI Faculty Governance
The Indiana University Faculty Constitution gives the faculty legislative and consultative authority over a broad range of university activities. The Constitution delegates that authority at university-wide, campus, and school levels. The faculty at all levels exercises its authority through a variety of elected councils.

At the university-wide level, faculty governance operates through the University Faculty Council (UFC) (https://ufc.iu.edu/), which includes elected and ex officio faculty representatives from all eight campuses plus ex officio administrative members. The UFC has several standing committees, and the work of the UFC is directed by its Executive Committee. The membership of the Executive Committee includes a co-chair from IUB, IUPUI, and the Regional Faculty Caucus, two elected faculty leaders from IUB and IUPUI, one elected faculty leader from the Regional Faculty Caucus, and the president of the university.

Faculty governance for the IUPUI campus operates through the IUPUI Faculty Council (IFC), which comprises elected unit representatives from each of the schools, elected at-large representatives from the campus faculty, and ex officio administrative members. The IFC is guided by a faculty president and vice president with an Executive Committee elected from its ranks by the council. The IUPUI Faculty Council has the following standing committees:

**Academic Affairs**
**Athletic Affairs**
**Board of Review Pool**
**Budgetary Affairs**
**Campus Planning**
**Constitution and Bylaws**
**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**
**Executive**
**Faculty Affairs**
**Faculty and Staff Relations**

**Faculty Guide**
**Fringe Benefits**
**Library Affairs**
**Nominating Committee**
**Ombudsteam**
**Online Education**
**Promotion and Tenure**
**Student Affairs**
**Student Appeals Pool (University Hearing Commission)**
**Technology**

More information about the Faculty Council and these committees appears in the Constitution and Bylaws found on this webpage. Faculty participation in the work of faculty governance is essential to faculty ownership of the institution. With the help of the IUPUI Nominating Committee, the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council composes the slates for elected positions and appoints members to the standing committees. Assignments are primarily based on responses to the annual committee service.
survey circulated by the IUPUI Faculty Council Office. Faculty members with particular interests may also contact the Executive Committee individually.

Faculty governance within the schools occurs in various forms but must comply with IUPUI governance standards as set forth in the Constitution of the IUPUI Faculty. The pertinent school faculty constitution should be consulted for details.

**Constitution and Bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty**
The current Constitution and Bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty can be found on this webpage.

**Definition of “Faculty” as Used in the IUPUI Faculty Guide**
The IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that in the IUPUI Faculty Guide, whenever the term “faculty” is used, it is understood to be defined as in Article 1, Sections A and B of the Constitution of the IUPUI Faculty unless otherwise noted.

**ARTICLE I. FACULTY MEMBERSHIP**

**Section A.**

All individuals serving full-time who are tenure-track, non-tenure-track, emeritus faculty, or librarians of comparable rank and who perform their functions primarily in Indianapolis, or who, having their principal functions elsewhere, have rank in an academic unit that is primarily situated at IUPUI (Indianapolis, Columbus, and Fort Wayne) shall be considered members of the faculty.

**Section B.**

1. All full time tenured and tenure-track faculty members (herein called tenure-track faculty) shall be voting members of the faculty.
2. All full-time non-tenure-track faculty shall be voting members of the faculty if they hold the following appointments:
   a. Clinical appointments,
   b. Lecturer and Teaching Professor appointments,
   c. Professor of Practice appointments,
   d. Research Scientist/Scholar appointments.
3. Those faculty described in Section B.1 and B.2 will be referred herein as the Voting Faculty.
4. Acting, visiting, adjunct, academic specialist, emeritus and other academic appointees are not voting members of the faculty.
5. Any provision in the IUPUI Constitution or Bylaws stating, directly or by implication, that voting shall occur by means of an in-person vote or a paper ballot shall be understood to permit electronic voting. The method and means of electronic voting shall be as established from time to time by the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee.
IUPUI Policy on School or Program Structuring

This policy is intended to cover transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, and elimination of academic programs. Because IUPUI is a dynamic institution that faces the challenge of preserving the important traditions of teaching, scholarship, and service while positioning itself to meet new demands in higher education, it may be necessary to make changes to the organizational structure of the campus, including the transfer and merger of programs between schools and departments, the reorganization of programs, including the division of schools and departments into smaller units, and at times even the reduction or elimination of a program.

The complete policy can be found in Appendix A.
IUPUI Faculty Council 2/2003

Merger, Reorganization and Elimination of Academic Units and Programs Involving Core Schools

University Policy ACA-79 “Merger, Reorganization, and Elimination of Academic Units and Programs Involving Core Schools”

University, campus and school administrators, or faculty, may occasionally decide that a reorganization of departments, schools and degree programs is warranted via merger, reorganization, or elimination of academic units (MRE). Such changes may be a response to: new directions in scholarship, science and the arts; new expectations for students entering professional careers or pursuing advanced education; financial constraints; administrative inefficiencies; declining performance or quality. These circumstances may make it prudent to consider and perhaps to implement the merger, reduction, elimination or renaming of academic units and programs, necessitating a reallocation of financial resources and the realignment of faculty members and librarians to new academic homes.

In the case of single-campus schools, current Faculty Council policies ensure that the faculty of a particular school involved in an MRE are part of the process, but also that a broad cross-campus perspective is represented.1

1 Indiana University Bloomington, Merger, Reorganization and Elimination of Academic Units and Programs (Formerly the Contingency Planning Policy and Procedures for Program Merger & Elimination). (By Action of the Bloomington Faculty Council: December 14, 1982; amended October 16; 1984; amended December 1, 2009; amended April 19, 2011)

IUPUI Policy on School or Program Restructuring approved by action of the IUPUI Faculty Council March 6, 2003.
Some MREs, however, may also involve core schools that have a presence on both the Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses of Indiana University. Each of the core schools has its own organizational structure (in some instances embodied in memoranda of understanding), which varies between schools. In each core school location, full-time tenure track faculty are tenured to the respective campus. Each core school is financially independent. Indiana University also has system schools and schools that operate beyond the Core campuses.

In the case of core schools, MRE decisions have the potential to affect that school at each location, and also broadly affect the Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses generally. Therefore, it is important to involve administrators, faculty, students, and constituents broadly on each campus so that all affected units have a chance to provide input and advice should a MRE of a core school be proposed.

Consistent with our commitment to shared faculty and administrative governance, the Indiana University faculty expects that the following principles shall govern such processes of MRE reorganization:

(1) **Consultation.** Faculty and student governance bodies shall be apprised of the need or desirability for reorganizing academic units and programs as early as possible in the MRE process of deliberation, so that their informed input may play a prominent and effective role in planning for change. For core schools, this means both the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) and Indianapolis Faculty Council (IFC), with notice to the University Faculty Council (UFC). The BFC, IFC, and UFC shall collaborate with administration to constitute an ad hoc MRE review committee for each such proposal, comprised of faculty proportionate to the faculty populations of each school and campus directly involved, and including appropriate representation from other affected units.

(2) **Faculty Response** Faculty members, librarians and others (e.g., professional staff), on either campus, shall have a reasonable period of time, to be decided in consultation with the UFC Executive Committee and the ad hoc MRE review committee, to provide feedback to the MRE Committee. They shall be invited to send their concerns to the ad hoc MRE review committee or to the Executive Committee of the faculty council on their campus. The ad hoc MRE review committee must be provided with documentation accurately describing the proposed reorganization and the justifications for it. The ad hoc MRE committee shall also receive (1) a financial forecast (including a draft budget [preferably for a three-to-five-year period] and an explanation of any reallocation of financial resources] and (2) an assessment of the benefits to teaching, research and service expected to arise from the MRE.

The MRE committee will prepare a report summarizing concerns expressed to it and offering its own comments on the proposed reorganization. The report shall be sent to relevant deans, provost(s) / chancellors and the university president – and considered by – them before any changes are finalized. The report shall also be sent to the executive committee of the UFC and parallel committees of the BFC and IFC.

(3) **Tenure.** Except under conditions of financial exigency (cf. AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure: “Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.”), the appointments of tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty members and librarians shall not be terminated as a consequence of such MRE reorganization. Necessary reductions in the number of tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty shall be achieved instead by voluntary reassignment or attrition.
(4) **Expectations for Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty.** Faculty members and librarians who are affected by the MRE reorganization of units and programs during the tenure probationary period and are then assigned to an IUPUI campus unit, may choose to be reviewed for tenure and promotion under the criteria and standards of the original home unit at the time they were first appointed or under those of their new home unit.

(5) **Reassignment to New Academic Home.** Faculty members and librarians (tenured and probationary tenure-track) whose academic home unit is merged, reduced, eliminated, renamed or in some other fundamental way reorganized may be reassigned to a new academic home based on the mutual fit of scholarly, scientific, or artistic interests. Every effort shall be made to find a new home that is agreeable both to the affected faculty member and to faculty members in the receiving unit, with the understanding that in rare instances it may be impossible to find an arrangement that fully satisfies all parties. While their current tenure-home campus has the primary and ultimate responsibility for finding a position for such faculty, reassignment to another IU campus may be a mutually desirable solution, especially in cases where the program as an academic entity continues in existence, although terminated on a specific campus. Faculty members and librarians remain obligated to perform customary research/creative activity, teaching and service responsibilities throughout the period of reorganization.

(6) **Principles governing Reorganization.** The following principles shall be honored in all MRE activities involving core schools of Indiana University:

   (A) **Compensation and Other Benefits.** Reorganization of academic units and programs shall not result in base pay reductions, in the alteration of negotiated agreements, or in the loss of time accumulated for sabbatical leave eligibility.

   (B) **Continuity of Degree Programs.** Every effort shall be made to enable students enrolled in degree programs at the time of reorganization to complete the requirements for those degrees.

   (C) **Contracts.** Contractual rights and obligations of faculty and graduate students shall be honored.

   (D) **Grievances.** Faculty members and librarians who object to personal consequences of the reorganization of academic units and programs may file a grievance with the Faculty Board of Review at their original tenure-home campus.

University Faculty Council 4/24/2012
Addition of verbiage under (4) Expectations for Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty was added to follow the 2023 IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

**Administrative Organization**
This section includes a brief description of IUPUI administrative committees on which faculty serve and a statement about Responsibility Center Management.

**Administrative Committees**
In addition to the standing committees of the IUPUI Faculty Council, a large number of administrative committees are involved in shaping IUPUI and directing its activities. Faculty member participation in this committee work is critical to faculty ownership of the institution. Faculty members wishing to serve on a
campus administrative committee should contact their school dean and the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council. Brief descriptions of the IUPUI administrative committees appear below.

**Academic Deans Group (Academic Affairs)**

EVC/CAO meets monthly with deans, associate vice chancellors for academic affairs, the executive director of Institutional Research and Decision Support, and the IUPUI Faculty Council president to discuss strategic initiatives related to academic affairs and operational aspects of campus leadership aligned with enrollment management, decision support, academic degree programs, and faculty affairs.

**Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (APPC) (Academic Affairs/Division of Enrollment Management)**

This committee performs much of the detail work in the development, implementation, and monitoring of student-related administrative academic policy for both undergraduate and graduate education. The committee provides a valuable forum in which members can raise issues and learn from the experience of other units. APPC members have a critical role in assuring that the updates and decisions made within the committee are properly communicated and implemented within their academic units.

[https://uc.iupui.edu/about/ucol-org/committees/academic-policies-procedures/index.html](https://uc.iupui.edu/about/ucol-org/committees/academic-policies-procedures/index.html)

**Academic Programs Committee (Academic Affairs)**

The Academic Programs Committee (APC) is comprised of the following individuals or their designees: the executive vice chancellor, the senior associate vice chancellor for academic affairs, the vice chancellor for finance and administration, the senior advisor to the chancellor for planning and institutional improvement, the associate vice chancellor for undergraduate education, the associate vice chancellor for enrollment management, the associate vice chancellor for graduate education, the president of the IUPUI Faculty Council (IFC), and the Chair of the IFC committee on campus planning (or another designee named by the IFC president). The APC reviews pre-proposals for new degrees and new free-standing certificate programs in advance of the development of a full academic proposal. In this way, the APC can facilitate communication among schools and programs at IUPUI that might be affected by the newly proposed academic program. This process facilitates cross school collaboration and paves the way for a smooth program development process if the proposal does move forward.

[https://due.iupui.edu/new-program-approval/academic-program-name/index.html](https://due.iupui.edu/new-program-approval/academic-program-name/index.html)

**Accreditation Steering Committee**

This committee leads the accreditation review process for the campus, creating the self-study report and preparing for the site visit. It begins its work several years prior to a scheduled site visit.

[https://irds.iupui.edu/reports-presentations/accreditation.html](https://irds.iupui.edu/reports-presentations/accreditation.html)

**Animal Care and Coordinating Committee**

This committee is responsible for assisting the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUCs) with the implementation of federal regulations and university policies as they pertain to the care and use of animals maintained for teaching and research purposes.

[https://research.iu.edu/compliance/animal-care/reviews-renewals/index.html](https://research.iu.edu/compliance/animal-care/reviews-renewals/index.html)
Athletic Affairs Committee
This committee is responsible for exercising institutional control of the intercollegiate athletic program at IUPUI as outlined by the applicable national, regional, and state athletic associations. It serves concurrently as a standing committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council.
https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/Committees/Athletic-Affairs

Campus Sustainability Committees
The Campus Sustainability Steering Committee provides assistance and leadership to the Office of Sustainability in the implementation of best practices across campus operations, provides leadership to guide established working groups in the development of campus goals, policies, and membership, assists in providing data needed, and reviews Greening IUPUI Grants. Other committees include Academics (focus: curriculum, research, faculty support, and course development), Campus Engagement (focus: engagement programming for students, faculty, and staff, and communications), Public Engagement (focus: campus-city collaboration and engagement with the city of Indianapolis), Operations (focus: air and climate, buildings, energy, grounds, purchasing, transportation, waste, and water), and Tree/Bee Campus USA (focus: Tree Campus USA program and the Bee Campus USA program).
https://sustainability.iupui.edu/

Center for Teaching and Learning Advisory Board (Reports to Office of Academic Affairs/Liaison to the CTL Director)
The Center for Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee consists of faculty and administrators from various schools and departments at IUPUI. The board advises the director of the Center for Teaching and Learning about strategic planning and programming priorities. Members have three-year appointments with approximately five members rotating off each year.

Chancellor’s Council of Deans
This council is advisory to the IUPUI chancellor and acts with appropriate regard for the prerogatives of the various faculties, the Faculty Council, the University administration, and the Board of Trustees of Indiana University. The Council of Deans concerns itself primarily with matters of academic administration.

Chancellor’s Professor Selection Committee
This committee is responsible for reviewing applications for Chancellor's Professor and recommending finalists to the IUPUI chancellor. The award recognizes senior faculty who display a record of extensive balanced accomplishment with special emphasis on impact to IUPUI's missions.
https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Honors-Awards/IUPUI-Campus-Awards/ChancellorsProfessors

Commencement and Special Ceremonies Committee
This committee assists in the coordination of events on the Indianapolis campus such as commencement ceremonies, dedications of new buildings, and other public occasions.

Enrollment Management Advisory Council
This council serves an important consultative role for the Division of Enrollment Management at IUPUI. The council serves as a key sounding board for the division in its planning, implementation, and assessment efforts. The council and its members provide recommendations and guidance on the full range of enrollment management activities from a variety of critical perspectives. It serves as an additional point
of connection and conversation between the division and the IUPUI campus, helping the division to best understand and address the needs and priorities of the campus and the campus to understand and take advantage of the leadership and services provided by the division in successfully fulfilling IUPUI’s enrollment management efforts.

https://dem.iupui.edu/resources/emac/index.html

Environmental Health and Safety
https://protect.iu.edu/environmental-health/index.html

**Campus Safety Committee**
The Health and Safety Committee promotes occupational health and safety in all areas of the IUPUI campus for the benefit of employees, students, and visitors. In general, the committee is responsible for:

- Identifying unsafe work practices and conditions and suggesting appropriate remedies
- Promoting OSHA compliance within work areas
- Recommending policies, procedures and training related to health and safety issues
- Reviewing specific health and safety related situations
- Conducting reviews to evaluate effectiveness of health and safety programs
- Educating co-workers regarding health and safety issues in the workplace


**Environmental Safety Committee**
The committee is concerned with chemical use, storage, and disposal; handling of hazardous and infectious waste; compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and ordinances concerning environmental and employee health and safety issues; reviews of laboratory safety programs, and of requirements of monitoring agencies such as Environmental Protection Agency, Occupational Health and Safety Agency, Department of Environmental Management, State Fire Marshall, and State Board of Health; recommended policies and procedures dealing with environmental and employee health and safety issues; and recommended revisions to existing procedures to insure compliance.

**Laboratory Safety Committee**
The Laboratory Safety Committee is a subcommittee of the Environmental Safety Committee. Its main purpose is to develop policies and procedures dealing with laboratory safety. The committee devises mechanisms to monitor and advises departments as to compliance with policies and regulations.

**Indoor Air Quality Committee**
The Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) Committee is a joint collaboration between Environmental Health and Safety and Campus Facility Services. The committee was developed to address indoor air quality complaints and concerns that arise within campus buildings and to work to identify and remediate the problems.


**Institutional Biosafety Committee**
This committee is responsible for implementing the federal guidelines for review and approval of all research activities involving recombinant DNA. Research studies using recombinant DNA must be approved by this committee.

https://research.iu.edu/compliance/biosafety/index.html
Radiation Safety Council (RSC)
The RSC has overall responsibility for the university's radiation safety program. The RSC coordinates the activities of various radiation safety committees, reviews the university's radiation safety program, and makes policy decisions.
https://research.iu.edu/compliance/radiation-safety/index.html

Radionuclide Radiation Safety Committee (RRSC)
The RRSC is the administrative body responsible for the safe handling of radioactive materials within the university. The establishment of this committee is required by the NRC. The RRSC meets at least four times a year and its responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the following: reviewing and approving or disapproving applications for the new or continued use of radioactive material within the university; prescribing special conditions that may be necessary for the safe handling of radioactive material; reviewing applications for new laboratories and other amendments to permits; taking any necessary action against unsafe procedures which could result in a significant radiation hazard and/or noncompliance with pertinent federal, state, or university regulations; serving as a consultant to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) regarding the use of radioactive material in humans for research.

Machine-Produced Radiation Safety Committee (MPRSC)
The MPRSC is the administrative body responsible for the safe use of machine-produced radiation. The MPRSC meets as warranted and its responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the following: reviewing and approving or disapproving applications and facilities for procedures involving machine-produced radiation; serving as a consultant to the IRB regarding the use of machine-produced radiation on humans for research.

Radioactive Drug Research Committee (RDRC)
The RDRC is the administrative body responsible for the utilization of radioactive materials in human research subjects for the purpose of obtaining basic information regarding human physiology, pathophysiology, or biochemistry, but not intended for immediate therapeutic, diagnostic, or similar purpose or to determine the safety and effectiveness of a drug in humans. This committee serves as an in-house extension of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), thus expediting review of protocols and eliminating the need to submit a Notice of Claimed Investigational Exemption for a New Drug (IND) form to the FDA in certain circumstances.

Equal Opportunity Council
The Equal Opportunity Council is a university standing committee that meets monthly, serving in an advisory capacity to the IUPUI Office of Institutional Equity. Its representatives hold key HR-related positions within the individual schools. The charge of this committee is to address issues and concerns related to equal employment opportunity in the workplace. It provides a unique opportunity for information sharing among different units that are largely decentralized.

Ethics in Research, Committee on
The purpose of this committee is to be responsible for making initial inquiries concerning alleged or apparent instances of misconduct in research activities and, where warranted, conducting a full investigation.
https://research.iu.edu/training/required/misconduct.html
Faculty and Staff Data Advisory Committee
As IUPUI continues to engage in data-driven decision making at all levels of the campus, effective data governance is essential to provide trusted, secure, timely, high-quality data consistently to all users. The purpose of the Faculty and Staff Data Advisory Council is to review faculty and staff data requests that may be questionable to ensure FERPA and other legal guidelines.

Fee Refund Appeals Committee
This committee deals with appeals on fee waivers, reduction, or refund policy with respect to involuntary withdrawals.

Forum Council (Academic Affairs)
Convened to support new/emerging initiatives and priorities that impact academic affairs and faculty affairs at IUPUI. Provides strategic direction for faculty development and curriculum development aligned with campus priorities (e.g., community engagement, curriculum internationalization, engaged learning, support for faculty and students from diverse groups, undergraduate research). Also provides opportunities to connect efforts across undergraduate and graduate education, enrollment management, and faculty affairs and to ensure that strategic priorities are being achieved, while also providing a context for collectively addressing challenges/threats. The Forum Council is associated with the Forum Network. https://theforum.iupui.edu/About/forum-council

Forum Network
The Forum Network’s mission is to provide integrated and holistic support to all educators at IUPUI, IUPUC, and IU Fort Wayne as they develop and advance professionally toward their individualized goals. The network intentionally forges and sustains connections among various centers, divisions, and offices providing professional development and support and helps to accelerate progress toward all strategic plan goals. https://theforum.iupui.edu

Graduate Affairs Committee (Office of Academic Affairs/Graduate Office)
This committee provides a campus forum to support and enhance graduate education at IUPUI in cooperation with the Indiana University and Purdue University Graduate Schools. It provides a central coordinating body and makes recommendations regarding fellowships, fee remission, and curricula. https://graduate.iupui.edu/faculty-staff/affairs-committee/index.html

Graduate Affairs Curriculum Subcommittee (Office of Academic Affairs/Graduate Office – Liaison: AVC for Graduate Education)
The Curriculum Subcommittee reviews all Indiana University Graduate School, Purdue University Graduate School, and “for graduate credit” courses offered at IUPUI. https://graduate.iupui.edu/faculty-staff/affairs-committee/curriculum.html

Graduate Affairs Fellowship Subcommittee (Office of Academic Affairs/Graduate Office – Liaison: AVC for Graduate Education)
The Fellowship Subcommittee reviews University and Travel Fellowship applications as well as Block Grant applications. https://graduate.iupui.edu/faculty-staff/affairs-committee/fellowship.html
Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)
The IRBs are charged with ensuring that those individuals participating in research are not subject to undue or inappropriate risks, that participation remains a voluntary right, and that the conduct of research is upheld as a privilege. The campus has several IRBs that review various segments of campus research and are assigned their reviews by the Research Administration Office. https://research.iu.edu/compliance/human-subjects/index.html

IUPUI Honors College Advisory Council
The IUPUI Honors College Advisory Council helps to advise on areas of academic process and policies, curriculum, budgetary affairs, and student affairs. It is comprised of faculty who are representative of the academic units on campus as well as units instrumental to the operation and success of the college. Members are appointed by their deans. https://honors.iupui.edu/about-us/advisory-council.html

Learning Technologies Steering Committee
The committee is charged to (1) Advise the appropriate associate vice president(s) and associate deans about priorities for the initiation and implementation of new teaching and learning technologies, enhancements to existing technologies, and the retirement of these technologies and services; (2) Provide an annual report to the appropriate Faculty Council committee(s) and the university community; (3) Consider policy issues related to the use of learning technologies and make recommendations to the appropriate governing organizations for consideration and possible action; and (4) Recommend improvements in services and support for learning technologies that may be suggested from the committee’s review of feedback from faculty, students and staff.

Parking Appeals Committee, Faculty-Staff-Student
The purpose of this committee is to provide an opportunity for all persons cited for violations of the University Motor Vehicle Regulations to be heard. The process involves appealing their citations and seeking redress through due process. The first step is a written appeal to be read and decided upon by the committee. The next and final step would then be to appeal in person. The committee is empowered, in accord with specified procedures, to sustain, deny, or reduce the severity of the violation. https://parking.iupui.edu/rules-regulations.html#Appeals

Policy Advisory Committee
This committee reviews drafted campus administrative policy and procedures documents before final approval by the Office of the Chancellor at IUPUI and subsequent promulgation. The committee’s review includes consideration of the policy’s practicability, clarity, and consistency with other campus policies and university policies and documents. https://fiad.iupui.edu/campus-policies.html

Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC)
This committee establishes guidelines for comprehensive program review for academic and administrative units and provides guidance for student outcomes assessment throughout the institution. It also provides a forum for the exchange of program review and assessment information and strategies among graduate and undergraduate programs and administrative units. This committee, which has faculty leadership, funds grants that promise innovative approaches or improved practice in assessment. It also has responsibility for preparing campus assessment plans and reports that may be required by the Higher Learning Commission. https://planning.iupui.edu/assessment/#PRAC
Resource Planning Committee
This committee is chaired by the vice chancellor for finance and administration and advises the chancellor on immediate and long-range fiscal matters to support academic and facilities planning for the campus. This committee is responsible for synthesizing input from key campus stakeholders – students, faculty, staff, and administrators. It recommends the campuswide budgetary agenda for each fiscal year, evaluates implications of potential policy changes, and considers other issues as determined by the chancellor.

Sabbatical Leaves Committee (Academic Affairs/Faculty Affairs)
This committee reviews applications for sabbatical leaves of absence and makes recommendations, based on specified criteria and standards, to the IUPUI chancellor through the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer.
https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Sabbaticals

Strategic Information Council (Academic Affairs)
Meets biweekly to regularly and strategically mine data repositories, including advising tools and institutional analytics developed internally (e.g., IUPUI Data Link developed by Institutional Research and Decision Support), by the Educational Advisory Board or available through Canvas, to identify soluble barriers to student success and to address them systematically. The council is tasked with nurturing a deliberate cycle of piloting responses to identified barriers, evaluating their efficacy, and rapidly scaling them up or implementing policy to support undergraduate student retention and success in coordination with the Enrollment Management Advisory Council, the Council on Retention and Graduation, faculty governance groups, and the Center for Teaching and Learning.
https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/About/Leadership/Strategic-Information-Council

Student Experience Council (SEC)
Co-chaired by the vice chancellor for student affairs and the associate vice chancellor for undergraduate education, the Student Experience Council (SEC) is composed of representatives from Enrollment Management, Student Affairs, Undergraduate Education, International Affairs, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Institutional Research and Decision Support, as well as representatives from academic units. The SEC provides a platform to stimulate and sustain collaboration among the Division of Enrollment Management, Division of Student Affairs, Division of Undergraduate Education, and the IUPUI academic schools around strategies, projects, and information focused on delivering the best possible experience to our undergraduate students. The SEC seeks, develops, and analyzes evidence on the student experience, identifying opportunities for innovation or improvement, and creating work teams to explore opportunities and implement initiatives to improve the student experience. The SEC pursues efforts to reduce barriers to persistence and on-time graduation. The SEC maintains a focus and attention on the development and execution of priorities related to student learning and success as outlined in the campus strategic plan.
https://dem.iupui.edu/resources/sec/index.html

Undergraduate Affairs Committee (Academic Affairs/Division of Undergraduate Education)
This committee is a standing faculty oversight and advisory body for the IUPUI campus comprised of associate deans and faculty members engaged in leading undergraduate curricula from across all schools conferring undergraduate degrees. It serves as the main undergraduate affairs governing and advisory board for the IUPUI campus, overseeing approval of new undergraduate degrees, subplans, minors, certificates, and name changes. It also oversees curricula and policies associated with the IUPUI General Education Core, including the review and coordination of undergraduate curriculum changes involving
general education courses. It coordinates the updating of four-year degree maps and helps to guide the development of curricular and academic policies to support on-time degree completion by beginning students, transfer students, and re-engaged adult learners.

https://due.iupui.edu/undergraduate-curricula/undergraduate-affairs-committee/index.html

University College Admissions Committee
This committee is comprised of representatives from IFC Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committees, as well as the associate vice chancellor for enrollment management, the director of undergraduate admissions, three University College senior faculty, a representative from University College Advising, and a representative from Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS). The committee meets annually to recommend admissions criteria for the entering freshmen class based on data provided by IRDS on student success.

Administrative Titles
(This pertains to the administrative titles of vice chancellors, the deans of schools, the dean of the IUPUI University Library, and the directors of support units organized as responsibility centers. For details on associate deans and assistant deans, see Section Two).

Search and Screen Procedures for Major Administrators

Major IUPUI administrative positions whose functions bear directly on the teaching/research/service mission of the Indianapolis Campus shall be filled through a formal search and screen process similar to that used for other academic positions, entailing a search and screen committee, search forms, and national advertising. Applicable positions are those subject to Review Procedures for IUPUI Campus Administrators (as listed in the current IUPUI Faculty Guide) and directors of interdisciplinary or interschool programs as appropriate.

Under exceptional circumstances, there may be departures from these procedures in which case the chancellor will confer with the leadership of Faculty Council (normally the president and vice president) prior to implementing the search.

As appointing officer for major IUPUI administrative positions, the chancellor shall appoint a search committee to aid in filling them. The chancellor shall first consult with the president and vice president of the Faculty Council to make sure that a majority of search committee members comes from names submitted by the Executive Committee and/or staff and student councils where appropriate.

The chair of the search committee shall also be appointed after consultation with the president and vice president, or in the case of a search for a school dean, with the president or leader of the appropriate school faculty governance organization.

If the search is for the dean of a school or of university libraries, faculty of that unit shall comprise a majority of the search committee. In such cases, the consultation and submission of names should normally come from the appropriate faculty governance leadership of that school or library.
In the case of new or significantly reorganized positions, there should be consultation with the Executive Committee early in the process.

The chancellor should make requests for the creation of search and screen committees in such a manner that ample time is available for the process, so that “interim” appointments are minimized in number and duration. Normally, within 15 working days of the chancellor’s request for committee members, the Faculty Council Executive Committee should provide a sufficient number of names and information about the individuals to select an appropriate committee. The chancellor will make the final committee list available to the president and vice president of the faculty before the official appointment of the committee.

The search committee shall follow existing affirmative action procedures in carrying out its work. The committee should be composed in a manner that adheres to the campus principle of encouraging diversity.

Major administrative search committees shall be no larger than is necessary to represent constituencies of the position. Normally the membership shall not exceed 13. In consultation with the chair of the committee, the chancellor shall designate secretarial and other support necessary for the work of the committee.

The chancellor shall convene the committee, with the Faculty Council president or vice president in attendance, as soon as practical, normally within two weeks of announcing membership. The chancellor shall give the search committee a written charge stating names of committee members, the role of the committee as spelled out by these search and screen procedures, the job description, the scope of the search, and time guidelines. Additional expectations may be stated in the written charge or discussed at the first meeting.

The search committee shall review the job description and may recommend changes to the chancellor. Any such changes would be discussed with the appropriate faculty body.

The search committee shall submit written recommendations, as requested in the charge, to the chancellor. If the chancellor rejects these, the chancellor shall give the committee a statement of reasons and may request further recommendations or appoint a new committee.

To assure equal access to potential advancement opportunities, major administrators shall inform all faculty in the appropriate unit of openings for associate dean, assistant dean, director and department chair positions to be filled internally (thus not subject to regular search and screen procedures). Before making these internal appointments, administrators shall solicit nominations and advice from their unit’s representative faculty body or its elected officers, or a search committee formed in consultation with faculty governance leadership.

For search procedures applying to the university president, vice presidents, the provost and chancellors of each campus, the associate vice president for online education, and the dean of the university graduate school, please see University Policy ACA-09 “Search and Screen Procedures for Administrators.”

**Review Procedures for IUPUI Administrators**

[https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/About/Administrative-Reviews](https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/About/Administrative-Reviews)

I. Introduction

IUPUI Faculty Guide

*Approved May 4, 2010; Updated Yearly and Archived on October 6, 2023*
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 campuswide 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 (Those officers reporting directly may be included in the review and reviewed at the same time as the officer they report to.) (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 approximately 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 multi-campus 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 unsolicited anonymous submissions but 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.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Revised 6/13/94; 01/20/2010; 5/2/2017
Approved by IFC, 2/2/2010; 5/2/2017
Editorial Changes made to some position titles; 6/29/15, 6/15/16

**Review Procedures for Core School Deans**

*University Policy ACA-11 “Review Procedures for Core School Deans”*

**Scope**

1. As of the effective date, this policy applies to the following deans who report to the Bloomington campus provost:
   a. Dean of the Luddy School of Informatics, Computing, and Engineering
   b. Dean of the Kelley School of Business
   c. Dean of the Paul H. O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs
2. As of the effective date, this policy applies to the following deans who report to the IUPUI campus chancellor:
   a. Dean of the School of Nursing

**Policy Statement**

1. Core school deans who report to the Bloomington campus provost, shall have their performance and that of their offices evaluated on a regular basis.
2. Core school deans who report to the IUPUI campus chancellor, shall have their performance and that of their offices evaluated on a regular basis.

**Reason for Policy**

Review provides a formal, systematic mechanism for faculty to have input into assessment of administrators. Well-designed reviews at regular intervals also provide opportunities for input and feedback for the improvement of administration, provide opportunities to acknowledge successful administration, and encourage both the administration generally and the individual administrator to set appropriate goals for the unit in question and to assess the administrator’s success in reaching those goals.

Review extends beyond the review of the individual administrator because, in general, it stimulates internal review of the units for which the administrator is responsible, and it allows those most directly affected (i.e., the faculty, students, and staff) to study the administrator's responsibilities.

Formally detailing separate review procedures for deans of core schools is desirable due to the inevitable complexities of administration in these multi-campus programs.

**Procedures**

1. For each of these deans, a comprehensive review (hereafter referred to as review) shall be conducted early in the fifth year in office and at recurring intervals of four years or more frequently if desired by the provost/chancellor. In addition, independent of these comprehensive reviews, each dean shall be evaluated by a survey distributed to the faculty of the dean's unit at the beginning of the dean's third year in office (see section 9). The provost or chancellor will provide reasonable and adequate staff and financial support for these review activities.

2. In the spring semester of each academic year, the provost and/or chancellor shall provide the University Faculty Council with a list of all core school deans subject to review the following year. The provost/chancellor shall request the creation of review committees simultaneously with the announcement of the deans to be reviewed in order to allow at least one semester for completion of the review process. 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. Each Review Committee will be assured of enough time to complete its work in a manner consistent with its charge.

The provost/chancellor shall have responsibility for selecting the members of the Review Committees according to the following procedures:

a. The Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Faculty Council and the Nomination Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council shall seek names from the Advisory Committee, Policy Committee, or similar faculty-elected committee (whichever is appropriate) of the unit being reviewed, and from other relevant groups, to be considered for inclusion in the list to be provided by the University Faculty Council Executive Committee. The majority of the members of each Review Committee shall be full-time faculty from the unit whose dean is being reviewed. Relevant members of the community may be nominated for membership on the Review Committee.

b. The University Faculty Council Executive Committee shall submit a list of prospective Review Committee members to the provost/chancellor. The UFC Executive Committee’s list shall contain approximately one-third more names than the number of committee members anticipated by the chancellor/provost to be on the Review Committee, so as to provide them with some choice in the selection of members for the committee. Only those individuals nominated by the UFC Executive Committee shall be appointed to the Review Committee.
c. The number of faculty selected from each campus in the core school shall roughly mirror the proportion of faculty from each such campus.

d. In addition to receiving nominations for the Review Committee from the University Faculty Council, the provost/chancellor shall solicit nominations from appropriate representative student and staff bodies as well as other constituencies, as appropriate, on both campuses.

e. The dean under review shall not provide any nominations for the Review Committee.

f. Before being finalized, the composition of the Review Committee shall be reviewed by the dean, who may object to any nominee for cause. The provost/chancellor shall give appropriate weight to these objections in forming the Review Committee.

g. The provost/chancellor shall select a senior faculty member, preferably a current or former dean, to chair the Review Committee.

3. The provost/chancellor and the co-chairs of the UFC shall convene the Review Committee. The provost/chancellor shall provide the Review Committee with a description of the duties and responsibilities of the dean under review, and the dean to be reviewed will provide a statement of her or his own goals and objectives. The Review Committee shall respond with data to the following questions as a minimum:

a. How has the dean exercised leadership of the unit, including working with appropriate constituencies to establish, maintain, and facilitate clear goals and objectives?

b. To what extent does the dean facilitate the achievement of these goals and objectives?

c. How effectively does the dean represent and promote the school to constituencies outside the university, including state stakeholders, national peers, and international groups?

d. How well has the dean managed resources to maintain the integrity of the unit when faced with outside pressures?

e. How is the unit perceived by its faculty and staff? How is the unit perceived on each campus of the core school and throughout the university system?

f. How effectively has the dean led the unit in carrying out unit and campus policies on both campuses, including implementing affirmative action plans and aligning the campuses’ and school’s strategic plans?

g. How effectively has the dean worked with and implemented policies adopted by relevant faculty governance bodies?

h. What are the dean’s strengths and weaknesses and their impact upon their effectiveness?

4. Review of core campus deans is both important and complex. Therefore, it is important for Review Committees to consider the following guidelines:

a. Opportunities for involvement should be provided to all stakeholder groups, including students, who can reasonably be assumed to have valuable input on the dean’s effectiveness. This involvement should include opportunities to suggest questions in addition to those listed in Section 5 (of this policy) that may be important within the context of the dean’s specific unit.

b. Although surveys, as described in Section 9 (of this policy), are an important part of the review process, they should not be the only method through which data are collected. Interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and examination of extant data, among other methods, could all be used to gather information on the dean’s effectiveness. Ideally, most findings – and all critical findings – should be checked using multiple methods.

c. Multiple members of the committee, from both campuses, should be involved in the analysis of data to ensure that one person’s perspective does not dominate the summary and recommendations in the final report.

5. The report should consist of a description of processes, a narrative and critique, a summary of the committee’s findings, supporting documentation, and recommendations. To ensure that the particular interests of each campus are represented, the report narrative should include a separate section
summarizing the results for each relevant campus in addition to a general summary that cuts across all campuses for which a dean is responsible.

6. Once a draft of the committee's report is available, the Review Committee shall observe the following procedures:
   a. The committee shall provide the reviewed dean with a copy of the draft report.
   b. The committee chair and a committee member of full faculty rank chosen by the committee shall meet (not less than three days later) with the dean being reviewed to discuss the draft report. The dean should be given an opportunity to respond, in writing, to the committee's findings before the committee meets with the provost/chancellor.
   c. The committee shall consider the dean’s feedback, if any is offered, and prepare the final report.
   d. The Review Committee then shall meet with the provost or chancellor to submit and discuss its final report, including the dean’s written response to the final report, if one is provided.
   e. The provost/chancellor shall meet with the dean to discuss the final report.

7. Copies of the reports of the reviews of the deans listed in the Scope above shall be conveyed to the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Council, the Agenda Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council, the Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Faculty Council, and to the dean's elected Policy Committee or corresponding elected governing body. A final report may be made public at the discretion of the dean reviewed.

8. The provost/chancellor, in consultation with the UFC Executive Committee and Review Committee chair, shall determine what elements of the final report and the provost/chancellor’s response should be included in a public summary document. That document must include an accurate characterization of the results of any data collection activities conducted by the Review Committee, although stakeholders’ verbatim quotes should not be included. The summary report should be distributed to all faculty and staff in the applicable core school.

9. Surveys shall be conducted as follows:
   a. survey shall be conducted at the beginning of a dean's third year in office. Thereafter, a survey shall be conducted as part of each comprehensive review.
   b. The provost/chancellor shall appoint an independent agent (such as the IUB Center for Survey Research or the IUPUI Survey Research Center) to design and conduct the survey.
   c. The survey shall be in three parts:
      1. A set of approximately 10 questions, the same for all deans, drafted by the University Faculty Council Executive Committee in consultation with the survey agent and approved by the University Faculty Council. These questions will address such issues as the dean's leadership, administrative skills, encouragement of faculty, and program development.
      2. A set of approximately 5 unit-specific questions prepared by the Review Committee in the case of a survey conducted in connection with a comprehensive review, or by the dean's elected Policy Committee or corresponding elected governing body, in the case of a survey conducted at the beginning of the dean's third year in office.
      3. Sufficient space for written comments.
   d. The survey agent shall send a copy of the survey to each faculty member of the dean's unit and collect all faculty responses within a specified period of time. The agent shall make a tabulation of the responses to the questions and a compilation of the written comments, without reference to the originator. 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 dean under review, the provost/chancellor, or others.
   e. A copy of the written comments shall be conveyed to the dean and to the provost/chancellor and shall be treated as confidential. The tabulated results of the remainder of the survey shall be
conveyed to the chancellor/provost, to the dean, and to the dean's elected Policy Committee or corresponding elected governing body. In the case of a survey conducted in connection with a comprehensive Review, the results also shall be made available to the Review Committee. The tabulated results shall be treated as confidential unless confidentiality is waived by the dean.

f. In the case of a survey conducted in connection with a comprehensive review, the tabulated results of the survey shall be reflected in the draft and final reports as stipulated in Section 8 above (of this policy). In the case of an initial survey of a dean, the provost/chancellor shall prepare a summary report of the tabulated survey results, in conformity with the procedures of consultation stipulated in Section 9 above (of this policy).

Approved by UFC, 3/26/2013
Edited for title and committee names by Karen Lee, 4/13/15
Edited to remove schools that no longer report to an IUB dean by Faculty Guide Committee, 5/21/19
Edited pronouns (he/she) for inclusivity (their), 7/1/20

Program Review
https://planning.iupui.edu/assessment/index.html#reviews

Academic program review is a collaborative process designed to bring to bear the judgment of respected colleagues in assessing and improving the quality of academic and service units. This process involves students, faculty, community members, school and campus administrators, and external specialists in the discipline in (1) gathering information about a program (i.e., a department, or a school if the school has no departments), (2) reviewing and analyzing this information during a site visit, (3) synthesizing all available information and making judgments about overall program quality and recommendations for improvements, and (4) following up to ensure that the unit is fully supported in its efforts to address the outcomes of the reviews.

While self-study and peer review are also fundamental components of the external process of accreditation, program review at IUPUI serves important internal purposes. In its statement of mission and goals this campus has committed itself to continuous improvement of its programs and services, to setting new standards for collaboration and interdisciplinary work, and to strengthening community connections that promote academic and cultural activities as well as economic and human development. Program review at IUPUI places emphasis on (1) involvement of campus administrators and faculty from IUPUI units other than the one undergoing review; (2) linkages between the program and the community it serves; (3) unit support and compliance with existing campus requirements such as integration of the IUPUI+ (PLUS), also known as the Profiles of Learning for Undergraduates Success, (formerly the Principles of Undergraduate Learning [PULs]) into undergraduate programs, and (4) connections between the review and planning, decision-making and resource allocation at departmental, school, and campus levels. These emphases ensure that the reviews contribute in a fundamentally important way to the attainment of the campus mission and that warranted recommendations for improvement stemming from them are carried out. Programs that are strengthened through peer review will enhance the overall quality and reputation of IUPUI.

Program review at IUPUI increases the sense of shared purpose among its many diverse academic programs and reinforces the need for coordinated planning for the future by all campus units. The involvement of campus administrators in the reviews ensures that meaningful and effective follow-up for each review will occur. The involvement of IUPUI faculty from academic units outside the one being
reviewed promotes campus-wide understanding of the contributions of each unit to the mission of the institution. The involvement of community members who have an interest in the program emphasizes the importance of IUPUI's connections with the community it serves and, at the same time, furthers community understanding of the program and of IUPUI. It should be noted that the term 'community' may be construed broadly in this context; some programs may perceive their community to be Indianapolis and central Indiana, others may wish to involve community members from throughout the state, while still others consider the region or the nation as their community.

Office of the Chancellor 12/2009
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IUPUI Formal Ceremonies

Formal ceremonies at IUPUI include the Chancellor's Honors Convocation, held each April to honor outstanding performance by IUPUI students, staff, and faculty; dedication and naming of major facilities; and the IUPUI Commencement ceremonies, which are held in May. All faculty, full-time and part-time, are encouraged to participate in these ceremonies. Faculty members also are encouraged to attend the Chancellor’s Employee Recognition Ceremony.

Ceremonies and other special events are planned and implemented by IUPUI’s Office of Academic Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Community Engagement, IUPUI’s Office of Alumni Relations, and Indiana University’s Office of University Events and Conference Services.
Section Two: The Academic Appointee and IUPUI

Voting Faculty for IUPUI Governance
The various faculty/librarian ranks and titles used in the Indiana University system are discussed in the University Policies website as well as in the IUPUI Faculty Guide, but some clarification regarding what constitutes the "voting faculty" should be made.

For Indiana University systemwide faculty governance, the voting faculty comprises those full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty in the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor plus full-time librarians in comparable ranks, and non-tenure track faculty if they hold the following appointments: clinical, lecturer or teaching professor, professor of practice, and research scientist/scholar.

For details, see the current (IUPUI Faculty Council Constitution and Bylaws Appendix F).

Academic Appointments at IUPUI

Full-Time Appointments at IUPUI
As noted in University Policies, the academic work of the university is done by individuals holding academic appointments in different classifications including (among others) tenured and tenure-track faculty and librarians, clinical faculty, lecturers, scientist/scholars, and professors of practice. While information in University Policies address many expectations and requirements for most types of academic appointments, the following sections are included to provide contextual details and expectations for appointments at IUPUI. For IU-wide information please refer to University Policy ACA-14 “Classification of Academic Appointments.”

For most human resources and governance purposes, a “full time” appointee is one who has at least a 75 percent appointment at IU/IUPUI. For faculty governance purposes, an individual who has an appointment split between two units will function as a “full time” voting member for one unit, although the other unit may explicitly extend voting privileges to them.

Clinical Appointments
This section supplements the university-wide description and policies for clinical appointments (non-tenure-track), as found in University Policy ACA-18 “Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments.”

Description of Clinical track appointments
Assistant, associate, and full clinical professors2 (hereinafter, “clinical faculty”) have responsibilities for teaching and service. They are to be evaluated on teaching and on service, and may seek promotion based on excellence in teaching, excellence in service, or on a balanced case.

2 In the School of Medicine, the proper form is, Assistant/Associate/Professor of Clinical XXXX, where XXXX is the department or specialty; in other schools, the form is Clinical Assistant/Associate/ Professor of XXXX.
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Appointment and qualifications
The qualifications of people hired as clinical faculty will depend on the needs and standards of the department. For work or teaching that involves provision of regulated services, maintaining a relevant professional license is expected. For initial appointment at the rank of associate or full, the endorsement of the unit’s Promotion and Tenure Committee is required.

Initial appointments are for either one or three years; after a three-year initial appointment reappointment is in one-year increments until a long-term appointment is awarded by the school. IU policy on notification of non-reappointment is in effect for all clinical faculty; after the second year of service, one year’s notice of non-reappointment is required. IU policy supports long-term appointments for clinical and lecturer faculty past a probationary period (ACA-18).

After an initial probationary period, determined by the school, clinical faculty may receive long-term appointments. Schools may tie these appointments to promotion (via campus procedures) or to an internal decision-making process. Schools or departments may require attainment of promotion (or long-term appointment) in order to maintain employment.

Nature of work
Clinical faculty typically have a lower class-based teaching expectation (number of sections) than lecturer-rank faculty, and a higher class-based expectation than tenure-track faculty. Clinical faculty may also have administrative responsibilities, although they may not be appointed to the status of department chair (IU policy), or of associate dean if the scope involves academic affairs (see IUPUI Faculty Guide section on Associate Deans).

Clinical faculty positions involve one or more of the following:
• Provision of medical, health, or legal services to clients and patients; partnering with or directing learners in providing the same.
• Developing, training, or building professional skills.
• Organizing or supervising internships, practica, and other off-campus learning experiences.
• Leading interactions with community organizations, businesses, and agencies.
  Faculty whose responsibilities do not include any of these or are clearly and exclusively (or nearly so) teaching in nature should be appointed as lecturer-rank faculty. However, some activities of lecturer faculty and clinical faculty will overlap.

Evaluation
Clinical faculty are expected to demonstrate satisfactory teaching and satisfactory service. With lecturer faculty, “service” may be solely university-based. With clinical faculty, there may be a disciplinary, professional, or community aspect to service as well.

Clinical faculty may select excellence in service, excellence in teaching, balanced-integrative, or a balanced-binned case. Excellence is manifested in relevant measures of outcomes (learning outcomes, service outcomes) as well as peer-evaluated dissemination. For consistency in expectations and evaluation, schools, departments, or programs should be clear in what is considered “service” and what is considered “teaching,” and make this explicit for external reviewers as well.
Lecturer Appointments
This section supplements the university-wide description and policies for lecturer appointments, as found in University Policy ACA-18 “Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments.”

Description of Lecturer track appointments
Lecturers, senior lecturers, and teaching professors are responsible primarily for teaching and scholarship in support of teaching. They are also expected to provide service that supports the academic mission of IUPUI.

At the entry level, lecturers will have completed an appropriate advanced degree or have the appropriate credentials as determined by the hiring department. Lecturers may have organizational and oversight responsibility for the courses in which they teach. They will also perform service for the department or school. Senior members of the department will supervise and mentor lecturers, according to department policies. After having completed a probationary period satisfactorily, lecturers are eligible for long-term appointments. This long-term appointment is controlled by the school, which may or may not tie it to campus processes for promotion to senior lecturer or teaching professor.

Appointment and qualifications
The qualifications of people hired for lecturer positions will depend on the needs and standards of departments. For initial appointment at a rank above lecturer (senior lecturer and teaching professor), the endorsement of the unit’s Promotion and Tenure Committee is required.

Minimal qualifications may be:
1. an advanced degree in a relevant field,
2. experience and instruction in effective teaching within the discipline,
3. an enthusiasm for teaching and
4. a commitment to developing as an educational professional.

Initial appointments are for either one or three years. After a three-year initial appointment reappointment is in one-year increments until a long-term appointment is awarded by the school. IU policy on notification of non-reappointment is in effect for all lecturer faculty; after the second year of service, one year’s notice of non-reappointment is required.

After an initial probationary period, determined by the school, lecturer faculty may receive long-term appointments. Schools may tie these appointments to promotion (via campus procedures) or to an internal decision-making process. Schools or departments may require attainment of promotion (or long-term appointment) in order to maintain employment.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Clinical and Lecturer

Orientation, supervision, and mentoring
New faculty should be oriented adequately to their responsibilities during their first year in the position. Mentors should be assigned within that first year to assist lecturers and clinical faculty in their work and to prepare for eventual promotion. Each school and department should establish clear reporting lines of authority

---

3 Teaching undergraduates: ‘undergraduates’ is removed.
**Promotion considerations**
Promotion recognizes past achievement and indicates confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. Promotion considerations must take into account the individual's contribution to the school/campus mission as well as differences in mission of varying primary and unit levels.

Promotion timelines may follow campus rules, which set no minimum or maximum time in rank, or schools may set their own expectations.

Clinical and lecturer positions are not intended to lead to tenure-track ones. Appointees who have extensive responsibilities for research or creative endeavors outside their teaching or service responsibilities should be appointed to tenure-track positions. Creation of a new non-tenure-track position is not intended to be a means of retaining a tenure-probationary faculty appointee who has not been able to demonstrate the performance levels required for tenure.

**Equitable salaries and fringe benefits**
Salaries for non-tenure-track faculty should be appropriate to their education, qualifications, experience, and responsibilities within their positions. Benefits such as retirement plans, access to health insurance, leaves of absence, and vacation should be equivalent to those offered to tenure-track faculty members.

**Professional development**
Schools and departments should put into place structures that provide clinical faculty and lecturers with on-going exposure to content and pedagogical developments within their fields. Professional development support should contribute to developing pedagogical practice and be equivalent to that which is provided to tenure-track faculty members. Responsibilities for the maintenance of professional licensure should be clearly specified.

**Creation of new non-tenure-track positions**
The chair of a department or director of a division will recommend the establishment of new lecturer or clinical faculty positions. These recommendations should be based on the teaching and service mission, goals, and needs of the department or division. The dean of the school and the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer for IUPUI will review and act upon the requests.

**Rights and privileges of clinical faculty and lecturers**
Clinical faculty and lecturers (all ranks) must follow and are protected by university policies, including those pertaining to faculty hiring and faculty annual reviews. Clinical faculty and lecturers (all ranks) have the right to petition the school grievance committees and the IUPUI campus faculty Board of Review for redress of grievances concerning dismissal, non-reappointment, academic freedom, salary adjustment, or other conditions of work. Clinical faculty and lecturers will follow the same procedures as tenure-track faculty members in doing so.

Clinical and Lecturer Section revised 6-2-22 with approval of the Faculty Affairs Committee, IFC Executive Committee, and the Faculty Guide Committee.
Research Associate
Research associates are professional academic appointees who are full-time researchers, but do not qualify for appointment to a research rank (research professor / research scientist). On the IUPUI campus, they have representation on the Staff Council, and special grievance procedures have been developed for research associates and other academic staff who do not have access to Faculty Board of Review procedures. Regulation of Research Associates is described in *University Policy ACA-20*.

Research Scientist/Scholar
While a complete description of appointments to the research ranks is available in the *University Policy ACA-14: “Classification of Academic Appointments,”* it is important to note that in certain cases alternative titles may be used for the scientist/scholar ranks. For individuals serving as principle investigators and applying for external grants, it may be advantageous to have a “professorial” title. Therefore, it may be requested that the following titles be assigned:

Assistant Scientist/Scholar = Assistant Research Professor  
Associate Scientist/Scholar = Associate Research Professor  
Senior Scientist/Scholar = Senior Research Professor

Regulation of research appointments is described in *University Policy ACA-20: “Regulation of Research Appointments.”*

Research professors/scientists have responsibility for research. They may do some service, and may teach upon occasion, but may not be promoted based on teaching or service. Units should delineate criteria for research scientists that clearly distinguish expectations for tenure track faculty from non-tenure track research scientists.

Continued appointment of research scientists depends upon available funding and is not subject to the “non-reappointment” notification periods that apply to pre-tenure, clinical, lecturer, and professor of practice faculty.

Academic Specialist Appointments
NOTE: There are restrictions on hiring new academic specialists. Please contact the Office of Academic Affairs for more information.

Academic Specialist
This classification requires a specific title indicative of the work responsibilities. Currently approved titles include, but are not limited to director, manager, coordinator, advisor, community scholar, international affiliate, assistant dean, and associate dean. NOTE: an academic specialist may not serve as an associate dean for academic affairs or in a similar capacity by a different title if the position has direct authority over academic programs such as curriculum or academic personnel. Other titles may be approved by the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer.

Description
This classification has been designated for appointees with academic responsibilities who do not themselves offer courses for credit or act as principal investigators in research. Such roles will include specialized academic functions such as curating collections, directing specialized academic advising,
directing, scheduling, managing, or coordinating courses (but not curriculum development), administering research protocols, overseeing civic engagement, and general academic administration. Appointment in this classification will reflect the individual’s significant and meaningful contributions to meeting the educational objectives for the unit and campus. These may often be less than full time positions, but they may be coupled with actual teaching or research positions to total a full-time, benefits-eligible appointment for an individual.

Qualifications
Individuals serving in an academic specialist position must have at least a master’s degree in a field that will provide them the required expertise to perform the administrative or collaborative work required in their area.

Appointing Unit
An academic specialist may hold appointment in a department, school, center, or academic service unit subject to the approval of the senior academic administrative officer of the unit and the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer.

Term
Existing academic specialist appointments may be continued as permitted by funding. These are not tenure-eligible positions. Appointments at less than 100% FTE may be held in conjunction with other academic appointments to total 100% FTE. Required notice of termination is one pay period prior to termination date; it is expected that notice will be three months in the first year of appointment, six months in the second year of appointment, and 12 months thereafter.

Appointment Procedures
No new academic specialist positions may be created at IUPUI, nor may a new person fill an existing position if the incumbent retires or resigns, according to administrative and IFC decisions. Any current position that becomes vacant should be reorganized as either a faculty (clinical, professor of practice, lecturer, or tenure track) or staff role.

Responsibilities, Rights and Privileges
Academic specialists are employees of Indiana University and are subject to IUPUI and Indiana University regulations, including academic policies, to include, but not limited to, policies regarding academic ethics, sexual harassment, and non-discrimination. Academic specialists have the privileges of computer access, library resources, parking, and other use of facilities granted to academic appointees at IUPUI. They are eligible for fringe benefits, if working at an appropriate FTE, and leave of absences. They have the right to notice of termination as noted above. They are not eligible to participate in faculty governance and are not eligible for tenure.

Administrative Titles for Academics

Associate Dean
The duties of an academic appointee as associate dean may be part-time, and the title can be used only in conjunction with a full-time faculty appointment. This is a title used within a school or other academic unit, which is the “appointing unit.” It is not itself a classification.
Associate dean positions are associated with oversight for administrative work such as teaching, research, civic engagement, student services, financial management, development and so forth. Specific duties are identified for each area of responsibility, such as associate dean for research, for undergraduate studies, for academic affairs, for financial affairs, for external affairs, for development, for technology services, for clinical programs, for civic engagement, and so forth.

**Classification**
In general, the appointment may be a full-time academic appointee as lecturer, professor (any rank), clinical professor (any rank), or research professor (any rank).

In the special case of an associate dean for academic affairs, the rank of tenured associate or full professor is required. Academic Affairs includes full or partial responsibility for academic appointments, promotion, tenure, or annual review of other academic appointees, new course or degree approval, program review, or other functions that directly impact the academic mission of the unit.

**Qualifications**
A tenured faculty appointment is required for an associate dean for academic affairs (or other associate dean position with responsibility for academic affairs as defined above). The master’s degree is the minimum academic credential for all associate dean titles. Other requirements appropriate to the particular responsibilities of the associate dean may be added by the school.

**Appointment Procedures**
Associate deans may be recruited from within the school or external to IUPUI. A formal search process must be used, and a recommendation to offer appointment must be approved by the executive vice chancellor.

**Term**
The term of an associate dean appointment will be stipulated at the time the appointment is made, but the title may be discontinued at any time, without a required notice period, at the discretion of the appointing officer. Non-reappointment or termination of the faculty appointment is made in accord with the policies applicable to the academic appointment. In each instance, the notice requirements will be observed as stipulated for each academic classification. Tenured faculty may have the administrative title reviewed at the discretion of the appointing officer but may be terminated from the faculty appointment only in accord with applicable policies.

**Responsibilities, Rights and Privileges**
Appointment as associate dean will not alter, increase or diminish the responsibilities, rights and privileges already inherent in being an academic employee of IUPUI and Indiana University. The title of associate dean is awarded by the appointing officer after approval by the executive vice chancellor and may be removed by the appointing officer by the same process at any time; in those cases the individual would revert to their original non-administrative faculty position.

**Assistant Dean**
Specific duties are identified for each area of responsibility, such as assistant dean for development, for resource management, for facilities, for advising, or for student services. This position/title may be used for administrative duties associated with the coordinating and management functions of the school.
Classification
The Assistant Dean position may be posted as either an academic position or a professional staff position (Exempt-Individual Contributor or People Leader). If a position is to be Exempt (Individual Contributor or People Leader), it must be at the appropriate rank. If it is an academic appointment, the appointee must qualify for an academic classification. In the instance of academic appointments, the appointee must have a full-time appointment in an academic classification; duties as Assistant Dean may be part-time in combination with other academic responsibilities.

Qualifications
If position is to be Exempt (Individual Contributor or People Leader), then consultation with Human Resources must be held in order to create the position at the appropriate level. If position is to be academic, the expected academic credential associated with the position is minimally a master’s degree. (If the academic specialist classification is used for the position, a master’s degree is required.) However, in some cases, exceptions will be made for candidates holding only a baccalaureate, based on the duties of the position and relevant past experience of the candidate; in these instances, the appointment will be as an Exempt (Individual Contributor or People Leader).

Appointment Procedures
Assistant deans may be recruited from within the school, or external to IUPUI. In either case, if the appointment is to be academic, normal academic search procedures must be followed, and the recommendation to offer must be approved by the executive vice chancellor. If the position is to be a professional administrative staff appointment, the appointing unit must follow the guidelines set by Human Resources and also submit the proposed candidate’s documentation to the executive vice chancellor for approval. If a search is open to either staff or faculty, or if an external candidate might be hired as either staff or faculty, the position must be searched via both academic and staff procedures.

Term
If the appointment is a professional administrative staff appointment, there is no stipulated term definition required. Notice of non-reappointment or termination is made in accord with established HR policies. In the case of an academic appointment, the title may be discontinued at any time at the discretion of the appointing officer. Non-reappointment or termination of the underlying academic appointment is made in accord with the policies applicable to that academic appointment. Tenured faculty may have the administrative title reviewed at the discretion of the appointing officer but may be terminated from the faculty appointment only in accord with applicable policies.

Responsibilities, Rights and Privileges
Appointment as assistant dean will not alter, increase, or diminish the responsibilities, rights and privileges already inherent in being either an academic or professional administrative staff employee, as applicable, of IUPUI and Indiana University. The title of assistant dean is awarded by the appointing officer after approval by the executive vice chancellor and may be removed by the appointing officer by the same process at any time without affecting the right to notice or a grievance procedure as appropriate to the academic appointment or the professional staff appointment.

Dean of the Faculties 12/2009
Revised to reflect current professional staff appointment titles under the Job Framework Redesign 05/2021
Other Academic Appointments

Honorary Appointments
Civic engagement at IUPUI takes many different forms and draws upon both institutional and external resources to meet educational objectives across teaching, research, and service. These honorary, collaborative appointments may be held in a department, school, center, or academic service unit subject to the approval of the senior academic administrative officer of the unit and the executive vice chancellor. The initiative for applying for an appointment of this type may come from either the candidate or an IUPUI faculty or staff person. In either case, a letter from a center director, chair, or dean stating how the nominee will contribute to the mission of the appointing unit and stating the privileges to be granted to the individual for what period of time should be sent, along with supporting documentation, to the Office of Academic Affairs for review and approval, just as for any full-time academic appointment.

These individuals are not employees of Indiana University and are not subject to IUPUI or Indiana University regulations except that they will voluntarily consent to observing IUPUI policies regarding academic ethics, non-discrimination, and sexual harassment. Contingent on the scope and nature of their affiliation, they may be asked to observe other specific policies upon initial appointment or renewal of appointment. They may be accorded certain academic privileges as specified in the letter of appointment. They do not have any rights or privileges implied by an employment relationship and may be terminated at any time at the discretion of the appointing unit. Renewal or extensions of appointments are to be based on a review of its mutual benefit.

Community Scholar
The community scholar title may be modified by the use of one of the terms: teaching, research, or service. Alternative titles: field experience supervisor; clinical supervisor.

A community scholar represents a formal, flexible, and term appointment with academic status at IUPUI. The appointment reflects a colleague’s significant and meaningful contributions to meeting educational objectives for IUPUI students through community-based learning activities, research, or professional service. A community scholar is expected to engage in these activities through such roles as supervising community-based internships, clinical placements, field experiences, or service learning; teaching in an approved curriculum of the Community Learning Network or other formally recognized school-based continuing education program; serving as a co-teacher from another state or nation via distance education; participating in organized research conducted under the auspices of an academic or academic service unit; or providing direct services at a high level of responsibility in cooperation with an academic unit of the campus. The community scholar is differentiated from an adjunct appointment by not having direct responsibility and authority for teaching (i.e., awarding credit), research (i.e., receiving grants or contracts), or implementation of service (i.e., obligating the institution).

Qualifications
Community scholars are expected to have expertise through experience or training that prepares them to contribute to the educational achievement of students in community-based learning. A record of sustained participation with academic units of IUPUI is expected, ordinarily of at least a year’s duration. Recommendation for appointment should be based on a documented record of significant contribution (e.g., certification as a qualified internship or field experience supervisor). The candidate’s expertise and
training must be broadly consistent with clearly understood learning objectives, research objectives, or professional service. Ordinarily, a community scholar will hold a baccalaureate or advanced degree.

**Term**
Appointments can be for up to five years. Appointments may be renewed. This appointment may not be held concurrently with any other academic appointment whether full or part-time.

**Community Associate**
A community associate represents a formal yet flexible appointment with academic status at IUPUI. The appointment reflects a colleague’s significant and meaningful alignment with and support of the mission of IUPUI in cooperation with full time faculty or academic administrators. Community associates, however, do not have direct responsibility for supervising IUPUI students or staff.

**Qualifications**
Community associates are expected to have specific knowledge and expertise deriving from their roles in the community that allow them to support the mission of IUPUI.

**Term**
Appointments are for up to two years. Appointments may be renewed. This appointment may not be held concurrently with any other academic appointment whether full or part-time.

**Visiting Community Associate**
A visiting community associate represents a formal yet flexible appointment with academic status at IUPUI. The appointment reflects a colleague’s significant and meaningful alignment with and support of the mission of IUPUI in cooperation with full time faculty or academic administrators. Visiting community associates, however, do not have direct responsibility for supervising IUPUI students or staff. The visiting status is designed to accommodate a person with a short-term involvement with IUPUI of six months or less. It may appropriately be used for members of program review or accreditation teams, for government officials with specific limited needs and roles, members of a task force or commission, and the like.

**Qualifications**
Visiting community associates are expected to have specific knowledge and expertise deriving from their roles in the community that allow them to support the mission of IUPUI.

**Term**
Appointments are for up to six months. Appointments may be renewed but persons with involvement beyond a short time should be appointed as a community associate or community scholar. This appointment may not be held concurrently with any other academic appointment whether full or part-time.

**International Scholar**
The international scholar title is similar to the community scholar and should be viewed as its equivalent. On occasion, the title may be modified by the use of one of the terms: teaching, research, or service.

An international scholar represents a formal, flexible, and term appointment with academic status at IUPUI. The appointment reflects a colleague’s significant and meaningful contributions to meeting IUPUI’s mission through internationally-based learning activities, research, or professional service. An
International scholar is expected to engage in these activities through such instructional roles as supervising students in study abroad programs including service learning, internships, and clinical rotations, serving as a mentor to graduate students or faculty in sustained academic work in a nation or region outside the United States, or participating in an instructional program through distance education on more than an occasional basis; through collaborating in research that continues beyond a year; or through providing direct services at a high level of responsibility in cooperation with an academic unit of the campus. The international scholar is differentiated from an adjunct appointment by not having direct, sole responsibility and authority for teaching (i.e., awarding credit), research (i.e., receiving grants or contracts), or implementation of service (i.e., obligating the institution). The international scholar will have another nation as the principal site for work and living and will not hold any permanent visa status with the United States.

Qualifications
International scholars are expected to have expertise through experience or training that prepares them to contribute to the academic mission of IUPUI. Recommendation for appointment should be based on a documented record of prior significant contribution for a sustained period (e.g., certification as a contributor to distance learning, collaboration on externally funded research) or an expectation that the candidate will be in residence at IUPUI for at least a semester. The candidate’s expertise and training must be broadly consistent with clearly understood learning objectives, research objectives, or professional service. Ordinarily, an international scholar will hold a terminal degree appropriate for a professorial appointment.

Any appointment that involves residence at IUPUI that requires a visa will need to be cleared in advance with the Office of International Affairs.

Term
Appointments can be for up to five years. Appointments may be renewed. This appointment may not be held concurrently with any other academic appointment at IUPUI, whether full or part-time.

International Associate
An international associate designation represents a formal yet flexible appointment with academic status at IUPUI. The appointment reflects a colleague’s significant and meaningful alignment with and support of the international dimensions of the mission of IUPUI in cooperation with full time faculty or academic administrators. International associates, however, do not have direct responsibility for supervising IUPUI students or staff.

Qualifications
International associates are expected to have specific knowledge and expertise deriving from their roles in their home nations or international organizations that allow them to support the mission of IUPUI. Ordinarily, an international associate will hold a terminal degree appropriate for appointment at the lecturer or higher rank.

Any appointment that involves residence at IUPUI that requires a visa will need to be cleared in advance with the Office of International Affairs.
Term
Appointments are for up to two years. Appointments may be renewed. This appointment may not be held concurrently with any other academic appointment at IUPUI, whether full or part-time.

International Affiliate
An international affiliate represents a formal yet flexible appointment with academic status at IUPUI for a short term of six months or less. The appointment reflects a colleague’s significant and meaningful alignment with and support of the international dimensions of the mission of IUPUI in cooperation with fulltime faculty or academic administrators, typically in conjunction with a project, course, or activity during a semester or summer session. International affiliates, however, do not have direct responsibility for supervising IUPUI students or staff. The affiliate status may appropriately be used for members of program review or accreditation teams, for government officials with specific limited needs and roles, members of a task force or commission, persons teaching in a distance education course for a year or less, a collaborator on a research project for a year or less, and the like. Any appointment that involves residence at IUPUI that requires a visa will need to be cleared in advance with the Office of International Affairs.

Qualifications
International affiliates are expected to have specific knowledge and expertise deriving from their roles in the community that allow them to support the mission of IUPUI. Ordinarily an advanced degree is expected but exceptions can be made.

Term
Appointments are for up to six months. Appointments may be renewed but persons with involvement beyond a short time should be appointed as an international associate or international scholar. This appointment may not be held concurrently with any other academic appointment at IUPUI, whether full or part-time.

Distinguished
The designation “Distinguished” may be added to any of the above appointment types. The designation is made in the “Notes” section of the appointing document. For an honorary volunteer to be designated as “Distinguished,” the relevant administrator must make a recommendation to, and receive an endorsement by vote of the faculty of the relevant unit, either as a whole or by an appropriate committee. Ordinarily, the qualification “Distinguished” would apply to persons with exceptional achievements and experience in professions, business, government, or community as appropriate. This designation applies only to these listed titles. It does not apply to adjunct or no-pay appointments which are not one of these listed titles. People who are in paid positions, full- or part-time, may not use the term “distinguished” unless they qualify under IU Policy ACA-39, “Distinguished Ranks.”
Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee, 1/2022
Approved by the IUPUI Faculty Council, 2/1/2022

Voluntary Appointments
In addition to the above honorary appointments, most of which are without pay, the university also provides units with the ability to make voluntary academic appointments to individuals who will contribute regularly or occasionally to academic programs or to students’ academic work. These may be physicians who occasionally lecture, or include students as observers in their practices, lawyers, nurses, teachers or social work practitioners who oversee students in professional settings, or any of several other individuals
contributing to the academic mission. These appointments are without any remuneration or benefit and are renewed by the academic units at intervals through a written appointment process.

These are termed “ACNP” (academic no-pay) and are AC1 academic appointees.

If an individual, if employed by IU, would qualify for a professorial title, the typical administrative designation is “Adjunct xxxx” where “xxxx” is appropriate academic rank and type, such as “Adjunct Assistant Professor,” “Adjunct Clinical Professor.” This use of the term “adjunct” is different from the word “adjunct” used for those who are part-time instructors (per-course associate faculty) who are AC2 appointees.

Part-Time Appointments at IUPUI

IUPUI Policies Concerning Adjunct Academic Appointments
Adjunct academic appointees are hired by schools on a temporary basis for per-term appointments based on changing needs. Subject to review by the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer, each school is responsible for appointing, evaluating, and reappointing adjunct academic staff in accord with the policies found in the University Policies. Consistent with University Policy ACA-14: “Classification of Academic Appointments” and the following general policies, each school should develop its own policies and procedures statement for adjunct academic staff. In the absence of school statements, the following general policies will apply to adjunct academic appointees.

Although most adjunct appointments are made at the rank of lecturer, appointment at other ranks may be approved when credentials and circumstances warrant. Adjunct appointments are for teaching only. Appointments for service or research may not be made through the adjunct category.

IUPUI Policies in regards to oversight of adjunct faculty are written in accordance to University Policy ACA-26 “Support of Associate Instructors and Adjunct Faculty.”

Exceptions
These policies do not apply to persons appointed to AC1 line-numbered positions on a continuing basis even when their appointments are less than 100%. Similarly, student academic appointees (i.e., associate instructors, graduate assistants, faculty assistants, and research assistants; AC3s) are a distinct group and are covered by separate IUPUI policies; however, policies for student academic employees should reflect the same concerns addressed below and should be stated in writing.

In brief, each academic appointee, whether full- or part-time, should have the benefit of and be advised of policies that govern her or his conditions of employment. The policies are not the same for full-time and part-time academic appointees.

Appointments and Reappointments for Adjunct Faculty
All appointments for adjunct faculty are for a specific academic term to meet school teaching needs. There are no indefinite term appointments for adjunct faculty. Further, no appointment for adjunct faculty may be for more than 69% FTE (for adjuncts in 10-month positions) or 47% FTE (for adjuncts in 12-month positions). Standard hour limits are based on a relationship of 1 credit hour equaling to 3 standard hours per week (4 for a summer course). Thus, for example, 9 credit hours equals 27 standard hours per week; 30 standard hours equals 75% FTE. For summer session adjunct appointments, a credit hour will be
counted as 4 standard hours. Adjunct faculty may teach a maximum of 6 credit hours in the summer.

There are no exceptions allowed for higher FTEs during any part of the year.

Reappointment is based on unit need and documented performance. When dismissal is based on performance, the adjunct academic appointee may seek a review of the decision within the unit of appointment according to applicable review procedures of that unit. There is no review process for non-reappointment. In all cases, the review of the dean of the school will be final; there is no appeal process for dismissal or other grievances beyond the dean of the appointing school.

**Evaluation**
The performance of each adjunct appointee should be reviewed according to a systematic plan. A written statement summarizing the substance of each evaluation should be maintained in department or school files and a copy given to the adjunct faculty member. The Office of Academic Affairs should receive a copy of the evaluation protocol for the unit and written notification that reviews have been completed (and filed) according to the protocol; copies of individual evaluations should not be forwarded unless requested.

Each unit should design its evaluation protocol to meet the needs of the unit and the adjunct appointee for the purposes of professional development and personnel decision. A common component of the evaluation system should be that all courses taught by adjunct persons are evaluated regularly using assessment materials and processes as prescribed by the unit; student evaluations and full-time faculty peer evaluations should ordinarily be components. The adjunct appointee should have the opportunity to attach comments to the evaluation data which become a part of their file. Adjunct academic staff should have the option to submit sample materials to demonstrate teaching performance and the obligation to submit specific materials based on the school or department evaluation protocols. Class visitation is strongly encouraged as a part of the evaluation of adjunct lecturers new to the unit or those seeking or needing developmental guidance.

Based on evaluation materials, the responsible unit administrator should provide an evaluation summary and a recommendation regarding future appointment. This summary should be shared with the adjunct appointee and a copy should be filed in the Office of the Dean. Reappointment should not occur in the absence of evaluation data and a positive reappointment recommendation.

Adjunct appointees must recognize that class visitation by the department chair or designee is expected. Adjunct appointees are required to cooperate in evaluation of teaching, including class visitation.

**Course Conduct and Academic Freedom**
Adjunct academic appointees must observe [University Policy ACA-33](#) “Academic Appointee Responsibilities and Conduct.” Complaints by students involving adjunct academic appointees will be resolved in the same manner and with the same assurance of due process as is followed for full-time faculty and as specified in the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Ethics (or approved school alternative).

**Salary**
Each school will establish salary schedules for adjunct academic appointees annually. The salary schedule must be made available in writing upon request. Salary complaints must be addressed within the school in accord with established procedures.
Reviews and Reappointment Procedures for Probationary Faculty

Types of Reviews
Following is a description of the various types of reviews conducted during a faculty member’s probationary period:

Faculty Annual Summary Report
IUPUI faculty are required to provide an annual report of their activities, according to school requirements for content and due dates. The system used by most IUPUI faculty is Digital Measures Activity Insight, accessible from one.iu.edu. The information provided by the faculty member is used in completing the Annual Review, determining awards or bonuses if offered, and providing reports to school, campus and university administration on faculty achievements.

Annual Reviews
IUPUI observes a mandated annual review policy for all faculty in accordance to University Policy ACA-21 “Faculty and Librarian Annual Reviews.” This review is normally conducted by the principal administrative officer of the department or school in which the faculty member holds an appointment. The purpose of the annual review is to provide input on the faculty member's progress in the areas of teaching, research, and service, leading to the tenure review year (or, for non-tenure track faculty, to reappointment on a long-term contract) and to promotion. Annual reviews also provide information for use in salary recommendations and other assessments. To be most beneficial to the faculty member, these reviews should be candid and critical appraisals of the faculty member's work and should call attention to weaknesses as well as strengths. The department chair or senior administrator should meet with the faculty member to discuss the review, and there should be a final comprehensive document generated within a short period of time after this meeting. This final comprehensive document should be fully edited to incorporate all the notes and a summary of the discussion between the chair and the faculty member that conveys the chair's evaluation in light of faculty input. This final version of the comprehensive document should be signed and dated by the supervisor and the faculty member. One printed copy of the signed document should be given to the faculty member at that time and another kept by the department, along with electronic copies. Although campus and university policies do not require annual peer reviews, they are strongly recommended, and some school bylaws may make such a provision.

Reappointment Recommendations
Inherently, the reappointment recommendation constitutes a written form of review. After the period of initial appointment, reappointment is considered annually until the end of the probationary period, and thereafter, for non-tenured faculty, at intervals one year prior to the end of a multi-year appointment. Most schools base reappointment recommendations on the annual review, but faculty subject to annual reappointment should become familiar with the procedures followed in their respective units. Although
campus and university policies do not require committee reviews for reappointment, some school bylaws may make such provision.

**Policy on Third-Year Formative Review of Tenure-Probationary Faculty and Librarians**

IUPUI faculty and librarians (hereinafter referred to collectively as “the faculty” or “the faculty member(s)”) represent our campus’s most valuable resource. The university makes a substantial long-term investment in its faculty. Our tenure-probationary faculty’s success must be among the highest priorities for all campus administrative officers.

While IUPUI has in place an annual review policy mandating that all faculty members be provided with a yearly written evaluation of their work in the areas of teaching, research, and service (or, in the case of librarians, the equivalent areas of performance, professional development, and service), these annual reviews are frequently conducted by the department chair or the school dean alone, without the participation of a peer review committee.

**The Policy**

To ensure that all tenure-probationary faculty members benefit from helpful and meaningful assessments of their progress toward promotion and tenure near the mid-point of their probationary period, a THREE-YEAR FORMATIVE REVIEW [hereinafter referred to as the “REVIEW”] shall be conducted on all such faculty members during the spring semester of the third year of their appointments in accordance with the following guidelines.

**Applicability**

This policy applies to all tenure-probationary faculty members at IUPUI, with the exceptions noted immediately below. The term “third year” refers to the third full academic year of the tenure-probationary faculty member’s appointment. However, faculty members who enter with one year of credit toward tenure are in their “third year” during their second full academic year of appointment, and those who enter with two years of credit are in their “third year” during their first full academic year of appointment. Those who enter either with tenure or with more than two years of credit toward tenure are exempt from the REVIEW.

**Procedures**

In schools or units where faculty-approved policies or guidelines for conducting the REVIEW already exist, those policies or guidelines should be followed to the extent that they do not seriously conflict with the general procedures set forth below. If there is conflict, especially regarding due dates and required documentation, such schools or units ought to resolve it by either revising their policies or guidelines accordingly or negotiating special arrangements with the Office of Academic Affairs.

In schools or units where such policies or guidelines have not yet been formulated or approved by the faculty, the REVIEW shall in the interim be conducted in adherence with the following general considerations.

1. The chief purpose of the REVIEW is to provide tenure-probationary faculty members with feedback from the school or unit level review committees regarding their cumulative progress toward promotion and tenure. Hence, other than the department chair or school dean, involvement by the department’s Primary Committee (where applicable) and/or the school’s Unit Committee (where applicable) in the REVIEW is essential.
2. The order of review and deliberation involving the department chair or school dean and the Primary and Unit Committees should generally follow the sequence and procedure used by each school in handling ordinary tenure and promotion cases.

3. The faculty member being reviewed should submit only a candidate’s statement together with an up-to-date vita (in accordance with the “IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers”). The statement (not to exceed five pages) should be similar in organization to the statement the faculty member would expect to write at the time of making a case for promotion and tenure. In particular, it should clearly state the anticipated area(s) of excellence or the intention to request consideration on the basis of a balanced case.

4. The department chair or school dean and the primary and unit committees (where applicable) must each provide the faculty member with a written assessment that includes evaluation of progress toward promotion and tenure, using normal and appropriate metrics that will eventually be employed in a tenure decision. If the chair, the dean, or the committees identify any problems, their assessment must include specific suggestions for remedy aimed at helping the faculty member and the faculty member’s department or unit in their efforts to rectify the problems.

Documentation and Reporting
A copy of each review report, whether by the committees, the chair, or the dean, shall be communicated to the faculty member under review within three days of the time it is completed.

To ensure that the REVIEW is properly conducted for all applicable tenure-probationary faculty members, the dean of each school shall be responsible for submitting copies of the chair’s (if applicable), the dean’s and the committees’ reports on all tenure-probationary faculty members who have been reviewed to the chief academic officer through the Office of Academic Affairs by May 1 each year. One searchable PDF with the reviews, candidate’s statement, and CVs should be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs using the current procedure.

Limitation on the Use of the REVIEW
The thrust of the REVIEW shall be to help the tenure-probationary faculty member’s success. The REVIEW and its findings shall NOT be used by the department chair or the school dean, or the chief academic officer, as the basis for a tenure decision, a pre-tenure decision, a reappointment or non-reappointment decision, or any personnel action of like kind. The tenure-probationary faculty member is not limited in the use of the REVIEW.

Faculty Affairs Committee 1/2007
IUPUI Faculty Council 1/2007
Dates and offices changed 2016 and 2018.
Edited by Faculty Guide Committee to add reference to ACA-21, 07/2020
Edited to reflect change from Box.com to more generic sentence for submission procedure, 05/2021

4Some schools require far more than this (e.g., list of potential reviewers, summary of pre-IU professional activities, previous annual reviews, letters from students, or even a dossier “that is identical in substance and format to that which they will submit for the actual review two years later”). The present policy does not encourage premature requisites or burdensome requirements.
Fourth Year Review
If requested by the faculty member or required in current school policies when a faculty member’s three-year review revealed significant issues, a fourth-year review should be conducted. The purpose of this review is to give continuing feedback about the candidate’s progress toward tenure and promotion.

(IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, 2009)

Tenure Review
The tenure review involves separate and independent evaluations and is distinctly different in form and substance from either annual review or reappointment recommendations. The annual reviews are predictive, but they do not constitute a cumulative record indicative of the results of the separate tenure review. The three-year review does provide a multi-year assessment and should provide specific feedback in time for the candidate to take corrective action if needed prior to the tenure review. The tenure review is a multi-level review, conducted at the primary, unit, campus, and university levels.

IUPUI Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures
Subject to customary review and approval, schools establish their own internal procedures and policies consistent with campus and university policies for reviewing faculty for promotion and/or tenure.

Exceptions to the Probationary Period

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

Family formation leave automatically results in a one-year extension unless specifically waived by the candidate. In calendar year 2020, faculty could request a COVID-related (pandemic) extension under an expedited process.

Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved by the Faculty Council, 2/3/94
Edited for title change, 6/29/15
Edited pronouns (he/she) for inclusivity (their), 7/1/20
Addition of paragraph on professional or personal emergency: Approved by the Faculty Council Executive Committee, 8/12/21
Schoolwide Tenure Probationary Period Change 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 executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer and the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee by following the steps in this policy.

Policy: The IUPUI executive vice chancellor for academic affairs/chief academic officer will entertain approving extension of the tenure probationary period of 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 executive vice chancellor (EVC) 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 EVC, and the school’s faculty governance leaders for a thorough discussion.
(f) School faculty governance leaders, in consultation with the EVC and IFC-EC, will design and conduct the referendum vote for the school’s faculty as outlined in (h).
(g) Obtain authorization to conduct a referendum from the EVC 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 chief academic officer 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 timelines 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 EVC 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 EVC 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.

Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved by the Faculty Council on March 2, 2010.
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Adoption of Policies to Extend the Tenure-Probationary Period

From University Policy ACA-37 “Faculty and Librarian Tenure”

The faculty of a campus of Indiana University, acting through applicable shared governance mechanisms, may adopt policies which permit schools on that campus to request the Board of Trustees to extend the tenure-probationary period for all eligible faculty members in that school. The Board of Trustees may approve such requests if the school has followed the applicable campus policy and demonstrated a compelling justification for the extension. Before being presented to the Board of Trustees, any request for extension must be approved by the dean and the faculty of the school, by the provost or chancellor of the campus, and by the president of the university. Extensions for core schools require adoption of a policy and approvals by both campuses in which the core school resides.

Early Promotion and Tenure Policy

A. Definition and Applicability:

In the IUPUI Faculty Council policy, the phrase “early promotion and tenure” shall refer to a request for promotion and tenure based on a probationary period of fewer than seven years, with a tenure review occurring earlier than the sixth year of probationary service. This policy applies to all tenure-track faculty, including those who have received one or more years of credit toward tenure based on countable service prior to their tenure-track appointment, as long as the number of years of their probationary period added to that of their prior countable service is less than seven. This definition applies equally to tenure-track faculty who serve in schools that have extended the probationary period beyond seven years. In such schools, the seven-year probationary period remains standard. If someone has received an extension and then applies for tenure at the original time, this is not considered “early” application.

B. Policy:

1. No promise, either expressed or implied, regarding early promotion and tenure shall be made to candidates, including promises at the time of initial appointment.

2. Faculty members who determine they have met or exceeded all applicable promotion and tenure requirements at all levels of review fully one or two years before the start of the customary sixth year of probationary service may request early promotion and tenure in the fourth or fifth year (see also (4) below).

3. Candidates for early tenure must discuss the request for early review with their mentors, the department chair, or the appropriate dean to ensure that they understand the process and realize that the review may result in a notice of non-reappointment.

4. All tenure-probationary faculty members who enter service at IUPUI with zero, one, or two years of credit towards tenure specified in their offer letters must undergo a third-year formative review. Candidates may request that a unit conduct a “third year review” earlier than their third year of IU employment (or employment + tenure service credits), but the unit is not obliged to comply.

5. Requirements, procedures, and standards for reviewing early promotion and tenure cases shall be identical to those for reviewing ordinary cases and shall occur at the same time. The case must be

---

5 IFC Circular 2009-04 [PDF]: “School Tenure Probationary Period Extension Policy” (approved March 2, 2010).
made on the merits of the candidate’s accomplishments, which must be comparable to the merits of candidates who have served the full probationary period.

(6) Rules regarding dossier reconsideration during review, and negative tenure decisions after full review (see (10) below)6 apply equally to all candidates for tenure, irrespective of the length of their probationary period.

(7) Purdue faculty should be recommended for early promotion (or already hold the rank of associate professor or professor) to be considered for early tenure, in accord with the Purdue University Policy Academic Tenure and Promotion (I.B.2). For Purdue faculty, recommendations regarding promotion are made to the president and Trustees of Purdue University while recommendations regarding tenure are made to the president and Trustees of Indiana University.

(8) No candidate may apply for early tenure more than once.

(9) If a candidate is reapplying for promotion and tenure as a result of withdrawal of the case prior to final decision, all original external letter writers must be contacted with a request to update their letter with the new dossier information. If provided, the new letter is substituted in the dossier. If not, the original letter must be retained in the dossier. At least three additional new letters should be sought at the time of resubmission. In addition, each level of review may request access to the initial dossier’s reviews or reports that were made at an equal or lower level.

(10) Definitions: ‘Applying’ for early tenure is defined as the submission of materials by the candidate to the unit (department or school) and the sending of materials to external reviewers. From that point, all reviews received must be retained. ‘Full review’ means a review that proceeds through all campus levels up to (but not including) the decision by the president. A candidate may withdraw an early application prior to the final presidential review. If the application is not withdrawn, then the full review has occurred and the candidate is either tenured or on a one-year terminal appointment. If the candidate does withdraw, then they may have only one more application for tenure, and all letters received must be retained as described in (9).

C. Recommendation:
Candidates for early tenure should be forewarned that they may only expect one “full” review. In accord with University Policy ACA-37 “Faculty and Librarian Tenure,” this implies that candidates for early tenure may withdraw their request for early tenure at any time prior to a final decision by the president of Indiana University. This right does not preclude the risk of a notice of non-reappointment.

Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved by IFC: 4/5/11
Edited for policy number updates by Karen Lee, 4/13/15
Item B (10) added for clarity. Approved by the Faculty Council Executive committee, 8/12/21

Conditions of Employment

Employment Eligibility Verification
Based on federal and state laws, prior to beginning work at Indiana University, all new appointees must provide proper documentation showing that they are a U.S. citizen or an authorized alien entitled to work in the country for the period of appointment. The types of documents that are acceptable will be listed on

---

6 University Policy ACA-37 “Faculty and Librarian Tenure”
the current federal I-9 form and supporting documentation. The original documents must be furnished to a representative of the employing unit.

In addition, if the employment offer is to be with tenure and permanent resident status (which takes up to a year in many cases to acquire) is not acquired by the beginning date of the appointment, but an appropriate visa is obtained, appointment would have to be as visiting (or non-tenured) until permanent resident status is approved. The tenured offer would be effective once permanent residency papers are obtained.

For a tenure track appointment, please note that if permanent resident status is not acquired by the beginning date of the appointment, but an appropriate visa is obtained, appointment may be for a period of up to three years (or for the period for which the visa is valid, whichever is less). Reappointment beyond this period is contingent upon an extension of the visa or approval of permanent resident status before the end of the second year.

Executive Vice Chancellor 12/2009

Background Checks for Academic Candidates
This policy applies to Indiana University full-time and part-time academic candidates for academic appointment at IUPUI.

Purpose: IUPUI is committed to selecting and hiring the most capable faculty in order to pursue its strategic goals of excellence in teaching, learning, research, scholarship, creative activity and service to the community. Further, a law of the State of Indiana requires that we conduct a background check of all new employees regarding criminal activity as well as sex and violent offender convictions. This procedure details the steps that will be pursued to solicit and acquire background information on candidates for full-time and part-time positions at IUPUI.

Procedure: As a condition of employment, IUPUI has established a two-step background check process. The first step involves having the final group of candidates complete information including voluntary demographic information (gender, race/ethnicity), voluntary self-identification of protected veteran, voluntary self-identification of disability, and additional questions regarding legality of working in the United States and a requirement of an employer sponsorship. Without these items, the applicant's file will not be processed and may be withdrawn. The second step in the background check process occurs when a conditional offer for the position is extended to an individual. At this stage, the applicant will be required to sign a consent form for the background check, and provide specific personal information, such as date of birth and social security number. This information will be provided to a firm under contract with the IUPUI campus to conduct a criminal history check and sex and violent offender registry check.

The university reserves the right to withdraw or rescind any offer of employment (including the conditional offer of employment) based on failure to fully and truthfully disclose information or, if in the judgment of the university, information developed in the course of the background check so warrants. A criminal conviction will not necessarily disqualify the applicant from consideration. However, if an applicant fails to fully and truthfully disclose information, then the university will have the right to immediately deny or terminate employment.
A criminal history check is required for all full-time and part-time academic appointees, including Student Academic Appointees. The search and screen process for candidates for academic appointments which carry the titles of Department Chair or higher will require an additional credit history check and verification of state tax payment.

The policies and processes for criminal history checks for all staff, including full-time, part-time and student academic will be handled at the campus level by the Human Resources Office. This will include work study students and scholarship students who work with vulnerable populations.

**Acknowledged Convictions:** If acknowledged convictions are confirmed, the candidate for an academic appointment may be informed and given the opportunity to discuss the results of the criminal history check. The senior associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and the hiring department or school will jointly evaluate any conviction, including any additional information solicited from the candidate, before the offer of employment is confirmed. The existence of a conviction will not automatically disqualify a candidate from employment. Any decision to accept or reject a candidate with a conviction is solely at the discretion of Indiana University.

**Costs of Background Check:** The employing department or school will be responsible for the fees for the criminal history check, sex and violent offender registry check and credit and tax payment checks.

**Current Employees:** Consistent with the statement on its application for employment and in offer letters, Indiana University may conduct a criminal history check on any current academic appointee. If the university becomes aware that any current academic appointee has not been truthful about criminal convictions during the recruitment process, the academic appointee will be subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination for misconduct.

**Previous Criminal History Checks:** If Indiana University has performed a criminal history check on an academic appointee within the past year, a new check will not be required. The results of the previously performed criminal history check will be considered valid for any pending decision on academic appointments.

**Future Employment:** Academic appointees who have been terminated or who have had an offer of employment withdrawn under the provisions of this procedure are not eligible for future employment with Indiana University.

**Valid Driver’s License:** A Motor Vehicle Records check will also be required of all academic appointees who drive a motor vehicle as part of their Indiana University position. The results of the check will be considered in employment decisions as described above.

**Education, Employment and Licensure Checking:** These checks will be the responsibility of the hiring dean, department chair or chair of the search committee. Applicants are responsible for the accuracy of materials submitted when applying for a position, including degrees and other credentials. In any position for which a particular license may be required to perform a particular job, loss of license or failure to maintain the license in good standing is grounds among things for suspension or termination of the faculty appointment.

Executive Vice Chancellor, 6/2015
Revised, 5/2021, 7/2023
Teaching Loads at IUPUI

Teaching Loads: Full-Time Faculty
The Trustees of Indiana University have established an expectation that faculty in most schools on the IUPUI campus will teach six sections per academic year, taking into account the higher research expectations of this campus in comparison with the regional campuses where eight sections per year is the norm. However, the Trustees also recognize that the actual teaching assignment for an individual can best be determined at the department or school level. For this reason, the Trustees have set specific expectations for departments and schools in terms of the whole unit instead of individuals. As long as the department or school is meeting its expected capacity, individual faculty may have differentiated teaching assignments to take into account research, administration, professional service, and service to the university. Department chairs and deans are responsible for establishing the teaching assignments of individuals consistent with the expected capacity of the whole unit.

Overload Teaching: Full-Time Faculty
Credit and non-credit courses taught in addition to a normal load are considered overload. "Normal load" is evaluated in the context of the faculty member's academic unit and is equivalent to the unit's and the institution's estimate of a full-time combination of teaching, research, and service functions.

Therefore, amounts of time and remuneration are not to exceed the guidelines stated in University Policy UA-17 B.1.a “Conflicts of Commitment and Ghost Employment-Faculty.” Prior notice to, and approval by, the faculty member's administrative officer are required before the beginning of overload activity. A faculty member may not teach regularly on an overload basis within the department or school to which that faculty member has been appointed. In real life, almost all overloads are within the same unit. However, we discourage repeated overloading. Questions concerning faculty overload which cannot be resolved at the academic unit level should be referred to the Office of Academic Affairs at IUPUI.

Civility Statement
University Policy ACA-33 “Academic Appointee Responsibilities and Conduct”

This policy applies to all academic appointees at all times, including periods when the university is not in session, an appointee is on leave, and through the entire year for 10-month appointees. The provisions relating to responsibilities and conduct toward students apply to all personnel with instructional or supervisory responsibilities, whether paid or unpaid, whether on or off campus, including but not limited to coaches, advisors, and counselors.

Salary Information
IUPUI Campus Salary Policy for Faculty and Librarians
In April 1989, the University Faculty Council adopted a set of principles guiding the Indiana University faculty and librarian salary policies. Whereas these principles apply to all of Indiana University’s eight campuses, formulation of salary policies remains an individual campus prerogative. Consistent with the five-year academic plan of each school, as expressed in the 1988-2000 IUPUI development plan, and in keeping with the dispersion of operational control inherent in adoption of Responsibility Center
Management, authority for implementing salary policies is delegated to the individual units. Annual performance review to assure adherence to the principles, as well as to the academic plans, will be carried out at the campus level by the chancellor and the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer, in consultation with the Budgetary Affairs Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council.

1. All responsibility centers will establish their own written salary policy (which should be reviewed annually), consistent with University Policy ACA-28 “Faculty and Librarian Salary.” These individual unit salary policies will also be reviewed annually by the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer in consultation with the Faculty Council Budgetary Affairs Committee.

References:
- University Policy ACA-04 “Constitution of the Indiana University Faculty:” Article 5, Faculty Boards of Review
- University Policy ACA-21 “Faculty and Librarian Annual Review”
- University Policy ACA-28 “Faculty and Librarian Salary”

2. The dean of each school (or director of each responsibility center) will be responsible for administering all unit allocations. The dean or director of each unit will allocate salary increases in accord with the unit’s written policy statement and based on the unit’s available resources. Salary increases for faculty should be based on merit and performance. University priorities should be addressed in salary decisions, subject to resource availability. Each expenditure budget will be reviewed for consistency with the unit’s annual academic plan by the executive vice chancellor.

References:
- University Policy ACA-21 “Faculty and Librarian Annual Review”

Salaries as Public Records
University Policy ACA-27 “Access to and Maintenance of Academic Employee Records” stipulates that employee compensation is public information. Annually on July 1, salary information is available at: https://fdrs.fms.indiana.edu/cgi-bin/Salary/Salary.pl

Office of Finance and Administration, 4/13/15

Faculty Bonus Plan for IUPUI

Scope
This policy applies to Responsibility Centers (RC) that elect to award faculty bonuses.

Policy Statement
Each Responsibility Center (RC) must develop its own specific policy and process, in consultation with appropriate faculty governance groups. The bonus policy must be approved by IUPUI Finance and Administration.

Faculty bonuses at IUPUI differ from annual merit raises in terms of the source and process for funding. RC leaders recognize annual meritorious contributions during annual pay increase opportunities. A one-time cash bonus may be awarded no more than once every fiscal year in recognition of extraordinary accomplishment in service, teaching, research, and/or creative activity.
Cash bonuses cannot replace raises but are awarded in addition to raises. Raises should be awarded equitably and independent of any cash bonus award. Bonuses may not be given from funds that are intended for yearly raises. Bonus awards, like salaries, must be a matter of record made available upon request. The percentage and amount of each awarding RC’s budget allocated to such bonuses annually must be available upon request.

**Procedures**

Only full-time appointed faculty members are eligible for faculty bonuses.

**Calculation of faculty bonus:**
- 10 percent of individual’s base salary is the maximum for faculty bonuses (base salary is defined by the IU School of Medicine as core plus adjustable).

**Process for determining faculty bonus:**
- Each RC must develop its own policy and guidelines for faculty bonuses.
- Policy and guidelines must be approved by the RC’s faculty governance group.
- Faculty bonus policy and guidelines must be filed with IUPUI’s Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer.
- Faculty bonus policy and guidelines must be approved and administered by IUPUI Finance and Administration.
- Bonus pay is distinct from research incentive pay and extra compensation.

This policy replaces the Policy for Cash Bonuses for Academic Appointees at IUPUI as passed by the IUPUI Faculty Council in May 2003.

Revised by the IFC Faculty Affairs Committee and presented to the Faculty Council, 5/5/15
Passed by Faculty Council, 5/5/15

**Administrative Guidelines for Faculty Stipends at IUPUI**

IUPUI has invested in considerable support for leadership development for our faculty, and one natural consequence of this investment is increased opportunities for faculty to engage in short-term campus-level projects through Faculty Fellowships or similar positions. These guidelines are intended to help ensure consistency in compensating faculty appropriately for campus projects that extend for more than one week’s time, and that are not eligible for merit-based salary increase within the faculty member’s home unit.

The determination whether or not to offer a stipend to a faculty member who is performing work for a university unit other than their home unit can be based on an evaluation of the work requested and the extent to which it reflects upon the following compensable factors:
- Skill/expertise: The specific nature of the assistance being sought
- Effort: The extent or duration of the commitment
- Responsibility: The level at which the person will be operating, including resources the person will manage
• Working conditions: Whether beyond the regular conditions of the person’s job (e.g., on evenings and weekends, over the summer, or involving travel)

In general, consideration of compensation acknowledges there is a threshold beyond the regular service obligations of faculty member that comprise a substantive contribution of disciplinary expertise and technical assistance or require effort above and beyond for any of the other compensable factors.

A stipend may be appropriate if a faculty member is being requested to apply their knowledge and disciplinary expertise or provide technical assistance to an internal unit beyond the scope of the regular expectations of their job and for which there would be a reasonable expectation of remuneration if the work were being performed for an external agency (on the open market).

The determination should be made whether the funds should go to the faculty member (e.g., a stipend or honorarium) or to the department (buy-out).

A buy-out is an agreement between unit leaders and is appropriate when the service assignment is beyond a single instance and is for a longer period of time. The buy-out is recognition of the impact the person’s assignment to another unit will have on the home unit. Usually, no additional compensation will be offered to the faculty member unless the extent of responsibility or other compensable factor is over and above usual expectations for person’s job.

If the faculty member’s engagement with the other internal unit is deemed to have negligible impact on the home unit, then a stipend or honorarium may be appropriate. The decision regarding the amount of the stipend should weigh whether the activity comprises a single instance of application of expertise/skill (e.g., giving talks, conducting workshops, or facilitating a meeting for strategic campus programs) or is for a more extensive effort.

In determining the amount of the stipend, the burden of proof is on the faculty member in indicating how much they would be paid for similar effort in the external market. Of course, fiscal constraints, including the ability and willingness to pay a stipend at a given rate, will also factor into deciding how much of a stipend will be offered.

The inherent diversity of disciplines and related compensation determinations make it impractical to suggest dollar amounts for stipends or honoraria. However, reasonable practices should be in place to assure internal consistency.

If the faculty member under consideration has an administrative appointment at the level of dean or higher, service to the campus may be considered part of the administrative responsibilities and expectations of the person’s administrative assignment are therefore not eligible for additional compensation.

Revised 1/17/18
Leaves

Faculty members are responsible for notifying supervisors (chairs, directors, etc.) of any absences in a timely way according to unit procedures.

Sabbatical Leaves for Faculty and Librarians

The sabbatical leave program is available to provide time for scholarly research and any travel incident thereto, and to allow members of the faculty to keep abreast of developments in their fields of service to the University. IUPUI adheres to the Indiana University policies and processes regarding sabbatical leaves. *University Policy ACA-47 “Leaves for Academic Appointees”*

Vacation

For full-time, 12-month academic appointees: one month vacation annually. This is generally interpreted as 22 working days. This time does not accrue, does not carry over from one calendar year to the next, and has no monetary value if unused. Appointees can take vacation leave as terminal leave.

For full-time appointed 10-month academics: faculty are not obliged to be on campus during campus breaks but there is no vacation time available.

Medical leave

Absences for sickness of less than 15 days per calendar year are handled informally with each unit.

When needed and medically documented, faculty are eligible for six weeks full leave fully paid and nine weeks full leave, half-pay, per calendar year, per occurrence. If informal sick days become a situation where the appointee needs a major leave, the days of sick leave are counted in the six-week time period. “Per occurrence” means that the appointee must return to work before another leave is taken, even if that leave is in a different calendar year.

When medically appropriate, medical leave can be incremental, in that the appointee may work a certain percentage and be on leave a certain percentage (e.g., 20% work, 80% on leave). The six-week leave period will be prorated (extended) accordingly.

Indiana University Family Leave Policy for Academic Appointees

*University Policy ACA-47 “Leaves for Academic Appointees” Section B and University Policy ACA-51 “Indiana University School of Medicine Paid Family Leave for Academic Appointees”*

General Statement

Indiana University supports an environment that offers solutions to the complex issues academic appointees face in balancing their work and family commitments. Family leave provides eligible academic appointees with up to twelve weeks of fully or partially paid leave for either or both of the following events:
• Family formation, which includes the birth or adoption of a child by the academic appointee or the academic appointee’s spouse or domestic partner. Family formation leave extends for 12 weeks (see “Incremental leave” below) and must be concluded by 6 months after the birth or adoption of the child.
• Family support, which includes the primary care of an eligible family member with a serious health condition. Family support leave is based on medical documentation that the family member needs the care of the academic appointee and can extend as long as 12 weeks of full leave (see “Incremental Leave” below).

Family leave is not intended to be a supplemental pay plan. The policy allows an academic appointee to take necessary time off from work without undue financial hardship. People may need variable amounts of leave and it is expected that paid leave periods will vary by need and circumstance and may extend across semesters. An appointee should not be expected to perform duties while on leave, to make up time or work, or to be on call in clinical settings. The leave is intended to relieve the appointee of responsibilities so they may attend to the family need. For non-Medicine appointees, family leave is separate from and in addition to sick leave, including pregnancy-related leave for the academic employee. Leave taken pursuant to this policy shall fulfill all or part of the requirements of the federal Family and Medical Leave Act.

Eligibility
Both 10- and 12-month academic appointees are eligible for family leave after one year of continuous full-time Indiana University service; full-time here means at least 76% FTE. Visiting, adjunct, part-time, post-doctoral, and intermittent appointees are not eligible for family leave. Post-doctoral appointee leave is governed by type of appointment and specific funder requirements.

This policy applies only to salaries paid by the university; it has no application to salaries or other compensation from other sources, including professional practice plans.

The duties of a clinical faculty member in the School of Medicine are governed by the separate family-leave policy adopted by the School of Medicine.

Eligible Family Members for Family Care Leave
Spouse, domestic partner, parent, dependent child, or dependent child of the appointee’s spouse or domestic partner.

Scope of Coverage
• Leaves for the purpose of family formation shall be at full salary for the duration of the leave period covered by this policy.
• Leaves for the purpose of family care shall be covered at the following amounts for the duration of the leave period covered by this policy:
  o For eligible academic appointees earning salaries up to and including $125,000 annually, the leave shall be at full salary.
  o For eligible academic appointees earning salaries above $125,000 annually, the percentage of paid leave shall be reduced by 1% for each $2,000 in salary above $125,000. However, the percentage of paid leave shall not fall below 50% of the academic appointee’s salary.

Leave Frequency
Academic appointees may take family leave up to twice every five years, but the appointee must return to full-time service for at least one fall or spring semester between leaves. Appointees in non-teaching appointments must return for at least five months. Family-formation leave must be concluded within six
months of the birth of the child or the date on which the child is placed in the physical custody of the academic appointee. The first week of any family leave begins the period for calculating both the twelve weeks and five-year eligibility period.

Break Periods & Vacation Time
All semester breaks (i.e., Thanksgiving, winter and spring breaks) count in the family leave period. For persons on twelve-month appointments, any accrued vacation time for which an appointee is eligible does not count in the total twelve-week eligibility period.

Incremental Leave, Flexibility, and Teaching Assignments
1. Incremental parental leave: Faculty may choose to take a parental leave on less than 100% basis: that is, they may work for 20% (or other percentage). The leave period would increase proportionately (from the base of 12 weeks of full leave). All parental leave must conclude within 6 months of the birth or placement of the child.
2. Incremental family support leave. All family support leave must be based on documented medical necessity. If that documentation indicates the faculty member can be on leave partially, then the leave weeks would increase proportionately. For 10-month faculty, paid leave cannot extend into the summer months.
3. When a proposed leave under this policy would prevent an appointee from carrying out their regular teaching responsibilities in two consecutive semesters, they must reach an agreement with the relevant academic unit that meets the needs of both the appointee and the academic unit. Agreements may include a reduced teaching schedule in one or more semesters, partial-semester teaching schedules, additional non-teaching duties, or a combination of paid and unpaid leave. Appointees and academic units are encouraged to be creative and flexible in developing solutions that are fair to both the individual and the University.
4. All agreements must be committed to writing, signed by the appointee and the head of the relevant academic unit, and approved by the vice provost for faculty affairs or vice chancellor of academic affairs. It shall be the responsibility of the vice provost for faculty affairs or vice chancellor of academic affairs to ensure that all agreements entered into are entirely voluntary and fair to both the appointee and the university.

Relationship to Sick Leave Policy (above)
Pregnancy is treated as any other temporary medical condition for the purposes of granting sick leave. Sick leave for pregnancy consists of full leave for six weeks, approximately two weeks before birth to four weeks after, with no medical documentation needed. An additional nine weeks of full leave at half pay is available if medically necessary and documented. Except for IU School of Medicine (see ACA-51), sick leave, including pregnancy, is separate from family leave.

Tenure Clock
As with sick leaves, the tenure clock stops during a family leave unless the academic appointee requests otherwise. Failure to perform duties during the leave period shall not be considered in the evaluation for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or merit pay. For annual reviews, faculty members will be assessed on the portion of the calendar year which they do work.

Effective Date
Faculty leave policy was updated 3/1/2022 (ACA-47).

By Action of the University Faculty Council: April 8, 1997; April 27, 2004
The IUPUI Senior Academy

The IUPUI Senior Academy is an independent association of retired faculty and staff who contribute their expertise and experience to the university and to the greater community. The academy, with the assistance of the university, encourages and assists scholarly, professional, educational, and service interests of the members, enabling them to continue to contribute to the campus and its program.

http://www.iupui.edu/~sacademy/

IUPUI Emeritus Policy

Preamble

The emeritus/emerita title (hereafter simply “the title”) may be awarded upon retirement from IUPUI faculty members as recognition of substantial contributions to the university in the fields of teaching, research, and/or service. Upon recommendations by the department, chair, dean, executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer, and chancellor, the Board of Trustees awards the title as recognition of scholarly and professional contributions made before retirement and, to a lesser degree, as encouragement for continued association with IUPUI and continued pursuit of scholarly and other professional interests.

Eligibility

Faculty members may, upon retirement, be awarded the title if they meet the following criteria:
1. have been at IUPUI for a significant period of time (ordinarily at least ten years); and
2. have made substantial scholarly and professional contributions for the university.

Procedures

1. Recommendations for the title are initiated by the department (or unit) and transmitted by the chair to the dean. (If the candidate holds a tenured or affiliate appointment in more than one department, the departments are expected to coordinate recommendations.) Transmissions to the dean should include a narrative summary, preferably one page in length, citing the professional accomplishments and the record of university service of the candidate, as well as a copy of the letter of retirement and the expected retirement date.
2. With the dean’s approval, documentation (including the departmental letter of recommendation) is transmitted to the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer, the chancellor, and the Board of Trustees.
3. Recommendations for candidates for the title retiring at or prior to the end of the fiscal or academic year are considered at budget preparation time (in February or March): and the title is awarded on the day of retirement, or as soon thereafter as possible.

For administrators and those outside the regular faculty member or librarian ranks, these procedures will be modified as needed.

Privileges

Retirees awarded the title may be accorded the following privileges:
1. lifetime ID card indicating their status, and listing in university catalogs and directories;
2. network account and access privileges per university licensing;
3. regular-faculty library privileges, including remote access to on-line databases;
4. by invitation of the department or unit, service as guest lecturer, substitute or part-time faculty, or member of master's and doctoral thesis committees—in some cases, especially in the health and legal areas, this may include the provision of licensure and insurance fees;
5. based on availability and the recommendation of the department or unit, use of office or lab space, equipment, and other campus facilities in support of research or educational projects;
6. in exceptional cases, service as department chair or in other administrative functions;
7. with the recommendation of the school or unit, voting privileges in the department;
8. purchase of regular-faculty parking permits and/or, when underwritten by the department or unit, receipt of free parking for special committee assignments;
9. fee courtesy for credit courses and reduced fees for non-credit Continuing Studies courses;
10. participation in university public ceremonies (such as Commencement) and, on request, receipt of campus publications;
11. regular-faculty access to and ticket arrangements for use of recreational and social activities;
12. reduced membership fees in The University Club at IUPUI.

Retirees awarded the title are expected to maintain the same level of professionalism as before their retirement; if such professionalism is not maintained, the emeritus/emerita title may be rescinded.

Approved by Faculty Affairs Committee 1/28/2000
Amended 1/29; 2/25; and 3/24/2000; 1/2017
Approved by the IUPUI Faculty Council 4/6/2000; 2/7/2017
Title changes made by Karen Lee, 4/13/15
Expansion of eligibility passed by the IFC 2022.

Faculty Awards

The Office of Academic Affairs promotes and administers campus awards for faculty such as the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching, the Bynum Mentor Award, the Irwin Research Scholar Award, the Chancellor's Professorships, and many others. Recipients of the awards are honored at the Chancellor's Academic Honors Convocation.

System awards such as the President's Distinguished Teaching Awards, the W. George Pinnell and John W. Ryan Service Awards, and Distinguished Professorships are promoted by the President’s Office.

For more information on eligibility, award criteria, deadlines, and nomination procedures for the IUPUI campus, see https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Honors-Awards. Information on the systemwide awards can be found here: https://honorsandawards.iu.edu/.

Trustees Teaching Award (TTA)

In June 2000, the Trustees of Indiana University reviewed the Teaching Excellence Recognition Award (TERA), which had been established by the Trustees in 1997. The Trustee’s review process considered surveys of faculty across the campuses of IU and resulted in a series of recommended changes. The Trustees formally replaced TERA with the Trustee’s Teaching Award (TTA) in June 2000 and amended the new award in January and February 2001. It is to be awarded before the completion of each academic year to
tenured and tenure-track faculty and to non-tenure-track faculty. The TTA is to be awarded to those from among these groups who have demonstrated they are the best teachers. The amount of the award will be $2,500, and it will be given to no more than 6% of the total eligible faculty in each of the categories. The Trustees annually determine whether to award the TTA and may change the parameters at any time.

*University Policy ACA-80 “Trustees’ Teaching Award”*
Board of Trustees 2-24-15

**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 complete policy can be found in [Appendix B](#).

**IUPUI Dismissal Procedures for Tenured Faculty and Librarians**

In accord with university policy, dismissal of tenured faculty or librarians shall occur only for reasons of incompetence, serious personal or professional misconduct, or extraordinary financial exigencies of the university. Faculty who are not yet tenured but earning credit toward tenure are subject to review and reappointment during their probationary periods. A separate policy applies to these faculty: "Reappointment and Non-reappointment During Probationary Period" (ACA-22). The complete policy for dismissal of appointees with tenure can be found in [Appendix C](#).

**Research Misconduct**

**Scope**

1. This Policy applies to:
   a. All individuals who hold University appointments and all graduate students who are engaged in the design, conduct, or reporting of research, whether or not the research is funded; and to
   b. Anyone engaged in the design, conduct, or reporting or research through a Sponsored Program at Indiana University, to the extent of that research.
2. Except for research misconduct in the context of a Sponsored Program, allegations of research misconduct by undergraduate students shall be dealt with through the *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct*.
3. The Deciding Officer (DO) may, in consultation with the Dean of the Graduate School, determine that an allegation of research misconduct on the part of a graduate student is more appropriately referred
to the disciplinary channels provided in the *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct* or such other disciplinary process duly established by a campus or academic unit.

4. All members of the University community have a duty to guard against and to report research misconduct; to cooperate with the Inquiry and Investigation Committees and the Research Integrity Officer (RIO); and to provide relevant evidence to the committees and the RIO in the course of research misconduct proceedings.

The complete policy can be found in Appendix E.

## Policy on Dealing with the Effect of Financial Difficulties Upon Faculty at IUPUI

### I. General Principles

Academic organizations face the risk of serious financial problems which can be solved only by extraordinary means. As one of those extraordinary measures, suspension or dismissal of any faculty or librarians should be approached with great care and implemented according to plans and policies developed outside an atmosphere of impending financial stress. Removal of the people with the primary responsibilities for carrying out the mission of the university places into immediate jeopardy the vitality of the institution and its ability to respond to the needs of its constituents. Accordingly, consideration of removal of persons with tenured or tenure-track academic appointments should never be considered as a tactic to be employed before other measures have been given a chance to work, much less as a routine or automatic step in the process of financial recovery, but rather as a measure of last resort, and the proponents of such action bear the burden of proving its necessity.

The complete policy can be found in Appendix D.

### Grievances

**Ombudsteam**

All IUPUI full- and part-time academic appointees are encouraged to first seek the assistance of the Ombudsteam before engaging in the grievance process listed under *Grievance Procedure for Designated Academic Appointees* below. (Grievance procedures are governed by the IUPUI Faculty Council Bylaws, Article, IV.)

The IUPUI Ombudsteam is designed to provide designated place(s) and persons for faculty to voice concerns and learn about options for channeling criticisms and addressing complaints, which may include a formal grievance, so that faculty can be fully informed about possible actions and consequences before they make a decision, if any, to take further action (e.g. seek a remedy via the established informal process or via a Faculty Board of Review).

The IUPUI Ombudsteam consists of five members with each of the members able to serve as primary or preferred contact. The Executive Committee nominates potential members, and the IUPUI Faculty Council
elects those members in the May meeting. Tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure-track faculty, and members of the IUPUI Senior Academy who have served as faculty or librarians are eligible for election. At least three of the members must be tenured full or emeritus professors and at least four should have served on IUPUI or Unit promotion and tenure committee; academic affairs committee; faculty affairs committee; diversity, equity, and inclusion committee; faculty board of review; or as president of the IUPUI Faculty. Members shall represent different schools, and no two members shall be from the same school. The members serve three-year, staggered terms. The chair of the IUPUI Ombudsteam serves as liaison to the Offices of Academic Affairs and the Office of Equal Opportunity.

The complete policy can be found on the IFC policy webpage.

Formal Grievance Procedure for Designated Academic Appointees
(Grievance procedures are governed by the IUPUI Faculty Council Bylaws, Article, IV.)

At IUPUI all full-time academic appointees are eligible to seek redress for grievances through the established informal grievance process and, if informal measures fail, to seek a Faculty Board of Review (FBOR). Adjuncts and others with less than a fifty percent appointment are entitled to a grievance process within the employing unit, which will have the final authority for addressing such grievances.

1. A resolution will first be attempted at the program or department level and the grievance will be heard by the director or department chair. In schools without departments or programs, the dean or designee will consider the grievance. Grievances must be initiated within a reasonable time after the cause of the complaint but not longer than six months. Grievances which are not filed in a timely fashion may not be considered.

2. If the grievance cannot be resolved at the department or program level, the employee has 10 days following a meeting with the chair or director (or designee) to submit the grievance in writing to the dean. The dean will respond in writing within 30 days of receiving the written statement. The dean may hold meetings, appoint panels, and review evidence in reaching a resolution. The employee has the right to present information, to be present for formal proceedings, if any, convened to make a recommendation to the dean, and to have access to any documents or information considered as a part of the process.

3. The faculty member may contact the president of the Faculty Council at any time to seek advice about a potential grievance.

4. The IUPUI Ombudsteam is an elected faculty group designed to be available early on in the course of emerging concerns or potential grievances. It is further designed to provide designated places and persons for faculty to voice concerns and learn about options for channeling criticisms and addressing complaints so that faculty can be fully informed about possible actions and consequences before they make a decision as to what steps, if any, to take next. The IUPUI Ombudsteam serves all IUPUI faculty, including both full- and part-time faculty and librarians who may utilize these grievance procedures and other faculty and librarians who may wish to voice concerns but otherwise lack standing to file a formal grievance pursuant to these procedures. (See the IFC Bylaws for more information about the IUPUI Ombudsteam.)

5. The faculty member must submit a written request for a FBOR, stating:
   a. The category or categories of the grievance action involved (dismissal, academic freedom, non-reappointment, tenure, promotion, salary adjustment, and/or nature and conditions of work.),
   b. A concise summary of the grievance scenario,
   c. Steps taken to redress the grievance prior to contacting the president, and
   d. The redress sought.

6. The grievant may withdraw a complaint at any time.
7. The president of the Faculty Council, when a formal request for a FBOR is received, shall immediately inform the chief academic officer of IUPUI, who will be given two weeks to seek an administrative resolution of the grievance.

8. If no administrative resolution is gained, the president then will seek a decision by the IFC-EC on whether to empanel a FBOR. The complaint must be brought within one year, for good cause, and must fall within the purview of a FBOR. Bylaws procedures for creating a FBOR shall be followed.

9. Once created, the FBOR must conduct hearings and issue a final report within two weeks of the hearing, following the specific requirements in the bylaws of the IFC. Members of the FBOR will maintain confidentiality of the proceedings and final report.

10. The findings of the FBOR shall be forwarded by the members of the FBOR to the chancellor who responds within four weeks of receipt.

Further appeal by the grievant may be made to the president of the university.

Revised by the IUPUI Faculty Council 5/2006
Title changes made by the director of the Faculty Council, 4/13/15
Procedural changes updated, including the addition of the IUPUI Ombudsteam, 5/2021

Faculty Work

Two primary documents—University Policies and the IUPUI Faculty Guide—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 [including librarians] shall have full freedom of instruction, subject to adequate fulfillment of their academic duties" (University Policy ACA-32 "Academic Freedom"). 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 absences that may impact teaching (ACA-33, Academic Appointee Responsibilities and Conduct).

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 *University Policy ACA-12 “General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments”*), 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 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. 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 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, Fort Wayne, 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 some 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 time period 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 if compatible with IU policy on conflict of interest and conflict of commitment (*University Policy UA-17*). As that policy states (section B.1.b.5), tenure-track faculty and librarians are allowed 20% time overall (“one non-weekend day per week”) for external professional work, but this does not apply to non-tenure track academic appointees. Faculty members will report outside work to the appropriate unit administrator (chair, division head, etc.) and will ensure that such activities do not interfere with their primary professional responsibilities.

**Vacations**
Twelve month appointees have 22 working days per calendar year for vacation (ACA-47). The scheduling of vacations must be coordinated with chairs and deans.

**Faculty Leave of Absence**
Leaves of absence without pay are described in section E of *University Policy ACA-47* “Leaves for Academic Appointees.” 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.

**Changes to Initial Faculty Appointment Conditions**
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 members 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 Conflicts of Interest and Commitment as stated in *University Policy UA-17* “Conflicts of Interest and Commitment.”

**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 *University Policy ACA-17* “Faculty Boards of Review Uniform Standards” or *Article V of the University Faculty Constitution*, 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. Some 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.

Proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved by IFC, 3-4-14
Edited to update University Policies, 4-13-15
Edited to update University Policy ACA-32 language, 5-28-19
Edited to update University Policy UA-17 language, 5-28-20
IUPUI Guidelines for Faculty Work Arrangements

Full time faculty members and other academic appointees typically have responsibility for research, teaching and service. Much of this work necessarily involves being physically present on campus—in the lab, the classroom, or the office. Service to the department, school and campus and mentoring of colleagues and students is dependent upon an active, engaged, and present faculty. Moreover, the presence of the faculty is critical for the health and wellbeing of the campus community.

Exceptions to the general expectation of working and living within proximity of one’s campus will be rare, truly exceptional, and entirely at the discretion of the dean. In such cases, there must be clear evidence of benefit to the school, program or department and their missions. Expectations as to teaching, research and service must be clearly delineated in writing. The burden will be on the faculty member to proactively demonstrate that they are contributing to the community of the school and campus. Faculty presence will continue to be employed as a factor in assessments of faculty performance for salary decisions, promotion and retention. Finally, such flexible work agreements must contain a plan and timeline for reexamination (at least once a semester) to assure that the faculty member is meeting the agreed upon expectations and the arrangement continues to serve the interests of the school, program or department. If at any time the faculty member fails to honor the agreed upon expectations, the dean may revoke the agreement.

Approved IFC, 5/2/17

Remote Work for Academic Appointees

University Policy ACA-83 “Remote Work for Academic Appointees”

The IU policy is consistent with the IFC statement above and adds decision factors, required procedures, and steps. The chancellor at IUPUI has delegated to deans decisional authority for individuals’ requests for remote working arrangements. Each request must be considered in light of IUPUI’s character as an in-person institution and an engaged academic community for teaching, learning, service, research, creative activity, and librarianship anchored by full-time faculty members and librarians who are physically present on campus regularly. Each faculty request must be reviewed and approved via a school-based process every year. The remote work policy does not prohibit or inhibit a request for reasonable accommodations based on disability.

Nepotism

University Policy UA-17: “Conflict of Interest and Commitment”(A.1.d)

Employment situations that constitute nepotism are prohibited. Nepotism is the supervision or influence over an academic appointee or employee by another university academic appointee or employee with whom they have a familial or personal relationship, as defined in this policy. Influence in the employment situation may concern issues such as hiring, promotion, supervision, evaluation, determination of salary, or working conditions.

Academic appointees or employees with familial or personal relationships should not be appointed or transferred to a position that creates a potential situation of nepotism without an approved management
plan to avoid instances of supervision or influence. Potential nepotism situations must be reported prior to appointment or transfer, according to the procedures below.

Situations of nepotism that arise in existing employment situations due to a change in relationship, must be reported promptly and addressed by an approved management plan. Existing situations of nepotism must be reported and addressed unless a management plan approved by the University Compliance Office is already in place. Other management plans in existence prior to the effective date of this policy should be provided to the University Compliance Office for review.

Members of the Board of Trustees should not recommend for employment at Indiana University persons with whom they have a familial relationship.

Procedures:
1. Whenever a person recommending, or considering the acceptance of, an appointment to a staff, faculty, or other position has reason to believe that a familial or personal relationship as described in this policy exists or may exist in the potential employment situation, they must report the facts to the relevant academic dean (faculty) or unit director (staff) so that a determination may be made prior to the actual appointment.
2. When a prohibited instance of nepotism is created during the course of existing employment, the academic appointee(s) or employee(s) and/or supervisor must promptly notify the relevant dean or director. Currently existing situations of nepotism must be reported in a timely manner.
3. In all situations, the dean/director must inform the University Compliance Office for assistance in developing an approved nepotism management plan. The University Compliance Office will consult with the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel, as well as with the campus offices of human resources and/or academic affairs, as appropriate. [https://compliance.iu.edu/compliance-areas/conflicts-of-interest/nepotism_review_form.html](https://compliance.iu.edu/compliance-areas/conflicts-of-interest/nepotism_review_form.html)
4. Management plans must be reviewed and signed by the involved parties, the relevant dean/director, the campus Vice Chancellor/Provost of Academic Affairs (if faculty or academic employees are involved), and the campus HR director (if staff are involved). Final copies of all approved management plans must be forwarded to the University Compliance Office which will retain copies.
5. The University Compliance Office, in cooperation with the relevant unit, will review all approved management plans periodically for effectiveness, but no less than every three years, or as conditions change. Any changes to approved management plans should be forwarded to the University Compliance Officer. Instances of nepotism, as well as the existence of approved management plans to avoid nepotism, must be reported on the university’s annual conflict of interest forms.
Section Three: Academic and Administrative Policies

University policies are the primary source of academic policies and procedures. This IUPUI Faculty Guide contains campus specific policies and procedures.

Academic Calendar

The Academic Calendar for IUPUI is developed by the Calendar Committee, chaired by the IUPUI Registrar. The Calendar Committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee. The recommendation of the Calendar Committee is forwarded to the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (an administrative committee) and to the Academic Affairs Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council. Following the review and recommendations of these committees, the proposed calendar is forwarded to the IUPUI Faculty Council for action. Calendars are recommended and approved a number of years in advance. The Calendar Committee is responsible for reviewing and recommending the action stated above. The Academic Calendar can be viewed at: https://studentcentral.iupui.edu/calendars/official-calendar.html.

Faculty Access to Student Evaluations

Resolution
The IUPUI Faculty Council charges the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer to assure that existing policies on faculty access to student course evaluations are implemented according to common principles at the school and department level. The Faculty Council asks reaffirmation of the faculty’s right to access their student evaluations and statistical and other summaries of them by explicitly granting access in the University Policies to these documents, in addition to other documents named in the policies, which the faculty may already access.

The right of access is already implicit

University Policy ACA-27 “Access to and Maintenance of Academic Employee Records” acknowledges the right of the faculty to access their personnel records, and implicitly, student evaluations. It defines these records to include “…any items or collections of information on individual academic employees including transcripts of conversations, recorded and stored in any medium under personal name or by any equivalent identifying number or symbol.” “Access to Personnel File by the Academic Employee” guarantees faculty members’ right to access their personnel file, except for letters or statements from students solicited by the University and written prior to November 1, 1983. Also, “Maintenance of Records of Academic Employees” clearly indicates that formal student evaluations are considered part of the faculty member’s personnel record and, hence, under the above-mentioned policies, accessible to them, “With the exception of formal student evaluations of teaching, anonymous communications shall not be included in any record, nor shall they be stored or maintained. Such anonymous communications shall not be considered or referred to in matters of promotion, tenure, reappointment, or salary determination.”
The use of student evaluations for faculty development

The principal use of student evaluations is for faculty development and faculty have a right to access all information that will help them evaluate their own teaching effectiveness and enhance their performance in order to meet the goals of the unit in which the faculty member is employed. This conclusion is consistent with AAUP policy (“Redbook” or AAUP Policy Documents & Reports, 1995, p. 136) that states, “The responsible evaluation of teaching does not serve advancement procedures alone. It should be wisely employed for the development of the teacher and the enhancement of instruction.” Faculty members’ self-assessment and their ability to learn from evaluations are hampered by inadequate access to information within or derived from them.

Correction of administrative errors

It has come to the attention of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) that, on occasion in recent semesters, faculty have been denied access to their student evaluations and have instead received only their supervisor’s opinion of the quality of their teaching drawn from the supervisor’s interpretation of the evaluations. The FAC believes that the faculty must be given the opportunity to correct erroneous conclusions drawn from statements that have been taken out of context and, in other rare cases, as a result of an administrator’s vindictiveness. According to the AAUP (1995, p. 134), “…unilateral judgments by department chairs and deans…” based on a paucity of data, are inadequate. All too often, chairs do not actually witness the teaching of their faculty, and conclusions drawn from anonymous opinions must be handled with sensitivity and caution. This protection is possible only if a faculty member can examine original evaluations in order to verify the correctness of summaries of them as well as to verify the context in which comments are written, whatever the evaluation procedure employed in different units across campus.

Correction of conclusions drawn from student misconceptions

There must be a provision for faculty to examine student evaluations so they can distinguish complaints from students whose low expectations of their own responsibilities prompt them to conclude erroneously that the standards that an instructor establishes are unreasonably high, as opposed to complaints about assignments that are inappropriate considering the prerequisites and objectives of the course. It is imperative that faculty, not students, set the standards in a class. The integrity of every discipline depends upon the faculty determining those standards.

Furthermore, the return of student evaluations to faculty, whether the evaluations are administered at the end of a semester or midway through for some pedagogical purposes, as well as the return of statistical inferences generalized from them, can be delayed until after course grades have been assigned, eliminating the risk of retribution to students who write negative reviews of their instructor. In cases where there is continuity between the instructor and student beyond a single course, complete typed transcriptions of student comments, which eliminate any possibility of identification of the student by handwriting, can be given to the instructor. Evaluations that are multiple-choice, machine-graded forms pose no risk to the student in any case.

Conclusion

The IUPUI FAC acknowledges the extreme importance of this complex issue and notes that standardized principles protecting faculty members’ access to their student evaluations are already implicit in University Policy ACA-27. Although we recognize the right, and the desirability, of each school or division to establish evaluation procedures that best meet its needs, it is vital that all faculty in all units across campus be explicitly guaranteed access to student evaluations as integral contents of their personnel records as stipulated in the University Policy ACA-27.
Statement on the Expected Use of Canvas

The IUPUI Faculty Council unanimously endorses the requirement that all faculty use Canvas, at a minimum, to post course syllabi. Canvas makes available policy documents required by law or expected to be communicated to students through syllabi, together with a directory of academic support services. Canvas also captures data on student engagement (logins, page views, etc.) that may eventually help to inform early alert systems focused on student success.

This requirement was requested by the Council of Retention and Graduation and the Enrollment Management Advisory Council in 2017.

Equal Opportunity, Non-Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct

Indiana University prohibits discrimination on the basis of age, color, disability, ethnicity, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, or veteran status (University Policy UA-01 “Non-Discrimination/Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action policy).

Indiana University prohibits any form of sexual misconduct (University Policy UA-03 “Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Misconduct), including sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, sexual exploitation, and stalking. The policy applies to on- and off-campus behavior and applies to misconduct that has a continuing adverse effect or creates a hostile environment on campus or in any university-sponsored program or activity. Individuals who have experienced sexual misconduct are strongly urged to promptly report such incidents. Under this policy, faculty are responsible employees. Responsible employees have an obligation to report information related to a potential sexual misconduct matter to the Deputy Title IX Coordinator(s) for IUPUI/IUPUC/IUSM/IUFW campuses.

If the individual alleged to have engaged in the misconduct is a student, the matter is handled by the Office of Student Conduct. Deputy Title IX Coordinator: Sara Dickey. Submit a report to the Office of Student Conduct.

If the individual alleged to have engaged in the misconduct is anyone else (i.e., faculty, staff, visitor, etc.), the Office of Equal Opportunity handles the matter. Deputy Title IX Coordinator: Karloa Stevens. Submit a report to the Office of Equal Opportunity.

Resources regarding sexual misconduct and campus reporting information may also be found on the Stop Sexual Violence website at: http://stopsexualviolence.iu.edu/help/iupui/index.html.
Please reach out to the Office of Equal Opportunity with any questions related to either policy. OEO will investigate matters thoroughly and consistently.
Updated: February 2019

IUPUI Office of Institutional Equity
Bryce Building
986 Indiana Ave, Suite B310
Indianapolis, IN 46202
Phone: (317) 274-2306
Email: oieindy@iu.edu

Indiana's Sex & Violent Offender Registry Search
IUPUI does not hire applicants for faculty or staff positions, nor retain in employment, faculty or staff personnel who have been convicted of certain sexual offenses. A search of the Dru Sjodin National Sex Offender Public Website, coordinated by the United States Department of Justice, is completed before hire.

IUPUI Alcohol and Drug Policies
The Drug Free Workplace Act of 1988 (41 U.S.C. § 8103) and Drug Free Schools and Campuses Regulations of 1989 (34 CFR 86.100) require universities to adopt a substance-free workplace policy because substance abuse increases the risk for a number of health-related problems and can contribute to a number of social, behavioral and academic work performance problems.

The university prohibits the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession, use, or being under the influence of controlled substances or alcohol on university property or in the course of university activities. For further information see University Policy ACA-40 “Substance-free Workplace for Academic Appointees.” The IUPUI Police Department enforces all state and federal laws pertaining to alcohol and illegal drugs, including the state underage drinking laws.

The university provides training to recognize employees in need of assistance, to provide basic assistance, and/or to facilitate referrals to community resources offering assistance. The following is a partial list of offices that can facilitate assistance or referrals.

- Student Activities 317-274-3931
- Student Affairs 317-274-8990
- Counseling and Psychological Services 317-274-2548
- Human Resources Administration 317-274-8931
- IU Employee Assistance Services Plan 1-888-23IUEAP

For further information contact:
Indiana University Police Department, Indianapolis Division
1232 West Michigan Street
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317-274-2058 (Voice)
For Emergencies (Voice and TDD) 317-274-7911
The Americans with Disabilities Act

Background and Summary
The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Public Law 101-336, was enacted on July 26, 1990, "to provide a clear and comprehensive mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities." This federal legislation requires equal treatment of disabled persons in employment, public services and transportation, public accommodations, and telecommunications services.

IUPUI, being a public entity, is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Title II of the ADA prohibits discrimination against qualified individuals with disabilities with regard to the services, programs and activities at IUPUI. The university is also prohibited from discriminating against qualified individuals with disabilities in its employment practices pursuant to Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

IUPUI Nondiscrimination Policy for People with Disabilities
IUPUI is committed to the spirit and letter of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The university is subject to the nondiscrimination provisions of Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Under Sections 503 and 504, the university has instituted various administrative policies, practices and procedures to ensure nondiscrimination against individuals with disabilities. These policies, practices and procedures have been amended to comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Accordingly, "no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be either excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities" of IUPUI. Moreover, no qualified individual with a disability shall be discriminated against because of the disability of that individual with regard to job application procedures, the hiring or discharge of employees, compensation, advancement, job training, and other terms, conditions and privileges of employment.

Compliance Responsibility
Responsibility for coordinating IUPUI's compliance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act resides with the director of equal opportunity.

Complaint Procedure
Individuals who have complaints regarding the university's compliance with particular provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act should contact the director of equal opportunity. Complaints will be promptly acknowledged and investigated with the purpose of equitable resolution.

IUPUI Office of Institutional Equity
Bryce Building
986 Indiana Ave, Suite B310
Indianapolis, IN 46202
Phone: (317) 274-2306
Email: oieindy@iu.edu
IUPUI Smoking Policy

In accordance with IU policy (PS-04) Tobacco use or sale, including, but not limited to smoking and vaping, is prohibited on university-owned, -operated, -or leased property. Exceptions may be granted for specific auxiliary enterprises, as approved by the chancellor. Tobacco use, including, but not limited to smoking, is not permitted in university-owned, -leased, or -operated vehicles.

Enforcement of this policy will depend upon the cooperation of all faculty, staff, and students not only to comply with this policy, but also to encourage others to comply with the policy, in order to promote a healthy environment in which to work, study, and live.

Violations of this policy should be referred to the appropriate administrative office for review and appropriate administrative action: for faculty, Office of Academic Affairs; for staff, Human Resources Administration; or for students, the Office of The Dean of Students.

Published 2006.

Research Compliance
https://research.iu.edu/compliance/index.html

All research affiliated with Indiana University must comply with federal, state, and institutional guidelines. Procedures in seven compliance areas establish the highest ethical standards and best practices in pre-clinical, clinical, and other research activities at IU, and they are enforced independent of funding agencies or sponsorship. The following are compliance areas and links to their policies:

- Animal Care and Use: https://research.iu.edu/compliance/animal-care/index.html
- Biosafety: https://research.iu.edu/compliance/biosafety/index.html
- Radiation Safety: https://research.iu.edu/compliance/radiation-safety/index.html
- Conflict of Interest: https://research.iu.edu/compliance/conflict-interest/index.html
- Export Control: https://research.iu.edu/compliance/export-control/index.html
- Research Integrity: https://research.iu.edu/compliance/integrity.html

Indiana University Intellectual Property Policy

The University Policy UA-05 “Intellectual Property Policy” has five basic elements: definitions, categories of intellectual property, the distribution of revenues, dispute resolution within the university, and implementation. Under this policy, the primary division of intellectual property is between patentable and copyrightable works. Generally speaking, ownership of patentable work is vested in the university. Copyrightable works are subdivided into Traditional Works of Scholarship, ownership of which remains with the creator of the work, and University Works, as to which the university retains ownership. The formulas set out in this policy distribute revenues from intellectual property owned by the university.
IUPUI Intellectual Property Revenue Policy

At IUPUI, the 15% of net revenue governed by section 3.A.i.c of the IU intellectual property policy shall be distributed according to the following table, depending on whether departments and/or centers were involved in the creation of the intellectual property. Deans will determine for their units what constitutes a department or center for the purpose of this policy. This distribution shall also apply to revenues reassigned to the originating school under section 3.A.i.b of the policy.

The table shown below provides the recommended distribution of the 15% net revenues among the possible units. Each of the given columns refers to a possible case involving the presence or absence of one or more units. For example, the last column, for which the entries for departments and centers are left blank, corresponds to the case where no departments and centers have been involved, and the entire 15% of net revenues should go to the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>% Net Revenue</th>
<th>% Net Revenue</th>
<th>% Net Revenue</th>
<th>% Net Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, it is recommended that the units receiving the returned revenues use the given funds in support of the research, scholarship, and creative activity that produced it. Additionally, if the conditions arise that result in the 15% of net revenues from section 3(b) to be assigned to the originating administrative unit, it is recommended that the distribution of the given revenue be determined based on the conditions defined in the above table.

IUPUI Faculty Council 11/2009

Policy on Conflict of Interest and Commitment

These guidelines and procedures detail the IUPUI campus’ implementation of the University Policy UA-17 “Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment,” which is grounded in the Principles of Ethical Conduct. Recognizing the scope of IUPUI Academic Appointees responsibilities these guidelines and procedures are also applied to teaching and service activities and administration.

IUPUI encourages interactions and the establishment of relationships between Academic Appointees with governmental entities (federal, state, and local), business and industry, and non-profit organizations as an important part of the university mission of teaching, research and professional service. Academic appointees at IUPUI have a major responsibility to discover and transmit new knowledge through scholarly activities. Financial support for such activities comes both from public and private entities external to the University. Increasingly, alliances between Academic Appointees and external entities have become a significant feature of academic research and educational activities. As these relationships become more common and complex, possibilities for conflicts of interest increase.

A basic principle of these Guidelines and Procedures is the assurance of objectivity in research, teaching, professional service and administration to preserve the credibility of the University and the individuals engaged in these endeavors. While broader in scope, these guidelines are intended specifically to ensure that individual financial interests do not influence our commitment to uphold ethical standards for the protection of human subjects. Interactions with the private sector carry with them an increased potential
for financial conflicts of interest, or at least the perception thereof. Just as integrity in teaching, research, and professional service is a personal responsibility of each individual, integrity in decision-making associated with financial and other business relationships with the private sector is a critical responsibility of those individuals and the administrators engaged in these relationships. As a steward of public funds, the university assumes the responsibility to assist the Academic Appointees in identifying activities that present potential for conflicts and in reducing or managing the conflicts to ensure they do not threaten the credibility of the University’s Academic Appointees’ core activities.

The IUPUI Guidelines and Procedures on Conflicts of Interest are designed: (1) to help identify conflicts of interest arising from relationships between Academic Appointees and external entities; (2) to assist Academic Appointees to either manage or avoid conflicts of interest; and (3) to establish a system for disclosure and review of relationships with external entities in order to identify and resolve actual and perceived conflicts of interest. Additional information may be found at https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/Media/FCContent/documents/policies/2005-06_Academic_Year/conflict_interest.pdf.

IUPUI Faculty Council 10/2005
Revised July 1, 2019, to reflect updated UA-17, which replaced ACA-74 and ACA-29.
UA-17 revised December 5, 2019.

Conflicts of Interest in Research
The university is required to promote objectivity in research by establishing standards that provide a reasonable expectation that the design, conduct, and reporting of research, including research funded under Public Health Service grants or cooperative agreements will be free from bias resulting from investigator financial conflicts of interest. Investigators are required to annually disclose significant financial interests for evaluation by the University’s Conflict of Interest Program, and to update this disclosure as interests change to comply with federal regulations designed to protect the objectivity of federally funded research and sponsored programs. The University Conflict of Interest Committee and Conflict of Interest Program shall be responsible for identifying conflicts of interest and determining appropriate steps to reduce, manage, or eliminate the financial conflict of interest; to ensure, to the extent possible, that the design, conduct, and reporting of research will be free from bias; and to ensure that, to the extent required by federal law and regulation, the Conflict of Interest Program fulfills federal public disclosure requirements of managed conflicts of interest and provides training to investigators (see, Responsibility of Applicants for Promoting Objectivity in Research for which PHS Funding is Sought (42 C.F.R. Part 50, Subpart F)).

The Office of Research Compliance will develop procedures that are consistent with this policy. That office’s current procedures and information related to the review process may be found at Compliance Services: Conflict of Interest on the website of the Office of Research Compliance.

Guidelines and Procedures on Conflict of Commitment for Academic Appointees
Indiana University recognizes that participation by academic appointees with outside activities often complements research, education, and public service responsibilities. Sponsored activities supported by grants, contracts, or gifts from outside organizations and individuals provide a valuable source of funds, equipment, and topics for university research. Consulting arrangements and other contacts between academic appointees and outside organizations advance the university’s ability to provide high-quality research and educational experiences, and to enhance employment opportunities for students. University licensing of technology to outside organizations, academic appointees’ consulting for private companies, governmental entities and non-profit organizations, assisting in new company starts, and developing other
forms of technology transfer are critical to meeting society’s needs. The university, therefore, clearly has a responsibility to foster the free flow of ideas and individuals between the university and outside organizations. Additional information may be found at https://policies.iu.edu/policies/ua-17-conflicts-of-interest-commitment/index.html.

Approved by the IFC, 10/6/05

**Laboratory Safety Policy**

*University Policy #PS-EHS-02 “Laboratory Safety”*

IUPUI houses many laboratories for learning and for research. Extensive policies and procedures apply to their users, with specific responsibilities for faculty members and principle investigators. For current policy, information, and links to specific needs (animal, biological, chemical, hazardous materials transport, radiation, laser, robotics, and waste management, see the University Policy PS-EHS-02.

**Open Access Policy**

The faculty of IUPUI is committed to disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible. The Open Access Policy can be found here: https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/Media/FCCContent/committees/library_affairs/open_access_policy_2014-10.pdf

**Sustainability of Research Centers**

This policy defines ongoing support for campus and university-designated research centers that span more than one school. https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/Media/FCCContent/committees/research_affairs/sustainability_inter-school_Centers_9-2-14.pdf
Section Four: IUPUI Services, Resources, and Student Relations

Division of Student Affairs: https://studentaffairs.iupui.edu/

Office of the Registrar: https://studentcentral.iupui.edu/register/index.html

Academic Calendar: https://studentcentral.iupui.edu/calendars/official-calendar.html

Fall Break Policy: http://go.iu.edu/21wG

Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success (The Profiles): https://profiles.iupui.edu
Approved by IFC May 1, 2018.

Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, & Conduct: http://studentcode.iu.edu/

RISE Initiative: https://rise.iupui.edu/

Faculty Sponsorship of Student for Admission as a Beginning Freshman (approved 9-5-17): http://go.iu.edu/1GSk

IUPUI Admissions Criteria: https://go.iu.edu/4PZ3
Effective 2004, University College faculty assumed primary and initiating responsibility for reviewing and recommending changes in undergraduate admissions policies and practices in collaboration and in coordination with the IUPUI Faculty Council and the Division of Enrollment Management. When changes in policy are recommended by the Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee, there are two routes for implementation: (1) When changes are within Trustee-established policy or practice, they will be referred to the IFC Academic Affairs Committee for consideration and comment and subsequent referral to the chief academic officer. (2) Any change that would vary from Trustee-approved policy would be referred by the IFC Academic Affairs Committee to the IUPUI Faculty Council with a recommendation for action; changes to existing policy would require subsequent action by the University Faculty Council, the president, and the Board of Trustees. All changes in policy by either route are forwarded to the chief academic officer for implementation or forwarding to the university levels as required.

Student Disciplinary Procedures for the IUPUI Campus: https://studentaffairs.iupui.edu/student-conduct/discipline.html

IUPUI Policy for Undergraduate Probation, Dismissal, and Reinstatement (approved 4-4-17) http://go.iu.edu/1ASI


IUPUI General Education Core (approved on May 14, 2013, by the IFC with the provision that the course list will change yearly as needed): https://due.iupui.edu/undergraduate-curricula/general-education/iupui-general-education-core/
Master Course Inventory Policy (ACA-81): https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-81-undergraduate-master-course-inventory/index.html


IUPUI Admission Policy

For freshman students: https://admissions.iupui.edu/apply/freshman/index.html

For transfer students: https://admissions.iupui.edu/apply/transfer/index.html

Transfer of Credit Completed at the 100 and 200 level (Policy ACA-56): https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-56-transfer-credit-two-year-institutions/index.html


IFC Resolution Regarding a Test Optional Approach to Undergraduate Admissions (Circular 2019-12): http://go.iu.edu/2tVx

For returning students: https://admissions.iupui.edu/apply/former-iupui.html

For visiting students: https://admissions.iupui.edu/apply/second-degree-and-visiting.html

IUPUI Fresh Start through Academic Renewal Policy

The purpose of this policy is to establish an effective way to encourage capable, mature students to return to IUPUI after a significant hiatus to complete their baccalaureate degree when they have achieved poorly during an earlier attempt at higher education within Indiana University. The spirit of the policy is to provide a fresh start for Indiana University students in the same way accorded to students who transfer into IUPUI from other universities. Prior work may count towards degree requirements but is not included in the calculation of the cumulative program GPA.

1. The IUPUI Fresh Start through Academic Renewal policy applies to former IU students pursuing a first baccalaureate degree who have not been enrolled in any IU campus for 36 or more consecutive months (three years). This policy first became available to students returning to IUPUI in the fall of 1996.

2. All IUPUI undergraduate, degree-seeking students who meet the criteria, regardless of the unit of enrollment, are eligible to apply for Fresh Start.

3. Students must apply to use this policy by the last day of classes in their second term of enrollment after the 36+ month hiatus.

4. Under the policy, all grades, credits, and courses remain on the transcript but an adjustment is applied to the academic record to remove the GPA points/values from the cumulative program GPA for all prior coursework. Credit for any prior IU coursework completed with grades of C or better
will continue to count towards degree and/or program requirements. The school may establish guidelines which define a GPA threshold above which a student may not petition for Fresh Start.

5. If the application is approved, the student starts their post-Fresh Start academic record with a cumulative program GPA of 0.00 after which all the rules of academic probation and dismissal for the school will apply. After approval, the student must complete a minimum of 30 credit hours on the IUPUI campus after his/her return in order to meet the graduation residency requirement.

6. Students must make application through their current school of enrollment. Once the unit confirms the student meets the eligibility criteria, the application is forwarded to the associate vice chancellor for undergraduate education for approval. Stipulations or conditions for continued enrollment of the student may be applied.

7. Fresh Start may be invoked only once. The policy is not available to a student pursuing a degree after a first baccalaureate degree, regardless of the level of the second degree or where the first degree was awarded.

8. Invocation of the Fresh Start option does not preclude a student from using other available course-specific grade replacement options for work taken subsequent to re-enrollment.

9. Fresh Start is only available for courses taken at Indiana University. Schools retain the right to consider records of performance from other universities in determining admission to the school, granting of honors, or other matters.

10. There may be students who had transferred to IUPUI from a Purdue campus into a Purdue mission program where transfer credit applied to the record retained GPA value. In order to allow these returning students the opportunity to reset with a 0.00 cumulative program GPA, these courses, while not IU courses, are eligible for the application of the Fresh Start policy.

11. Grades awarded based on a violation of the IU Code of Student Rights, Responsibility, and Conduct will not be removed from the cumulative program GPA by application of Fresh Start.

12. The policy will apply to all terms of IU enrollment, regardless of the campus on which the courses were completed, for the purposes of determining IUPUI degree progress and completion.

13. Students receiving Fresh Start at IUPUI who subsequently become degree-seeking students on another IU campus are subject to the policies in effect for the IU campus from which they receive their degree. Students receiving a similar academic forgiveness or academic renewal application on another IU campus are not eligible for IUPUI Fresh Start.

IUPUI Faculty Council (11/23/93)
Student Affairs Committee (1/24/94)
Academic Affairs Committee (1/24/94)
Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (10/13/95)
Dean of the Faculties (10/26/95)
Academic Affairs Committee - approved clarified language (2/13/97)
Academic Policies and Procedures Committee - clarified language (2/21/97)
Dean of the Faculties (3/31/97)
Academic Affairs Committee (4/19/21)
IUPUI Faculty Council (10/5/21)

IUPUI Grade Replacement Policy
Explanation of Policy: http://go.iu.edu/21CH
Purpose: The purpose of this policy is to allow students who have done poorly in a course to repeat the course and remove the weight of the earlier grade from the student's cumulative grade point average. The
committee sees this policy as an expansion of the current policy by extending the replacement option to courses in which students receive any grade rather than just grades of F. Grade replacement is seen as a reasonable option for a student who, new to higher education, had a less-than-optimal start and is trying to get a second chance. This is why the new policy is limited to undergraduate students seeking their first baccalaureate degree. Schools retain the right to consider the student's complete academic record for purposes of admission to the school, granting of honors, or in meeting the minimum GPA required for conferral of the degree.

1. The effective date is the beginning of the fall 1996 semester. Any course being used to replace an earlier taking of the course must be taken in the fall of 1996 or later.
2. The provisions apply to students pursuing an undergraduate degree only.
3. A student may exercise the grade replacement policy for a maximum of 15 credit hours. The 15 credit hour limit includes any course previously replaced using the FX policy.
4. Grade replacement replaces use of the FX option. Grades previously granted FX will be honored subject to #3 above.
5. A student may exercise the grade replacement policy no more than two times for a single course. Each attempted replacement will count towards the 15 credit limit.
6. Once invoked, a student may not subsequently request reversal of the grade replacement granted to a particular course.
7. Any grade may be replaced. The replaced grade will then be excluded from the cumulative grade point average. However, the course listing and the replaced grade will remain on the student's academic record with an "X" denoting that the grade is excluded from the cumulative grade point average.
8. Invocation of the forgiveness option does not preclude a student from using grade replacement for work taken subsequent to re-enrollment as defined by the Forgiveness Policy.

Grade replacement is available only for courses taken at Indiana University. Schools retain the right to consider records of performance from other universities in determining admission to the school, granting of honors, etc. [Note: This assumes that if the student's initial course was taken on another IU campus, that campus is willing to place the replacement flag on the course at our request.]

IFC Academic Affairs Committee 11/1995
Approved by the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee with the stipulation that academic units will interpret as appropriate for their unit or not implement if it is not applicable and in concert with their requirements. 2/8/1996
IUPUI Faculty Council 12/1996
Policy clarification from “first undergraduate degree” to “first baccalaureate degree” approved by the Academic Affairs Committee, IUPUI Faculty Council, 10/14/15, effective fall 2015.

Policies Regarding Final Examinations
Final examinations are given in all courses except those in which the instructor decides an examination is not necessary.

Students should consult the final exam schedule early in the semester to discover problems such as more than three exams in one day or insufficient time to cover the distance between successive exams. Final examination conflicts should be resolved with the course instructors.
Except for laboratory, clinical, studio, and other activity-based sections, final exams—whether comprehensive or not—are to be given at the appropriate scheduled time during the formal final examination week. Tests or major writing assignments may not be required during the week before the formal final exam week. However, papers, projects, or oral presentations may be due during the last week of class when assigned on the syllabus or announced at the beginning of the semester. Exceptions must be approved in advance by the dean of the particular school involved.

The final exam schedule is established to limit potential conflicts in a student's final exam schedule. If an exam is given, it must be held on the day and time published. If the instructor changes the exam time, and that change creates conflicts for a student, he/she should first consult with the instructor. If the problem is not resolved he/she should report the change to the instructor's department chairperson. If the problem is not resolved at that level, the student should contact the chairperson's dean, or director. If the conflict is not resolved at that level the student may contact the Office of Academic Affairs. An instructor giving a final examination before the final exam period should be reported in the same way.

IUPUI Faculty Council 12/1999
Edited to update office title change 4-14-15

IUPUI Policy on Religious Holidays and Class Participation

IUPUI respects the right of all students to observe their religious holidays and will make reasonable accommodation, upon request, for such observances. On occasion conflicts may occur between a student's obligations in a course and the student's obligations in observing major religious holidays.

Any student who is unable to attend classes or participate in any examination, study, or work requirement on some particular day or days because of his or her religious beliefs must be given the opportunity to make up the work that was missed or to do alternative work that is intrinsically no more difficult than the original exam or assignment. Upon request and timely notice, students shall be provided a reasonable accommodation. It is recommended that dates and times for examinations and other major course obligations be announced at the beginning of the semester or summer session and that students let instructors know of conflicts very early in the semester, so that accommodations can be made.

Students seeking accommodation for religious observances must make a request in writing by the end of the 2nd week of the semester, or equivalent for nonsemester length courses, to the course instructor and must use the Request for Course Accommodation Due to Religious Observance Form. In the case of religious holidays for which the date may change, the student should state the approximate date and when the exact date is known, inform the instructor of the exact date. The university will not levy fees or charges of any kind when allowing the student to make up missed work. In addition, no adverse or prejudicial effects should result to students because they have made use of these provisions.

It should be noted that while campus policy requires instructors to make reasonable accommodations when a student must miss an examination, assignment, or other academic exercise because of a required religious observance, it is not campus policy to require accommodations when students wish to travel to share a holiday with their families. Most religions are represented in the Indianapolis area and can provide
appropriate observances. However, it is appropriate to grant accommodations for a few hours after the holiday if the observance includes fasting.

**Recommended Accommodations**

The instructor and the student should discuss what a reasonable accommodation would represent. In general, the student must be given the opportunity to do appropriate make-up work that is equivalent to and intrinsically no more difficult than the original examination, assignment, or other academic exercise. This could be the same work with a different due date, or a substantially similar exercise at another time. However, any accommodation that is mutually agreeable to both student and faculty member is acceptable.

For example, if a student asks to be absent from an examination that falls during a religious holiday, it is the responsibility of the instructor to provide the student with an opportunity to take the examination or an alternate examination at another time. Some instructors have a policy of dropping the lowest examination score before calculating the course grade, but it would be inappropriate to require the student to drop an examination held on a religious holiday, since the student does not have an opportunity equal to all other students in the class to take all the examinations and drop the lowest grade. Similarly, an offer to substitute for the examination grade an average of the grades on the other examinations may not be fair if the student would do better on this examination than on the others.

If after discussion the instructor and student cannot agree on an accommodation, either or both should seek the advice of the senior associate vice chancellor for academic affairs.

Approved by IUPUI Faculty Council May 3, 2001
Updated by the Academic Affairs Committee and Approved by the IUPUI Faculty Council, April 6, 2010

**Cheating and Plagiarism**

Cheating on examinations or other course work, alteration of records, or illegal use of examinations is considered dishonesty. Anyone who permits or helps others to cheat is as guilty as the persons assisted. Plagiarism is the presentation of the work of another as one’s own. Honesty requires that *ideas or materials taken from another source be fully acknowledged*. The language or ideas taken from another may range from isolated formulas, sentences, or paragraphs to entire articles copied from books or from the writing of other students. The work of others should be clearly identified, generally through the use of quotation marks and footnotes.

A faculty member who suspects cheating or plagiarism initiates the process of determining guilt or innocence. No action is taken before the student has been informed of the charges and has had an opportunity to reply. This process may result in disciplinary action and dismissal from the university.

For further regulations, refer to the Indiana University Academic Appointee Responsibilities and Conduct, ACA-33 and the IUPUI Cheating and Plagiarism Policy.
Student Records: Release of Public Information
https://studentcentral.iupui.edu/personal-information/your-rights-privacy.html

IUPUI Student Records Retention Schedule

IUPUI Student Death Notification Protocol
https://go.iu.edu/2RGd

Administrative Withdrawal Policy
https://studentcentral.iupui.edu/register/administrative-withdrawal.html

Percentage of IUPUI Courses Required for Conferral of Certificate
http://go.iu.edu/2tVv

Access to Academic and Administrative Policies Using Computer Networks

Continuing efforts are underway to increase the amount of information that can be accessed on the campus computer networks. Many academic and administrative policies and procedures, the Schedule of Classes, and facts about IUPUI as well as other IUPUI information such as library holdings are available on-line through the IUPUI computer network. Access can be obtained through the IUPUI Home Page (http://www.iupui.edu).

- Computer user responsibilities at IU: http://kb.iu.edu/data/begk.html
- Personal Home Pages: https://kb.iu.edu/d/algh
- Two-Step Login (Duo): https://one.iu.edu/task/iu/duo and https://kb.iu.edu/d/aluu
Section Five: Support Services

Administrative Offices

- Division of Student Affairs: https://studentaffairs.iupui.edu/
- IUPUI Faculty Council: https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/
- IUPUI Staff Council: https://staffcouncil.iupui.edu/
- Office of Academic Affairs / Office of Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer: http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/
- Resources for Faculty (Forum Network): https://theforum.iupui.edu
- Center for Teaching and Learning: http://ctl.iupui.edu/
- Center for Research and Learning: http://crl.iupui.edu/
- Center for Service and Learning: http://csl.iupui.edu/
- Office of International Affairs: http://international.iupui.edu/
- IUPUI Research office and resources: https://www.iupui.edu/research/index.html
- Libraries: http://www.iupui.edu/about/libraries.html
- Office of Community Engagement: https://engage.iupui.edu/index.html
- Office of Finance and Administration: https://fiad.iupui.edu/
- Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement: http://www.planning.iupui.edu/
- IUPUI Graduate Office: https://graduate.iupui.edu/
- Office for Women: http://ofw.iupui.edu/
- Senior Academy: https://senioracademy.iupui.edu/
- Indiana University Research Gateway: http://research.iu.edu/
- Faculty Crossing: https://facultycrossing.iupui.edu/

Safety and Emergency

- Escort “Safewalk” Service: https://safe.iupui.edu/where-do-i-get/index.html

Services

- Adaptive Educational Services: http://aes.iupui.edu/
- Indiana Members Credit Union: http://www.imcu.com
- IUPUI University Club: https://universityclub.iupui.edu/
- The Forum Network: https://theforum.iupui.edu

Fitness and Recreation

- Campus Recreation Facilities: https://studentaffairs.iupui.edu/health/campus-rec/facilities.html
- IU Natatorium: https://iunat.iupui.edu
- Michael A. Carroll Stadium (IU Track and Field Stadium): https://track-soccer.iupui.edu/
- National Institute for Fitness and Sport: http://www.nifs.org/
Appendix A

IUPUI Policy on School or Program Restructuring

This policy is intended to cover transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, and elimination of academic programs. Because IUPUI is a dynamic institution that faces the challenge of preserving the important traditions of teaching, scholarship, and service while positioning itself to meet new demands in higher education, it may be necessary to make changes to the organizational structure of the campus, including the transfer and merger of programs between schools and departments, the reorganization of programs, including the division of schools and departments into smaller units, and at times even the reduction or elimination of a program. Although financial considerations may be a factor in the decision to transfer, merge, or reorganize an academic program, clearly the primary determinant must be that such a structural change offers significant enhancement to the educational process. Similarly, decisions to reduce or eliminate programs must be based on strong evidence that such steps are necessary to ensure the long-term viability of the educational mission as a whole, rather than as an adjustment for temporary budget or enrollment variations.

Consultation among all the relevant parties in matters of transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of programs is in the best interest of the administration, the faculty, the staff, and the students. Although the appropriate locus of decisions regarding school-level units is the school, the complexity of IUPUI requires faculty consultation at the campus level as well. When such structural changes as transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of programs are contemplated, the process must include faculty involvement and input at all stages and must also have a goal of providing affected faculty with the opportunity to be part of the new organizational structure through reassignment and retraining. The dismissal of faculty and librarians with tenure or the termination of faculty or librarians before the expiration of a term of appointment is allowed only when the chancellor declares the campus in a state of financial exigency. (See Policy on Dealing with the Effects of Financial Difficulties Upon Faculty at IUPUI.)

I. Guiding Principles

A. The decision to transfer, merge, reorganize, reduce, or eliminate an academic program shall be based upon educational considerations, as determined primarily by the faculty as a whole and by the particular schools involved. "Educational considerations" do not include temporary or cyclical variations in enrollment. The decision on whether to transfer, merge, reorganize, reduce, or eliminate a program must be based on evidence that the educational mission of the institution as a whole will be enhanced by the proposed changes. In addition, the benefits of adding new programs must be studied carefully when these programs impinge on or threaten the resources necessary for existing programs.

B. It is expected that financial considerations will be a factor in decisions on the transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of programs when the range of programs offered must be limited in order to have sufficient resources available to ensure acceptable educational quality. However, such changes should not be undertaken if the savings to be realized are inconsequential, and both the tangible and intangible costs of program changes must be addressed.

C. When an academic program is to be transferred, merged, reorganized, reduced, or eliminated, every effort should be made to phase the changes in over an adequate period of time with due notice given to staff and students, and with consideration of the contractual rights of faculty whose appointments will
be affected. In cases of program elimination, the phase-in period should not be less than two years. In any such changes, the impact on students, particularly those already enrolled in the affected program(s), must be considered.

D. Proposals to transfer, merge, reorganize, reduce, or eliminate academic programs must include provision for reassigning and retraining faculty members affected by the change including reassignment of faculty members to other campus schools and units in order to preserve their tenure status.

E. No affected faculty member shall be left out of the process or be disenfranchised as a result of the process outlined in this policy.

II. Faculty Authority
Article II of the Constitution of the IUPUI Faculty provides the faculty with legislative authority in the determination of faculty status and the standards and procedures of faculty appointments and faculty promotion and tenure. With this in mind, the following points must be observed:

A. Decisions concerning transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of programs shall occur as a result of a review process in which the faculty has assumed a prominent consultative role and has had an opportunity to vote on the proposed plan by secret ballot.

B. Transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of a program shall proceed according to procedures outlined in Section IV and by the elected policy committee of each school directly affected.

C. When the implementation of a transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of a program results in a change in faculty appointments, changes will proceed according to procedures outlined in V below.

D. Proposals to transfer programs from one campus to another, to merge programs on more than one campus, or to reorganize, reduce, or eliminate programs existing on more than one campus shall be governed by policies that may be developed by the University Faculty Council.

III. Affirmative Action
All procedures shall be applied in a manner that is consistent with Indiana University's commitment to affirmative action, as outlined in University Policy UA-01 "Non-Discrimination/Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action."

IV. Procedures for Program Transfer, Merger, Reorganization, Reduction, or Elimination of Academic Programs
The review of an academic program for transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination shall be in accordance with the following procedures. It is expected that, before the following procedures are undertaken, there has been considerable discussion between the dean(s) of the affected program(s) and the faculty, staff, and students within the program(s), as well as consultation with alumni and leaders in the particular professional organizations who represent practitioners from the program(s). The degree of concern or opposition will determine whether the procedure to be followed will be Model A, B or C.

Model A
(Model A will be followed when there is strong opposition. In this case, a more comprehensive review process will be required.)

1. The dean(s) of the affected program(s) must provide notice to the faculty, staff, and students of the affected program(s) when the change is first contemplated. This should be done as a formal meeting
between the dean and the faculty, staff, and students. This meeting shall include discussion of which school and faculty governance bodies are to review the financial viability of the school and its affected programs, and what review processes are to be used and shall include the issuance of a precise statement about the financial and other difficulties associated with the affected programs and the possible impact on the school for not taking action. Sufficient documentation shall be provided to the faculty and to any others who request it to support and explain any proposed plan.

2. The school’s or unit’s faculty governance body may proceed like the dean as in #1 above to address financial difficulties that they believe are present in either specific programs or within a specific school or unit as a whole. In these situations, the designated leader of a school’s faculty governance body should be the one to initiate the meeting following the guidelines in #1 above.

3. The program faculty shall have an opportunity to discuss the proposed plan and vote by secret ballot.

4. The dean(s) of the affected program(s) shall provide an opportunity for input by faculty, staff and students of the affected program(s) prior to any formal action.

5. The faculty of the school(s) with affected programs shall forward its response to and the results of their voting on the proposed changes to the dean with a copy to the chancellor. In preparing the response, the faculty shall address the factors under IV. 6. a-j.

6. Any proposal to transfer, merge, reorganize, reduce, or eliminate a program must be evaluated according to the following considerations:
   a. The centrality of the program to the mission of the institution as a whole, as well as to the school or department in which it is located
   b. The academic strength and quality of the program and its faculty
   c. The complementary of the program and the work done therein to other programs or to essential functions performed at the institution
   d. The duplication of work done in the program and the work done in other programs, departments, or schools
   e. The current and projected demand for the subject matter taught in the program(s)
   f. The current and predicted comparative cost and efficiency analysis of the program(s)
   g. The provisions for reassigning and retraining affected faculty and the financial implications of the change
   h. The availability (or lack) of program material at other Indiana University campuses or other institutions
   i. The importance of the program(s) in meeting the educational or workforce training needs of Indiana’s citizens
   j. Other factors as appropriate, such as facilities.

7. Having considered the input from faculty, staff, and students, the dean(s) shall forward a proposal for the transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of the affected program(s) to the chancellor with a rationale for why these organizational changes are necessary, how they will enhance the educational process, and what their impact will be on faculty, staff and students. In preparing the proposal, the dean(s) shall address the factors under IV.6.a-j and include an environmental impact statement that shows how the changes will impact other programs and affect the campus as a whole.

8. If the dean(s)’ proposals and the faculty responses are in agreement on the rationale for and implementation of the changes and if the changes do not involve the elimination of a degree-granting program, the chancellor shall forward them to the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee. If the committee believes that further review is required, a majority vote may result in a request that the committee review the proposal and its effects on faculty, staff and students. The committee may choose to appoint an ad hoc committee to review the proposal or assign the proposal to one of the already constituted committees of the IUPUI Faculty Council for further review.

9. The Executive Committee review process must include at least one meeting with members of the faculty
from the schools or departments affected by the proposed changes.
10. Persons affected by, or concerned about, the proposed changes shall be permitted to provide written comments, which will be considered as part of the Executive Committee review process.
11. The Executive Committee or its designee shall prepare a report and recommendations and forward a copy to the chancellor and to the dean(s) of the affected program(s).
12. The dean(s) shall provide a response to the Executive Committee which will submit the proposal, the recommendations of the committee or its designee, and the response(s) from the dean(s) to the IUPUI Faculty Council.
13. When the chancellor of IUPUI declares that there may be a need to transfer, merge, reorganize, reduce, or eliminate a program on campus and that these structural changes may have an impact beyond the affected program(s) and result in the reassignment of faculty or the elimination of degree-granting programs, or when there is disagreement between the dean(s) of the affected programs and the faculty, the proposal will be submitted to the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee for further review.
14. The Executive Committee review process must include at least one open, campus-wide meeting at which anyone with concerns about the proposed changes may be heard.
15. The IUPUI Faculty Council shall be given a reasonable time to deliberate and make its own recommendations to the chancellor concerning the proposal.
16. The chancellor shall make final recommendations on the proposal and forward it to the dean(s) of the affected program(s) for implementation.

Model B
(Model B will be followed when there is uncertainty regarding the change and further investigation is needed.)

1. The dean(s) of the affected program(s) must provide notice to the faculty, staff, and students of the affected program(s) when the change is first contemplated. This should be done as a formal meeting between the dean and the faculty, staff, and students. This meeting shall include discussion of which school and faculty governance bodies are to review the financial viability of the school and its affected programs, and what review processes are to be used and shall include the issuance of a precise statement about the financial and other difficulties associated with the affected programs and the possible impact on the school for not taking action. Sufficient documentation shall be provided to the faculty and to any others who request it to support and explain any proposed plan.
2. The school’s or unit’s faculty governance body may proceed like the dean in #1 above to address financial difficulties that they believe are present in either specific programs or within a specific school or unit as a whole. In these situations, the designated leader of a school’s faculty governance body should be the one to initiate the meeting following the guidelines in #1 above.
3. The program and/or program faculty shall have an opportunity to discuss the proposed plan and vote by secret ballot.
4. The dean(s) of the affected program(s) shall provide an opportunity for input by faculty, staff, and students of the affected program(s) prior to any formal action.
5. The faculty of the school(s) with affected programs shall forward its response to and the results of its vote on the proposed changes to the dean with a copy to the chancellor. In preparing the response, the faculty shall address the factors under IV.6.a-j.
6. Any proposal to transfer, merge, reorganize, reduce, or eliminate a program must be evaluated according to the following considerations:
   a. The centrality of the program to the mission of the institution as a whole, as well as to the school or department in which it is located
   b. The academic strength and quality of the program and its faculty
c. The complementary of the program and the work done therein to other programs or to essential functions performed at the institution

d. The duplication of work done in the program and the work done in other programs, departments, or schools

e. The current and projected demand for the subject matter taught in the program(s).

f. The current and predicted comparative cost and efficiency analysis of the program(s)

g. The provisions for reassigning and retraining affected faculty and the financial implications of the change

h. The availability (or lack) of program material at other Indiana University campuses or other institutions

i. The importance of the program(s) in meeting the educational or workforce training needs of Indiana’s citizens

j. Other factors as appropriate, such as facilities.

7. Having considered the input from faculty, staff, and students, the dean(s) shall forward a proposal for the transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of the affected program(s) to the chancellor with a rationale for why these organizational changes are necessary, how they will enhance the educational process, and what their impact will be on faculty, staff and students. In preparing the proposal, the dean(s) shall address the factors under IV.6.a-j and include an environmental impact statement that shows how the changes will impact other programs and affect the campus as a whole.

8. If the dean(s)’ proposals and the faculty responses are in agreement on the rationale for and implementation of the changes and if the changes do not involve the elimination of a degree-granting program, the chancellor shall forward them to the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee. If the committee believes that further review is required, a majority vote may result in a request that the committee review the proposal and its effects on faculty, staff, and students. The committee may choose to appoint an ad hoc committee to review the proposal or assign the proposal to one of the already constituted committees of the IUPUI Faculty Council for further review.

9. The Executive Committee review process must include at least one meeting with members of the faculty from the schools or departments affected by the proposed changes.

10. Persons affected by, or concerned about, the proposed changes shall be permitted to provide written comments, which will be considered as part of the Executive Committee review process.

11. The Executive Committee or its designee shall prepare a report and recommendations and forward a copy to the chancellor and to the dean(s) of the affected program(s).

12. The chancellor shall make final recommendations on the proposal and forward it to the dean(s) of the affected program(s) involved for implementation.

Model C
(Model C will be followed when there is little to no opposition to the program transfer, merger, reorganization, or elimination of academic programs.)

1. The dean(s) of the affected program(s) must provide notice to the faculty, staff, and students of the affected program(s) when the change is first contemplated. This should be done as a formal meeting between the dean and the faculty, staff, and students. This meeting shall include discussion of which school and faculty governance bodies are to review the financial viability of the school and its affected programs, and what review processes are to be used and shall include the issuance of a precise statement about the financial and other difficulties associated with the affected programs and the possible impact on the school for not taking action. Sufficient documentation shall be provided to the faculty and to any others who request it to support and explain any proposed plan.
2. The school’s or unit’s faculty governance body may proceed like the dean in #1 above to address financial difficulties that they believe are present in either specific programs or within a specific school or unit as a whole. In these situations the designated leader of a school’s faculty governance body should be the one to initiate the meeting following the guidelines in #1 above.

3. The program faculty shall have an opportunity to discuss the proposed plan and vote by secret ballot.

4. The dean(s) of the affected program(s) shall provide an opportunity for input by faculty, staff, and students of the affected program(s) prior to any formal action.

5. The faculty of the school(s) with affected programs shall forward its response to and the results of its vote on the proposed changes to the dean with a copy to the chancellor. In preparing the response, the faculty shall address the factors under IV.6.a-j.

6. Any proposal to transfer, merge, reorganize, reduce, or eliminate a program must be evaluated according to the following considerations:
   a. The centrality of the program to the mission of the institution as a whole, as well as to the school or department in which it is located
   b. The academic strength and quality of the program and its faculty
   c. The complementary of the program and the work done therein to other programs or to essential functions performed at the institution
   d. The duplication of work done in the program and the work done in other programs, departments, or schools
   e. The current and projected demand for the subject matter taught in the program(s)
   f. The current and predicted comparative cost and efficiency analysis of the program(s)
   g. The provisions for reassigning and retraining affected faculty and the financial implications of the change
   h. The availability (or lack) of program material at other Indiana University campuses or other institutions
   i. The importance of the program(s) in meeting the educational or workforce training needs of Indiana’s citizens
   j. Other factors as appropriate, such as facilities.

7. Having considered the input from faculty, staff, and students, the dean(s) shall forward a proposal for the transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of the affected program(s) to the chancellor with a rationale for why these organizational changes are necessary, how they will enhance the educational process, and what their impact will be on faculty, staff and students. In preparing the proposal, the dean(s) shall address the factors under IV.6.a-j. and include an environmental impact statement that shows how the changes will impact other programs and affect the campus as a whole.

8. The chancellor shall make final recommendations on the proposal and forward it to the dean(s) of the affected program(s) for implementation.

V. Procedures Relating to Faculty Appointments as a Result of Transfer, Merger, Reorganization, Reduction, or Elimination of Academic Programs

A. Transfer, Reorganization, or Merger of Programs

1. Faculty members with tenure or those with an unexpired appointment shall not be involuntarily terminated as a result of transfer, merger, or reorganization of programs, which includes the division of a school or department into smaller units.

2. Faculty of a transferred, merged, or reorganized program shall be reassigned to another appropriate program at IUPUI.
   a. Tenured faculty shall be reassigned with tenure.
b. Faculty members with an unexpired appointment shall have the right, when reassigned, to serve no less than the remainder of their current term of appointment in the new program.
c. A faculty member’s reassignment shall not result in a reduced rate of compensation.
d. Other benefits earned before reassignment, such as credit toward a sabbatical leave, shall not be lost as a result of reassignment.

3. If the administrator of a program that is to receive a reassigned faculty member determines that such reassignment should be contingent upon retraining, affected faculty members shall be:
a. automatically eligible for training leave and
b. informed in writing by the administrator of the program to which they are scheduled to be reassigned what specific training must be completed successfully in order to maximize productivity following reassignment.

4. The university shall facilitate retraining for reassignment by approving release time or leaves with pay and fringe benefits for affected faculty members, in addition to requesting tuition-free admission from the Board of Trustees to appropriate courses at Indiana University. If the requisite training is not available at Indiana University, training undertaken elsewhere shall be at Indiana University's expense.

5. Reassigned faculty shall not displace an incumbent in an existing position.

6. If the affected program(s) is part of a school with system-wide responsibilities, faculty may be reassigned to a similar program at another campus, provided that such an assignment is voluntary on the part of the faculty member and shall encompass all of the protections identified in V.A.1-5 above. Faculty member choosing not to accept reassignment to another campus shall not be penalized.

B. Reduction of Programs

1. Reduction of programs shall not result in the involuntary termination of tenured faculty or those with unexpired terms of appointment.
2. Reduction of programs ordinarily shall be accomplished through attrition of faculty by retirement, voluntary resignation, or expiration of terms of appointment.
3. Reduction of programs also may be accomplished by means of negotiated termination of faculty with compensation or by voluntary reassignment in accordance with the provisions identified in V.A.2-V.A.6 above.

C. Elimination of Programs

1. Except under conditions of financial exigency, as defined by the Policy on Dealing with the Effect of Financial Difficulties Upon Faculty at IUPUI, elimination of a program shall not result in the termination of either tenured faculty or those serving with unexpired terms of appointment.
2. In the event of program elimination under conditions other than those of financial exigency, the university shall reassign affected faculty in accordance with the provisions identified in V.A.2-V.A.6 above. Such reassignment may include employment of faculty members in comparable non-faculty positions, provided that faculty members retain their faculty status, salary, and benefits. However, a reassigned faculty member shall not displace an incumbent employee in that position.

D. Prior Notice

After a decision has been made to reassign a faculty member or not to renew an existing faculty appointment under the provisions of V.A-C, the chancellor of IUPUI shall – pursuant to the “Discharge for Cause” of University Policy ACA-52 “Permanent Separations for Academic Appointees”–provide the affected faculty member with a written notice of such action at least one year prior to initiation of the change.
E. Appeal
1. Faculty members who are affected by the provisions of these procedures shall have the right of appeal to the Faculty Board of Review.
2. An appeal shall be made on the basis of a complaint about the interpretation or implementation of procedures regarding transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of programs as established by the IUPUI Faculty Council and elected policy committees of the schools located at IUPUI.
3. Review of such appeals shall be in accordance with the existing procedures of the Faculty Board of Review.

F. Procedural steps of resolution
1. The dean(s) of the affected program(s) shall provide notice to the faculty, staff, and students of the affected program(s) when the change is first contemplated.
2. The dean(s) of the affected program(s) shall provide an opportunity for input by faculty, staff, and students of the affected program(s) prior to any formal action.
3. The faculty of the school(s) of the affected programs shall forward its response to the proposed changes to the dean with a copy to the chancellor. In preparing the response, the faculty shall address the factors under IV.6.a-j.
4. Any proposal to transfer, merge, reorganize, reduce, or eliminate a program must be evaluated according to the following considerations:
   a. The centrality of the program to the mission of the institution as a whole, as well as to the school or department in which it is located
   b. The academic strength and quality of the program and its faculty
   c. The complementary of the program and the work done therein to other programs or to essential functions performed at the institution
   d. The duplication of work done in the program and the work done in other programs, departments, or schools
   e. The current and projected demand for the subject matter taught in the program(s)
   f. The current and predicted comparative cost and efficiency analysis of the program(s)
   g. The provisions for reassigning and retraining affected faculty and the financial implications of the change
   h. The availability (or lack) of program material at other Indiana University campuses or other institutions
   i. The importance of the program(s) in meeting the educational or workforce training needs of Indiana's citizens
   j. Other factors as appropriate, such as facilities
5. After considering the input from faculty, staff, and students, the dean(s) shall forward a proposal for the transfer, merger, reorganization, reduction, or elimination of the affected program(s) to the chancellor with a rationale for why these organizational changes are necessary, how they will enhance the educational process, and what their impact will be on faculty, staff and students. In preparing the proposal, the dean(s) shall address the factors under IV.6.a-j. and include an environmental impact statement that shows how the changes will impact other programs and affect the campus as a whole.
6. If the dean(s)' proposals and the faculty responses are in agreement on the rationale for and implementation of the changes and if the changes do not involve the elimination of a degree-granting program, the chancellor shall forward them to the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee. If the committee believes that further review is required, a majority vote may result in a request that the committee review the proposal and its effects on faculty, staff, and students. The committee may choose
to appoint an ad hoc committee to review the proposal or assign the proposal to one of the already constituted committees of the IUPUI Faculty Council for further review.

7. The Executive Committee review process must include at least one meeting with members of the faculty from the schools or departments affected by the proposed changes.

8. Persons affected by, or concerned about, the proposed changes shall be permitted to provide written comments, which will be considered as part of the Executive Committee review process.

9. The Executive Committee or its designee shall prepare a report and recommendations and forward a copy to the chancellor and to the dean(s) of the affected program(s).

10. The dean(s) shall provide a response to the Executive Committee and the committee will submit the proposal, the recommendations of the committee or its designee, and the response(s) from the dean(s) to the IUPUI Faculty Council.

11. When the chancellor of IUPUI declares that there may be a need to transfer, merge, reorganize, reduce, or eliminate a program on campus and that these structural changes may have an impact beyond the affected program(s) and result in the reassignment of faculty, or the elimination of degree-granting programs, or when there is disagreement between the dean(s) of the affected programs and the faculty, the proposal will be submitted to the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee for further review.

12. The Executive Committee review process must include at least one open, campus-wide meeting at which anyone with concerns about the proposed changes may be heard.

13. The IUPUI Faculty Council shall be given a reasonable time to deliberate and make its own recommendations to the chancellor concerning the proposal.

14. The chancellor shall make final recommendations on the proposal and forward it to the dean(s) of the affected program(s) for implementation.

IUPUI Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee - February 6, 2003
Edited to change references to the Academic Handbook to appropriate University Policies as the Academic Handbook no longer exists. – April 14, 2015
Appendix B

IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement

IUPUI 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.

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
• 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 (e.g., 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 Office of Academic Affairs.

- 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 their 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 their 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 their 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 their progress
- identify the source of any funding or institutional commitments, 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 reaffirm 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 reaffirm 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 their school or library.

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, 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 their 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 University Policies, the IUPUI Faculty Guide, 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.
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Appendix C

IUPUI Dismissal Procedures for Tenured Faculty and Librarians

In accord with university policy, dismissal of tenured faculty or librarians shall occur only for reasons of incompetence, serious personal or professional misconduct, or extraordinary financial exigencies of the University. Faculty who are not yet tenured but earning credit toward tenure are subject to review and reappointment during their probationary periods. A separate policy applies to these faculty: "Policies Governing Reappointment and Non-reappointment During Probationary Periods."

The purpose of tenure is to protect and preserve academic freedom and to provide economic security. In no case shall the exercise of academic freedom be construed as professional incompetence or misconduct. University policies shall be observed, particularly concerning equal opportunity, academic freedom, academic ethics, and discrimination. No dismissal of a faculty member or a librarian shall be based on:

1. One's age, sex, color, race, national origin, religious preference, status as a veteran, political preference or allegiance, or sexual preference;
2. One's physical or emotional condition, whether legally a handicap or disability or not, except and only insofar as this condition demonstrably and seriously limits one's professional competence and was either unknown or nonexistent at the time of one's original employment (nothing in this statement precludes the faculty member's or librarian's right to disability coverage or the university's responsibility to place disabled employees on leave in accord with established policies);
3. One's performance in an area which one has been assigned without sufficient opportunity to prepare;
4. One's understanding of, or approach to, or method of pursuing an area of expertise as invidiously compared to what is considered merely preferable by others in the same or other similar discipline;
5. One's salary as an employee of the university;
6. Sources of income or other support available to one from sources other than the university unless there is a clear link to the allegation;
7. The retirement benefits for which one is eligible;
8. Unsubstantiated complaints either from within or from outside the university, even if job-related.

To the extent possible, all dismissal proceedings shall be kept confidential.

If a faculty member or librarian requests a review of an administrative action through the Faculty Grievance Procedures (Bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty Council Article IV), the procedures described within the dismissal documents will proceed concurrently with the Faculty Grievance Procedures. Once exonerated, a faculty member or librarian shall not be required to answer repeated charges based on substantially the same facts.

I. ALLEGED PROFESSIONAL INCOMPETENCE

Professional competence involves the ability to perform adequately on a continuous basis during the years of appointment the basic tasks of a university professor or librarian. The basic tasks of a faculty member are defined with regard to teaching, research, and service, as understood in a faculty member's academic unit and particularly in their discipline. The basic tasks of a librarian are defined with regard to
performance, professional development, and service responsibilities as understood within the particular library environment. One’s status as a tenured faculty member or librarian at IUPUI establishes a presumption of being professionally competent throughout one’s career through continuing professional growth and development. This presumption is further strengthened by the terms and conditions stated at the time of one’s initial appointment, by one’s professional accomplishments documented in ways established by department, school, library and campus policies, and by any changes in one’s professional responsibilities mutually agreed to during the course of employment as a member of the faculty or as a librarian. It is recognized that both institutions and the individuals who comprise them have a mutual responsibility to evolve with changes in the knowledge and practice bases of our respective disciplines.

Professional incompetence on the part of a faculty member or a librarian, respectively, is the demonstrated continuing inability to perform adequately the ordinary duties of teaching, research, and service as expected of faculty within the academic unit or the ordinary professional responsibilities expected of librarians within the unit. The burden of documenting the professional incompetence of a tenured member of the faculty or of a tenured librarian rests with the dean of the academic unit in consultation with the department chair, library director or other appropriate administrator. For this purpose, only information or evidence that relates to the alleged professional incompetence may be considered.

Notice Period Procedure:
A faculty member or librarian must be given adequate primary official notice of alleged deficiencies serious enough to warrant consideration of dismissal proceedings on the grounds of professional incompetence, and the individual must have an adequate opportunity (a notice period of at least two years) to correct deficiencies which may have contributed to professional incompetence. During the notice period, the faculty member or librarian shall have access to the provisions of Plan A of the Policy on IUPUI Faculty and Librarian Review and Enhancement. Participation in a development plan shall not extend the notice period. In an extraordinary situation, the notice period can be set for less than two years, if:

- The faculty member has a history of annual reviews that document performance which does not meet the specific responsibilities described in the Indiana University Code of Academic Ethics, and
- The Dean can justify the determination that attempts to remediate the performance deficits are unlikely to be successful, and
- The chancellor determines that a shorter notice period is required to protect the interest of the members of the university community.

Primary official notice must be given in written form to the individual by the dean of the academic unit in consultation with the department chair/library director or other appropriate administrator (all hereafter referred to as "the administrator" throughout this document), and the written notice must specifically mention all alleged deficiencies and also the possibility of dismissal.

The primary official notice should be given in confidence to the faculty member or librarian, but the person must be informed of the means whereby they may request an immediate peer review by the appropriate promotion and tenure committee. But, if a majority of the duly constituted promotion and tenure committee is appointed, then the departmental (or unit) faculty or the librarians shall elect a special committee for this purpose as needed. Ordinarily, for faculty the committee to be consulted under this procedure is at the departmental level, but in smaller schools without departments the appropriate committee is the school committee. The faculty member or librarian need not request peer review at this stage and may choose to work solely and privately with the dean and the administrator.
When requested by the faculty member or librarian, the appropriate promotion and tenure committee shall review the concerns addressed in the primary official notice and review the individual's performance to assess whether the issuance of the primary official notice of deficiencies was warranted. The committee will prepare a confidential written report of their proceedings and opinion, with a copy going to the dean of the unit, the administrator, and the faculty member or librarian. The report should be submitted no more than 30 days following the submission of the request by the faculty member or librarian. (In cases in which the notice period is less than 30 days, the administrator may proceed with the initiation of the formal proceedings while the committee completes its work.) If the committee finds that the accusation of professional incompetence is not warranted, the dean may withdraw the official primary notice, and if so must send a written notice of such action to the faculty member or librarian and the administrator in a timely manner.

The intent of this notice period is to allow the faculty member or librarian an opportunity to correct any deficiencies contributing to an inability to perform adequately and to seek solutions other than dismissal. Issuance of the primary official notice may not by itself be used as a reason for changing the terms and conditions of their employment. However, documented evidence of performance may be used to establish annual salary increases (in accord with university, campus, unit, and departmental written salary polices) or to change work assignments.

If the primary official notice is not withdrawn, the faculty member or librarian may submit evidence of having corrected the alleged deficiencies to the administrator at any time during the notice period. If the administrator believes that all deficiencies have been corrected, they shall notify the dean. If the dean agrees that all deficiencies have been corrected, the dean will send a written notice to the faculty member or librarian stating that such is the case and that the question of professional incompetence is closed. If the administrator can demonstrate to the dean that the faculty member is not making progress toward remediating deficiencies during the notice period, the administrator with express permission of the dean of the academic unit may undertake formal proceedings for dismissal on grounds of professional incompetence.

Formal Proceeding Procedures:
If, at the end of the notice period, in the judgment of the administrator the alleged deficiencies have not been corrected, the administrator with the express permission of the dean of the academic unit may undertake formal proceedings for dismissal on grounds of professional incompetence. The administrator must send written notice of their decision to the individual faculty member or librarian in a timely manner. The administrator will confer with an elected peer committee before issuing any final written recommendation for dismissal. For this stage of the procedure, a special five member peer committee must be elected by the unit faculty and librarians from among the unit's tenured members holding the rank of professor, associate professor, librarian, or associate librarian, according to procedures established by the faculty of the unit. If the committee is not elected within 30 days after the administrator calls for the formation of a committee, the unit’s promotion and tenure committee will serve as the committee.

The peer committee shall notify the faculty member or librarian that proceedings have been initiated. A faculty member or librarian may request a hearing before the peer committee before that committee makes a recommendation. The request must be made within thirty days of receipt of notification from the administrator, and the faculty member or librarian shall be afforded at least thirty additional days to prepare a presentation to the peer committee. A hearing, if any, should occur no later than 60 days following the administrator’s written notification to the faculty member initiating formal proceedings. The
committee deliberations must be concluded and the report filed within 90 days following the initial written notification to the faculty member initiating formal proceedings.

The peer committee will meet privately to the extent permitted by law, examine all evidence, and arrive at a recommendation regarding whether or not the faculty member or librarian is professionally incompetent. At all points in this process, the faculty member or librarian is entitled to know the sources and nature of the evidence, to be present (except during initial organizational meetings and final deliberations) and to confront those alleging incompetence, to have outside experts testify, to be represented by counsel or anyone else of their choice, and to present evidence. Similarly, the administrator has a right to be present at meetings (except during initial organizational meetings and final deliberations), to interview witnesses, to have outside experts testify, to be represented by counsel if they chooses, and to present evidence.

The peer committee will make a written report regardless of its findings. The committee must file its report within 90 days of the faculty member’s initial notification by the administrator; the administrator may proceed with the dismissal process after 90 days regardless. If a majority of the peer committee finds that the faculty member or librarian is professionally incompetent, the written report shall state this and the basis for its determination. If the charge of professional incompetence is unsubstantiated, the committee will state this conclusion and the basis for its determination. The written report will be forwarded simultaneously to the faculty member or librarian, to the administrator, and to the dean of the academic unit.

If the peer committee finds that the faculty member or librarian is not incompetent, the committee will recommend that the proceedings terminate and that the administrator withdraw the allegation in writing. If the administrator proceeds with the process despite the peer committee’s findings, the peer committee must be notified and be afforded an opportunity to comment to the dean. All commentary from the peer committee must be a part of the record considered by all subsequent reviewers, who must explicitly address the peer committee’s findings if they disagree with the written record. The administrator must keep in mind that the burden of proof that adequate cause exists rests with the institution and will be satisfied only by substantial evidence in the record considered as a whole.

If the peer committee finds that the faculty member or librarian is professionally incompetent, the administrator shall send their written recommendation for dismissal on grounds of professional incompetence to the dean of the academic unit. Within thirty days of the receipt of the administrator’s written recommendation, the dean may proceed with dismissal procedures by forwarding the recommendation along with the peer committee report and their own comments to the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer. The dean of the academic unit will provide a copy of their written recommendation to the faculty member or librarian. The executive vice chancellor will add their own recommendation and will forward the entire file, along with any additional comments or responses from the faculty member or librarian, to the chancellor. The faculty member or librarian must be provided with a copy of all administrative comments and recommendations before they are forwarded to the chancellor. The chancellor may choose to proceed with the dismissal of the faculty member or librarian. If so, the chancellor shall issue via certified mail a written notice of dismissal, which will state with reasonable particularity the grounds for dismissal for professional incompetence. The notice shall state the effective date of dismissal.

In lieu of the one year notice period as required by the dismissal policy stated in the University Policies, the faculty member or librarian may be offered an amount equal to their salary and fringe benefits for one year unless some other mutually agreeable arrangement is negotiated. The faculty member or the librarian
shall have the right to resign at any point in the proceedings prior to notification of dismissal by the chancellor.

Within ninety days of receipt of the notice of dismissal from the chancellor, the faculty member or librarian may request a hearing before an IUPUI Faculty Board of Review.
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Edited to remove references to defunct Indiana University Library committees and review boards, April 17, 2019
Edited pronouns (he/she) for inclusivity (their), 7/1/20

II. ALLEGED MISCONDUCT

Dismissal of a tenured faculty member or librarian on grounds of misconduct shall be sought only with respect to behavior which constitutes such serious and willful personal or professional wrongdoing as to demonstrate the faculty member or librarian's unfitness to hold their academic appointment. The following acts exemplify, but do not exhaust the sort of activity which might constitute misconduct: acts which constitute a felony; acts which constitute a flagrant breach of university rules or academic ethics and which involve moral wrongdoing; acts of academic dishonesty such as plagiarism and falsification of reports or research; theft or misuse of University resources; persistent neglect of duties or persistent failure to carry out the tasks reasonably to be expected of a person holding the position involved. Malicious or knowingly false accusations of misconduct shall be considered serious misconduct on the part of the accuser(s). In the course of dismissal for misconduct proceedings, only information or evidence that relates to the alleged misconduct may be considered.

Where the ability of the faculty member or librarian to perform effectively is clearly and seriously impaired by the nature of the misconduct, or where the work of the department, school or library clearly would be disrupted or if immediate harm to himself, herself, or others is threatened by continuance, the faculty member or librarian may at any time be suspended by the dean with pay until the matter is decided.

Informal Discussion Period:
Actions for dismissal on the grounds of misconduct must be initiated by an administrator at the rank of dean or above, but the dean of an academic unit may base this action on the recommendations of a department chair, library director or other personnel who may be responsible for or knowledgeable about the conduct of the faculty member or librarian alleged to have engaged in misconduct. Where misconduct is suspected, the faculty member or librarian will first, as early as possible, be invited by the dean who is considering initiating action to discuss and respond to the allegations in person. The dean is obligated to collect such information and evidence as to have a reasonable and plausible belief that dismissal may be warranted by the facts; however, to the extent possible, the accusation of misconduct is to be kept confidential by the administration and those consulted. Several meetings may be required, and the faculty member or librarian must have been apprised of all allegations and evidence and been given a reasonable opportunity to respond to them prior to the end of the final exploratory meeting of the dean with the faculty member or librarian.
In cases in which the dean of the academic unit and the faculty member or librarian disagree as to whether the alleged misconduct has been properly characterized as "serious misconduct" warranting dismissal proceedings, the dean shall offer to bring this conduct characterization issue before an impartial committee composed of at least three faculty members or librarians who are jointly acceptable to the dean and faculty member or librarian against whom the allegations have been made. If the dean and faculty member cannot reach agreement on at least three members to form the impartial committee after considering all eligible members of the academic unit, the following process will be used. If the dean and the faculty member or librarian agree on two members from the academic unit, the chair of the IUPUI Ombudsteam (or the chair's designee) will serve as the third member of the committee. In all other circumstances, the committee will be composed of one member of the academic unit selected by the dean, one member of the academic unit selected by the faculty member or librarian, and the chair of the IUPUI Ombudsteam (or the chair's designee). This group, referred to subsequently in this document as "the Committee," shall elect its own chair. If this offer for early assistance is accepted by the faculty member or librarian, the Committee, after meeting with the dean and the faculty member or librarian, is only to render an opinion as to whether the nature of the alleged conduct may properly be characterized as "serious misconduct" as defined in Section II. If the Committee deems perusal of dismissal proceedings to be inappropriate, it should so state. In that case, the Committee may weigh the interests of the faculty member or librarian and of the unit and suggest, if possible, alternative ways to accommodate those interests. In the spirit of informal resolution, all parties are expected to maintain collegiality, but nothing in these procedures precludes a faculty member, librarian, or administrative officer from being represented by counsel or anyone else of choice. The entire procedure described in this paragraph should be completed within a reasonable period of time, which ordinarily would be one week. The faculty member or librarian and the dean shall be apprised of the panel's determination before any formal proceeding may begin.

In an instance when the Ethics in Research Committee has conducted a review of an allegation of research misconduct and made a recommendation to the chancellor for dismissal, the requirement for an informal discussion period will be set aside. In this instance, the process of dismissal will then begin with formal written notice being sent to the faculty member or librarian by certified mail by the dean as specified in the section titled, “Formal Proceeding Period,” unless the chancellor decides to act directly. Ordinarily, the chancellor will refer a recommendation for dismissal from the Ethics in Research Committee to the dean for action, but the chancellor may reserve the right to act directly on the recommendation of the Ethics in Research Committee after notifying the faculty member or librarian and the dean and allowing 30 days for a response from either party.

Formal Proceeding Period:
If the preceding discussions do not resolve the matter, the dean, having a reasonable and plausible belief that dismissal is warranted, shall, within ninety days after the final informal meeting with the faculty member or librarian, provide that individual with written notice of intent to initiate formal proceedings to investigate possible misconduct; copies of the notice shall be given to the department chair/library director or other appropriate administrator, to the executive vice chancellor or his/her designee, and to the chancellor. This notice shall detail the specific nature of the allegations and list the witnesses, statements, documents and other evidence on which they are based.

The formal written notice shall be sent to the faculty member or librarian by certified mail. When a formal, detailed notice has been issued, the faculty member or librarian will be allowed 30 days from date of receipt to present to the dean or other administrator initiating the dismissal proceedings, written information in response to the allegations; will be allowed to be represented by counsel or anyone else of their choice; and is entitled to full access to all relevant information regarding the case possessed by the dean or other
administrative officers, including the names and location of all witnesses. No information to which the faculty member or librarian is denied access shall be used by the administration.

After consideration of the written response, or if no response is received at the completion of the 30 day period, the dean may proceed. If the dean believes that the faculty member or librarian is guilty of serious misconduct and wishes to pursue the dismissal of the individual, the dean must forward a written recommendation for dismissal with supporting documentation to the executive vice chancellor or his/her designee, who will add their recommendation and comments and then forward the entire file to the chancellor. A copy of all materials forwarded, must be provided to the faculty member or librarian, who must be given an opportunity to provide comment and evidence in defense to the chancellor.

If the chancellor supports the recommendation for dismissal for misconduct, the chancellor shall issue via certified mail a written notice to the faculty member or librarian stating the effective date of dismissal and stating with reasonable particularity the grounds on which the action is being taken.

The faculty member or librarian shall have the right to resign at any point in the proceedings prior to notification of dismissal by the chancellor. The faculty member or librarian shall have 30 days from receipt of the notice of dismissal from the chancellor to request a hearing before a Faculty Board of Review (as per IUPUI Faculty Guide, Bylaw Article IV) regardless of the date of dismissal.

Nothing in this policy shall prevent designated university officers, including the director of equal opportunity or the director of internal auditing, from conducting investigations as specified by university policies. Nothing in this policy shall prevent the university from referring matters of possible misconduct to city, state, or federal agencies that may have jurisdiction in the investigation of possible misconduct.

Approved by IUPUI Faculty Council, April 4, 1995
Revisions approved by IUPUI Faculty Council, December 2, 1999
Edited for title and handbook names changes, April 14, 2015
Edited pronouns (he/she) for inclusivity (their), 7/1/20
Appendix D

Policy on Dealing with the Effect of Financial Difficulties Upon Faculty at IUPUI

I. General Principles
Academic organizations face the risk of serious financial problems which can be solved only by extraordinary means. As one of those extraordinary measures, suspension or dismissal of any faculty or librarians should be approached with great care and implemented according to plans and policies developed outside an atmosphere of impending financial stress. Removal of the people with the primary responsibilities for carrying out the mission of the university places into immediate jeopardy the vitality of the institution and its ability to respond to the needs of its constituents. Accordingly, consideration of removal of persons with tenured or tenure-track academic appointment should never be considered as a tactic to be employed before other measures have been given a chance to work, much less as a routine or automatic step in the process of financial recovery, but rather as a measure of last resort, and the proponents of such action bear the burden of proving its necessity.

Risks of impairment to the mission and stature of the institution are posed by remedial measures and must be borne across the campus when an even greater threat to its very survival exists. Faculty should be prepared to bear part of that risk equitably with the other components of the institution. If such extraordinary circumstances exist, and reduction in force becomes a reality, all constituents of the university must be assured that faculty and administrators have worked together to address the problem and alternative solutions. Starting with the proposition that precipitous and ad hoc measures taken in the face of financial difficulties magnify the risk of institutional degradation, this statement of policy has been developed to guide the cooperative efforts needed to avoid or repair the difficulties. Persons whose jobs have been eliminated as part of the measures for ameliorating financial difficulties should be able to draw some assurances from these guidelines that their sacrifices are indeed extraordinary and that all lesser measures with any reasonable potential for addressing the financial difficulty have been implemented prior to the call for their sacrifice.

Because of the many different kinds and levels of financial difficulty that can arise on a campus as large and complex as IUPUI, it is necessary to have a flexible policy for response. To minimize the likelihood of an abrupt or sudden financial exigency and to assure members of the university community that all measures have been taken to remedy the financial problems, it is essential to outline a structure for the responses to all levels of financial problems and assure broad cooperative participation in the development and implementation of the process. In light of the financial structure of IUPUI, it is imperative that the focus of solutions to problems should be as close to the source as possible. The following statement of guidelines is organized to respond to financial difficulties as a process that can develop from relatively minor problems to matters of grave and serious concern.

II. Faculty Involvement in Academic Affairs
The chancellor has ultimate responsibility for the financial health and integrity of the campus. Accordingly, the chancellor and those administrative officers who are directly responsible to the chancellor are expected to be directly involved in campus budgetary affairs. However, faculty also should be routinely involved in monitoring the financial health of the institution. The respective roles of faculty and administration in
budgetary affairs provide a basis for collective action in addressing problems when the financial health of the institution is in question.

Early responses to impending financial difficulties hold potential for maximizing corrective effect at minimal cost. Conditions affecting the financial health of an educational institution certainly can change suddenly and with little or no warning. However, most conditions of financial difficulty are predictable with careful monitoring of the budgets of both academic and support units over a significant period of time. Overall or broad-based developments such as declining enrollments can also have obvious negative financial impact and must also be monitored. The predictability derived from the monitoring process can expand the lead time for response, allow remedial measures to be exerted at an early date in the development of conditions producing the difficulty, and allow the negative impact of remedial measures to be spread over a wider time frame.

Effective responses to financial difficulties require the cooperation of administration and faculty. The best way to ensure informed faculty participation is through faculty budget committees at the school or unit level and at the campus level which have ongoing responsibilities in the development and review of budgeting. The nature and role of the school or unit budgetary committee provides decision makers immediate perspective on the financial difficulty and its history as well as a concrete view of the ramifications of solutions. The complexity of organization and financial management principles on the campus also makes it crucial that faculty be involved at the earliest stage of identification and consideration of alternative solutions to the problem.

The nature of the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee places it in a unique position to detect impending financial difficulties. It can bring to bear the experiences and insights of a broad base of faculty representatives knowledgeable in budgetary matters for review or development of plans to address financial problems at the campus, school or unit level. While the annual budget hearings in which the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee participates is the best mechanism for monitoring overall developments, budget committees at the school or unit level should be encouraged to communicate to the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee any information and concerns pertinent to the early stages of financial problems whenever they arise.

III. Impending Financial Difficulties
For a particular school or unit, financial difficulties can be recognized by administration and faculty at two different levels:

A. internally through the efforts of deans and faculty-selected school or unit budget committees; or

B. externally through the review function of the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee and the campus administration.

When the problem arises and is recognized or predicted at the school level, the dean and school committee should analyze it and formulate a plan for correction at their earliest opportunity. The information pertinent to the problem and the corrective plan should be communicated to the chancellor's office.

At this early stage of consideration of financial difficulties, for example, when it is anticipated that financial reserves are exhausted; when flexibility from carryover is gone, a range of actions that hold promise of averting the problem should be considered and implemented. Discussion of corrective measures should
give strong consideration to measures that increase revenues as well as those that reduce costs for such things as physical plant and equipment, or administrative and support services and personnel.

If the problem or the plan for addressing it arise from or affect other schools or other support units, the information pertinent to the problem and the plan for correction must be sent to the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee for review and recommendations prior to implementation. The plan will also be reviewed by the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee when the school or unit budget committee and dean are in disagreement. At any time, the school or unit budget committee may request information from or communicate its concerns to the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee.

When the problem arises within or from actions taken by a support center, faculty review may take place at the unit level in the appropriate faculty advisory committee. In any case, since financial difficulties in a support unit will inevitably affect other support and academic units, the problem and plans for its remedy will be reviewed by the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee.

Whenever the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee is involved in the formulation or review of a plan for correction of financial difficulties, the final plan should be the product of joint efforts of the committee and representatives of the chancellor's office and the Council of Dean's.

IV. Financial Crisis

Conditions may arise which will indicate that the financial difficulty presents a financial crisis that if not addressed decisively and with dispatch could seriously jeopardize the financial health of the institution. Financial crisis exists when any one or a combination of the following conditions present themselves, but it may present itself in ways other than those listed here:

A. A problem presenting financial difficulty may be recognized in the early stages of analysis as one that cannot be resolved at the school or unit level.
B. An earlier recognized difficulty may not be responsive to measures designed and implemented at the school or unit level to correct it.
C. New circumstances may arise which actually worsen the financial condition despite the application of corrective tactics.
D. An unanticipated and externally-generated problem may suddenly present itself, for example, deep reductions might be mandated by the General Assembly or sudden and unexpected enrollment declines might occur.

In crisis conditions it becomes necessary to broaden lines of communication and to consider more serious remedial steps. Since the problem can arise from and affect both school or unit and campus levels, the remedial tactics to address the crisis will be formulated by different constituent groups and have different attributes depending upon the level of origin and effect. At minimum, the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee and the chancellor will communicate the existence of the crisis to the Faculty Council, and allow opportunities for questions and discussion.

If the problem arises at the school or unit level, the school or unit budget committee and dean should proceed much in the same way as described in part III of this statement. However, under crisis conditions the participants will consider more drastic corrective measures, (such as adjustment of taxes for support units; reduction of administrative expenses; sale of university property; early retirement; reorganization, merger, or elimination of academic programs; and non-reappointment of faculty upon the expiration of the term of appointment).
In the extraordinary circumstances where the problem arises in a single school or unit and the financial condition of that school or unit, by the demands it places upon the resources of other components, threatens the mission of the institution, the chancellor may initiate the process for declaring financial exigency.

Although crisis conditions are very serious, they are not grounds for involuntary dismissal of a faculty member or librarian with tenure or serving a term of an unexpired appointment as a solution to the crisis. Nor shall such dismissals be undertaken in the name of attaining greater efficiency or for purposes of reducing the proportion of faculty or librarian salary lines in school or unit budgets. When such drastic measures become necessary, they require invoking the process for the declaration of a state of financial exigency described below in this policy statement. Reductions in force in support units should take place prior to dismissal of tenured faculty or librarians, non-reappointment or termination prior to the expiration of a term of appointment.

The steps to be followed under conditions of financial crisis at the school or unit level are as follows:

1. After notification of the chancellor's office of the circumstances that indicate the existence of a crisis, the school or unit budget committee and the dean must participate jointly in the formulation of a plan to address the problem.
2. Upon the development of a plan, the dean will submit the plan to the chancellor's office and shall include a statement indicating the faculty's position on the plan. In the event of a disagreement between the dean and the faculty, the disagreement and the basis for it should be clearly stated.
3. Upon receipt of the plan, the chancellor's office will forward a copy of the plan, including a statement of the faculty's position on the plan, together with supporting documents and information, to the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee for review and recommendations for modification. In the event of disagreement between the dean and the faculty, the disagreement and the basis for it should be clearly stated.
4. Upon receipt of the recommendations of the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee, the chancellor will implement the plan (as modified or approved).

If the problem arises from or affects more than a single school or unit, including support units, the crisis carries broader implications and must be addressed with remedial measures on a commensurate scale. When conditions of a crisis arise from or affect multiple components of the university, it may be appropriate to utilize university reserves to remedy the conditions. Consequently, it is imperative that the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee be involved as early as possible in a collaborative effort with central administration, schools, and administrative service units as necessary to formulate the remedial plan. No tenured faculty member or librarian shall be involuntarily terminated for reasons of financial crisis. Upon the issuance of a letter to a faculty member or librarian giving notice of non-reappointment upon the expiration of a term of appointment for reasons of financial crisis, the responsible dean or director, the chancellor, and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer shall report that fact to the Faculty Council at its next regular meeting. The report shall include assurances that the responsible dean or director has given every reasonable consideration of alternatives to dismissal.

V. Financial Exigency

A. Declaration of financial exigency
The most extreme financial difficulty is that of financial exigency: when conditions pose an imminent threat of indefinite duration such that the central mission of the campus is in jeopardy, American Association of University Professors, Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure §4 (c) defines "financial exigency" as "an imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by less drastic means." The chancellor, upon becoming apprised of evidence that the financial condition of the institution has reached or is about to reach this stage, will share the pertinent information with the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee and ask it to consider the possibility of a declaration of financial exigency.

Upon receipt of the chancellor's request, the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee shall consult with the Faculty Affairs Committee and representatives of other affected groups to obtain any other information necessary to consider the advisability of declaring financial exigency.

Within 30 days of the request from the chancellor, the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee shall submit to the chancellor and the Faculty Council a written report on its deliberations, its judgment on the severity of the situation, and its recommendations. If in the judgment of the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee the severity of the financial condition warrants a declaration of financial exigency, it shall state that judgment in the report.

Upon receipt of the report from the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee, the chancellor shall discuss its recommendations with the president or designee of Faculty Council and the chairs of the campus Budgetary Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committee. If this discussion leads to the conclusion that the institution is suffering a financial exigency, the chancellor shall, in a forum open to all faculty, declare that the campus has reached a state of financial exigency and present a summary of the reasons and evidence supporting that declaration. After making the declaration, the chancellor shall allow ample opportunity for questions and discussion.

B. Formulation, review, and reporting of a detailed plan for meeting financial exigency

1. Formulation:
Only when financial exigency has been declared is consideration of the most drastic of remedial measures appropriate. While it must be recognized that it may be necessary to dismiss tenured faculty or librarians, not reappoint, or terminate prior to the expiration of a term of appointment, such action should be taken only as a last resort.

The chancellor has the responsibility for dismissal of faculty or librarians with tenure, non-reappointment, and termination before the expiration of a term of appointment. It is imperative that decision makers at the school or unit level be involved in the consideration of such actions as remedial measures for financial exigency, and that they and their respective faculties have in place detailed policies and procedures well in advance of the occurrence of financial exigency. However, deans and school or unit faculty committees do not have unilateral authority to implement such measures. Because financial exigency reflects the condition of the campus as a whole and permits the dismissal of faculty or librarians whose tenure originally was approved by the president and Trustees of Indiana University, the dismissal of tenured faculty or librarians for financial exigency must be authorized by the president and reported to the Indiana University Trustees.

Termination of faculty or librarians with tenure, non-reappointment or termination before the expiration of a term of appointment under circumstances of financial exigency is a fundamentally different process.
from dismissal of tenured faculty or librarians for misconduct or incompetence because the elements of individual fault and responsibility are not present in the former. Accordingly, no tenured faculty members or librarians will be dismissed for reasons of financial exigency prior to the formulation of a Financial Exigency Plan developed by all affected schools or units. The chancellor, in consultation with the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee, will determine which components of the university will be involved in developing the plan to resolve the state of financial exigency.

Preparation of the detailed written plan shall be the collaborative responsibility of a task force which will include the appropriate administrative officers and representatives of the faculty groups or librarians who will be affected by the implementation of the plan. The composition of the task force will be guided by the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee's identification of the affected schools. The chancellor will appoint the members, and such appointments must include some faculty members drawn from a list of recommendations submitted by the President of the IUPUI Faculty Council. Each affected school or unit will submit specific recommended actions, including identification of the specific individuals who are to be dismissed under the terms of the financial exigency.

The faculty of each unit in consultation with the unit head shall adopt standing policies and procedures which will guide the development of the detailed plan described above. Included in these policies will be the criteria for selecting the departments, programs or units within the school or individuals to be dismissed. These policies and procedures should be generated prior to the development of a state of financial crisis within the school or unit.

The criteria for selection of components of a school must consider the centrality of the component to the school or to other schools, its mission, its quality, and the complementary of the component to other components within the school or campus, duplication of work done in other components, and student or community needs. Relative to the dismissal of individuals, the weighting of factors such as rank, seniority in rank, length of service at IUPUI are to be included. The criteria must stand the test of fairness and equity without regard to age, sex, color, race, national origin, religious preference, status as a veteran, political preference or allegiance, or sexual preference. In addition, given the university's long-range commitment to diversity, such dismissals should consider the sexual and racial balance of faculty and librarians in the unit.

If this policy for responding to financial difficulties has been followed, by the time financial exigency is declared, in addition to faculty and librarians with tenure or serving an unexpired term of appointment, only those administrators, support personnel and non-tenured faculty deemed essential to the central mission of a unit designated for reduction will remain. Dismissal of a faculty member or librarian with tenure in favor of retaining a faculty member or librarian who has not attained tenure is a departure from AAUP policy and jeopardizes the academic freedom and economic security implicit in tenure that is acknowledged by Indiana University. (University Policy ACA-37 "Faculty and Library Tenure") It can be justified only in the extraordinary circumstances where a serious distortion of the academic program would result. Any plan that retains untenured personnel while dismissing tenured personnel must clearly and convincingly justify the departure from policy. Changes in the status quo of an academic program, such as reduction in the number of course sections or increase in student-to-faculty ratios, of themselves do not constitute "serious distortion." However, all personnel who remain should recognize that their assignments and duties may be affected by actions that are consistent with the policy on reassignment and reorganization.
The IUPU Columbus faculty and librarians hold tenured appointments through the departments and schools of the IUPUI campus, but the budget which covers their salaries is separate and distinct. This policy for financial difficulties applies to IUPU Columbus.

2. Review
The task force will consolidate the recommendations received from each school and unit into a final plan. The task force may request modification of individual school or unit plans before incorporating the recommendations into the final plan. The final plan, along with any comments from the affected schools' and units' committees, is forwarded to the chancellor, who within one week will present the plan to (1) the Budgetary Affairs Committee for final review and comment on the budgetary aspects, (2) the Faculty Affairs Committee for review and comment on the consistency of the application of the school or unit's policies and procedures for identification of the faculty or librarians to be dismissed, (3) the Faculty Council Executive Committee for information purposes and (4) other appropriate campus offices. The Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee will submit comments and recommendations to the chancellor within one month of receipt of the final plan.

After receiving the recommendations of the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee, and other bodies whom the chancellor might consult, such as the Council of Academic Deans, the chancellor will finalize the Financial Exigency Plan and notify appropriate administrators, faculty representatives, the president, and Indiana University Trustees.

3. Reporting
The chancellor will ensure that timely, accurate, and comprehensive information about the status of the development and implementation of the Financial Exigency Plan is provided to the entire academic community throughout the process. The chancellor will report to the IUPUI Faculty Council regularly for the duration of the financial exigency.

C. Procedures

1. Notification of Dismissal
The chancellor has responsibility for implementing the plan by notifying tenured faculty and librarians of their dismissal and by directing other campus administrative officers to take the steps required to implement the plan. The chancellor will have responsibility for notifying tenured faculty or librarians that they are dismissed under conditions of financial exigency and shall issue the notice of dismissal in writing via certified mail. The notice will include a summary of the conditions which led to the declaration of financial exigency. A tenured faculty member or librarian will have at least two years' notice prior to dismissal or receive an amount equal to at least two years' salary and benefits or a combination of the two. Other employees affected by the financial exigency, including other academic appointees, shall be entitled to such notice as normally applies for any termination except misconduct.

2. Faculty Board of Review
Within a reasonable time following receipt of the notice of dismissal from the chancellor, the individual faculty member or librarian may request a hearing before an IUPUI Faculty Board of Review. The issues in this hearing may include the following:

a. Whether the policy and procedures for declaring financial exigency have been followed. The burden will rest on the administration to prove compliance. The findings of Faculty Boards of Review in previous proceedings involving issues of the adherence to policy and procedures for declaring financial exigency
may be introduced in subsequent board of review hearings if, but only if, all information identifying the

grievant has been removed from the findings to be introduced.

b. The validity of the judgments made at the school or unit level and the criteria developed by the school

or unit for identification of an individual for termination, but the recommendations of a faculty body

on these matters will be considered presumptively valid and will be overturned only upon a clear

showing by the grievant that the recommendations were fundamentally unfair.

c. Whether the criteria are being properly applied in the individual case.

The purpose of a faculty board of review proceeding upon an individual's grievance shall be to determine

if the individual's selection for dismissal has been made fairly and in accordance with the policy and

procedures specified in the Financial Exigency Plan. It is not for the purpose of opening up, on a wholesale

basis, the merits of the declaration of a financial exigency, or the plan for addressing the financial exigency.

Any Faculty Board of Review convened for the purpose of reviewing a dismissal for financial exigency shall

proceed to conclusion as soon as practicable and must make its final report within three months of its

receipt of a petition for review of such dismissal.

3. Replacement; reinstatement of dismissed faculty or librarians

Replacement and reinstatement of faculty dismissed pursuant to the financial exigency plan shall be

governed by the following rules:

a. Vacancies created by dismissal of tenured faculty or librarians and faculty not reappointed or

terminated prior to expiration of the term of appointment: For at least three years following dismissal,

school or units that have terminated faculty or librarians pursuant to a financial exigency plan shall

offer such person reinstatement and a reasonable time in which to accept or decline the offer prior to

hiring a replacement for the dismissed faculty member or librarian.

b. Vacancies in tenured positions created by normal attrition: Within an affected school, unit, or

University Libraries, essential replacement hiring to fill vacancies in tenured positions created by

normal attrition shall be possible for the three year limitations periods above, and every consideration

shall be given to hiring dismissed faculty or librarians if the possibility exists for retraining or adapting

to the requirements in the area of need.

c. Replacements for part-time positions: Every reasonable effort should be made by the affected school or

unit to reinstate dismissed tenured faculty members and librarians before hiring replacements for part-

time positions. Replacement hiring for part-time positions is appropriate in cases where part-time

positions have been a regular component of the school or unit's workforce, and continuation of such

positions is necessary to maintain the financial health of the school or unit.

d. Faculty Board of Review: Dismissed faculty or librarians have a right to request a Faculty Board of

Review within the three year limitations periods above for the purpose of obtaining review of issues

concerning hiring or reinstatement decisions that affect them.

4. Special Considerations for Dismissed Tenured Faculty and Librarians

Because faculty or librarians dismissed under financial exigency lose their position through no fault of their

own, these individuals qualify for special considerations. As stated above, every consideration must be

given to hiring dismissed faculty or librarians if the possibility of retraining or adapting to the needs of

other units exists. Consideration for appointments in other units might include administrative or

professional duties as well as teaching, research or service related to the faculty member's or librarian's

areas of competence. The Office of Academic Affairs will also provide assistance in identifying positions on
other campuses of Indiana University for these individuals. Faculty or librarians dismissed because of financial exigency will be notified of professional or administrative vacancies for which the individuals may be qualified for at least one year following termination of appointment. Every reasonable effort will be made to assist faculty or librarians in securing a comparable position at another institution.

For the three year period following dismissal for financial exigency or until appointment to a comparable position is achieved, the individual will be considered to have "affiliated" faculty or librarian status which, at a minimum, entitles the individual to use of the library; use of campus facilities under the same applicable fee structure that applies to other faculty members; purchase of health insurance under the same regulations that apply to faculty or librarians on sabbatical or unpaid leaves; office space where the office would not otherwise be occupied; use of office equipment that would not otherwise be used or disposed of, to include computers, printers, copy machines, telephones, etc.; and access to university computing services to the same extent as prior to dismissal or to the same extent as applies to retained faculty or librarians (e.g., e-mail, Internet, dial-up privileges). To the extent permitted by the terms of contractual obligations undertaken by the university with third parties in providing for retirement plans, faculty members and librarians dismissed pursuant to a Financial Exigency Plan shall retain rights to contribute to retirement funds.

D. Duration of declared state of financial exigency; report of actions
Although it may take a long time for the remedies to financial exigency to take effect, it is a condition based on future expectations which can change more quickly. As a result, the declared state of financial exigency will lapse after one year, at which time a report on the steps taken and resulting changes in financial conditions and projections must be made by the chancellor to the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee, Faculty Council, the president of the University and University Trustees. Any further consideration of dismissal of faculty or librarians with tenure, non-reappointment or termination prior to the expiration of a term of appointment for reasons of financial exigency will require a new declaration of financial exigency, preparation of a Financial Exigency Plan, and adherence to the principles and procedures set out in this document.

A final report of the actions taken under financial exigency will be prepared by the chancellor and kept on file in the Faculty Council office and the Office of the Chancellor. The report will be filed when all actions are complete or within one year of the date of declaration of financial exigency, whichever occurs earlier.
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Appendix E

Research Misconduct

(Policy unedited for brand.)

Scope

A. This Policy applies to:
   • All individuals who hold University appointments and all graduate students who are engaged in the
design, conduct, or reporting of research, whether or not the research is funded; and to
   • Anyone engaged in the design, conduct, or reporting or research through a Sponsored Program at
Indiana University, to the extent of that research.
B. Except for research misconduct in the context of a Sponsored Program, allegations of research
misconduct by undergraduate students shall be dealt with through the Code of Student Rights,
Responsibilities, and Conduct.
C. The Deciding Officer (DO) may, in consultation with the Dean of the Graduate School, determine that
an allegation of research misconduct on the part of a graduate student is more appropriately referred
to the disciplinary channels provided in the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct or
such other disciplinary process duly established by a campus or academic unit.
D. All members of the University community have a duty to guard against and to report research
misconduct; to cooperate with the Inquiry and Investigation Committees and the Research Integrity
Officer (RIO); and to provide relevant evidence to the committees and the RIO in the course of research
misconduct proceedings.

Policy Statement

General Policy on Research Misconduct

A. Responsibilities of All Members of the University Community
   • All members of the University community have a responsibility to guard against research
misconduct by themselves, their colleagues and collaborators, and the people they teach or
supervise.
   • All members of the University community shall report research misconduct to the RIO. If an
individual is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the definition of research misconduct,
they may consult the RIO informally. The RIO will advise on whether the circumstances described
by the individual appear to meet the definition of research misconduct. The RIO may refer the
individual or allegation to other offices or officials if appropriate.
   • All members of the University community shall cooperate with a research misconduct preliminary
assessment, inquiry, or investigation, and shall provide relevant evidence in the course of research
misconduct proceedings.
B. Protecting Parties
   • All parties to research misconduct proceedings, including respondents, complainants, witnesses,
committee members, the RIO, and staff, are entitled to be treated with respect.
   • As requested, the RIO and other institutional officials shall make all reasonable and practical efforts
to protect or restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in research misconduct, but
against whom no finding of research misconduct is made.
• No person may retaliate in any way against complainants, witnesses, committee members, or the RIO and their staff. The RIO shall investigate reports of alleged or apparent retaliation and recommend appropriate actions to the DO.

C. Confidentiality
• All research misconduct investigations shall protect the confidentiality of all parties to the greatest extent possible. The RIO shall:
  o Limit disclosure of the identity of respondents, complainants, and witnesses to those who need to know in order to carry out a thorough, competent, objective, and fair research misconduct proceeding; and
  o Except as otherwise prescribed by law, limit the disclosure of any records or evidence from which research subjects might be identified to those who need to know in order to carry out a research misconduct proceeding.
• The RIO shall use written confidentiality agreements or other mechanisms when appropriate to ensure that the recipient does not make any further disclosure of identifying information. If the complainant requests anonymity, the University will strive to honor the request within the limits set by applicable policy and law.
• The DO may communicate about research misconduct allegations and proceedings with other persons as required by law or as necessary to protect public health or safety, the integrity of research, fundamental fairness to the respondent or other parties, or an overriding interest of the University.

D. Conflict of Interest
• At all stages of research misconduct proceedings, all persons involved shall identify and disclose to the RIO, DO, or President, as appropriate, any real or perceived conflict of interest.
• If such conflicts are present, the individual shall recuse himself or herself from any investigative or decisional role in the case.
  o If any prospective committee member at any point in the process presents a conflict of interest, that committee member shall be replaced by the DO.
  o If the RIO has a conflict of interest, the DO shall name a replacement to carry out the functions of the RIO under this Policy for the particular matter.
  o If the DO has a conflict of interest, the President shall name a replacement to carry out the functions of the DO under this Policy for the particular matter.
  o Conflicts of interest on the part of deans or department chairs shall be dealt with by the DO.
• If it becomes necessary to appoint any replacement during the course of the process, the new appointee shall be fully informed regarding earlier procedures and evidence secured, but the process shall not commence anew.
• The DO is responsible for resolving disagreements over what constitutes a conflict of interest, except in the case of alleged conflicts involving the DO, in which case the President is responsible.

E. Standard of Review
• A finding of research misconduct requires that:
  o There be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and
  o The respondent committed the research misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly.
• Allegations of research misconduct must be proven by a preponderance of the evidence.
• The destruction, absence of, or respondent’s failure to provide research records adequately documenting the questioned research is evidence of research misconduct when the University establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that:
  o The respondent:
    ▪ Had research records and intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly destroyed them;
 Had the opportunity to maintain the records but did not do so; or
 Maintained the records and failed to produce them in a timely manner; and that
  o The respondent’s conduct constitutes a significant departure from accepted practices of the
    relevant research community.

F. The Standing Committee
• There shall be a Standing Committee that:
  o Serves as the pool from which members of Inquiry Committees are drawn; and
  o Upon request:
    ▪ Assists the RIO in evaluating allegations of Research Misconduct;
    ▪ Advises the RIO on appropriate members for Investigation Committees; and
    ▪ Advises the DO and the RIO on the implementation and revision of this Policy and
      Procedures.
  o The Standing Committee shall consist of no fewer than six (6) members, all of whom shall be
    tenured members of the faculty, chosen to reflect disciplinary diversity, and including at least
    one member from each of the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses and the Medical School.
  o The DO shall appoint the Standing Committee following consultation with the Executive
    Committees of the Bloomington and Indianapolis Faculty Councils.

G. Factual Findings are Conclusive. The factual findings of the Investigation Committee shall be conclusive
and binding on any later University proceeding convened for other purposes (e.g., grievances to the
Faculty Board of Review relating to sanctions imposed).

H. Limitation of Actions. Allegations must be raised within six (6) years of the date on which the alleged
research misconduct occurred unless:
• The respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred
  before the 6-year limitation through the citation, republication, or other use for the potential benefit
  of the respondent of the research record that is alleged to have been fabricated, falsified, or
  plagiarized; or
• The DO, following consultation with U.S. government Office of Research Integrity (ORI),
  determines that the alleged misconduct could reasonably have a substantial adverse effect on the
  health or safety of the public.

Reason For Policy
Research rests on a foundation of intellectual honesty. Scholars must be able to trust their peers, students
must be able to trust their teachers, and both sponsors and the public must be able to trust the integrity of
the results of research performed in institutions of higher education. The integrity of research is the subject
of widely shared professional norms and legal requirements that place specific obligations on the
University and all members of the University community.

This document sets forth Indiana University’s policy and procedures concerning research misconduct. It
is intended to ensure impartial and accurate adjudication of allegations of research misconduct that
respects the legitimate interests of all parties, enhances professional and public trust, and ensures
compliance with professional norms and applicable legal requirements.

Procedure
I. The Research Misconduct Resolution Process
• Preliminary Assessment of Allegations. Any person, whether associated with the University or not,
  may bring an allegation of research misconduct. Such allegations should be made to the RIO. On
receipt of an allegation of research misconduct, the RIO shall determine whether the allegation is frivolous, does not raise questions of research misconduct, or does not otherwise warrant further action. In such a case, the RIO may dismiss the allegation, seek to handle the matter informally, or refer it to the appropriate person or process. If the RIO determines that the allegation does not raise questions of research misconduct, does not warrant further action, or is determined to be frivolous, they shall take reasonable steps to inform the complainant and anyone else known to be aware of the allegation.

- The Inquiry Process. If the RIO determines that the criteria for an inquiry are met, they will immediately initiate the inquiry process. The purpose of the inquiry is to determine whether there is sufficient credible evidence of possible research misconduct to warrant conducting an investigation. An inquiry does not require a full review of all the evidence related to the allegation.
  - Sequestration of Research Records. As soon as practicable upon the initiation of an inquiry, the RIO shall take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, inventory the records and evidence and sequester them in a secure manner. Wherever possible, custody will be limited to copies of the data or evidence, so long as those copies have substantially equivalent evidentiary value as the originals. Where appropriate, the RIO shall give the respondent copies of, or reasonable, supervised access to the research records.
  - Notice
    - Upon initiation of the inquiry, the RIO shall provide the respondent with written notice of the allegation(s) and a copy of this Policy. The RIO shall also offer to meet with the respondent to review the contents of the allegations and related issues, describe the process that will be followed, and advise the respondent of their rights under the Research Misconduct Policy. If the inquiry subsequently identifies additional respondents, they shall receive the same written notice and offer to meet.
    - The RIO shall notify the DO; the dean of the School in which the respondent holds primary appointment; the Chancellor, Provost, or other senior official of the campus on which the respondent holds primary appointment; and the University General Counsel of the initiation of any inquiry.
  - The Inquiry Committee. The DO shall appoint at least two members of the Standing Committee to serve with the RIO as an Inquiry Committee. The members of the Inquiry Committee shall have no conflicts of interest with the respondent or with the case in question and shall possess sufficient expertise to enable the committee to conduct the inquiry and to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation(s). To the extent practicable, the members of the Inquiry Committee shall be from the same campus as the respondent. If necessary to obtain appropriate expertise or avoid conflicts of interest the DO may appoint other faculty to serve on an Inquiry Committee.
  - Inquiry Process
    - At the committee's first meeting, the RIO will review the allegation with the committee; discuss the allegations, any related issues, and the appropriate procedures for conducting the inquiry; and work with the other members of the Inquiry Committee to organize its work.
    - The Inquiry Committee will make a good faith effort to interview the complainant, the respondent, and key witnesses as well as examine relevant research records and materials. The Inquiry Committee will evaluate the evidence, including the testimony obtained during the inquiry. The committee will decide whether an investigation is warranted based on the criteria in this policy.
• The Inquiry Committee is not expected to determine whether misconduct occurred or the role of the respondent in any misconduct. However, if research misconduct is admitted by the respondent and there are no disputed factual issues, misconduct may be determined at the inquiry stage.
  o The Inquiry Report. At the conclusion of the inquiry, the RIO shall prepare a written inquiry report that describes:
    ▪ The allegations of research misconduct;
    ▪ Any federal support for research involved in the allegation;
    ▪ The committee’s recommendation as to whether an investigation is warranted;
    ▪ The basis for the committee’s recommendation; and
    ▪ Any comments on the draft report by the respondent.
  o Notification to the Respondent and Opportunity to Comment. The RIO shall provide the respondent with a draft copy of the Inquiry Committee report, together with a written notice that the respondent may submit written comments within ten (10) calendar days. The DO may extend this time for good cause. Any comments that are submitted by the respondent will be attached to the final inquiry report. Based on the comments, the Inquiry Committee may revise the draft report as appropriate before preparing it in final form.
  o Institutional Decision and Notification
    ▪ Decision by Deciding Official. The RIO will transmit the final inquiry report and any comments to the DO, who within ten (10) calendar days will determine in writing whether an investigation is warranted. In the event the DO disagrees with any of the Inquiry Committee’s recommendations, they will document the basis for their decision in writing. The inquiry is completed when the DO makes this determination.
    ▪ Notification and Documentation of Decision
      i. The RIO (or, in the case of federal agencies required to be notified, the DO), shall notify the respondent; the complainant; the relevant dean(s); the Chancellor, Provost, or other senior official of the campus on which the respondent holds primary appointment; the University General Counsel; the members of the Inquiry Committee; and any government officials required to be notified of the DO’s decision.
      ii. If the DO decides that an investigation is not warranted, the RIO shall also take reasonable steps to inform anyone else known to have knowledge of the inquiry.
      iii. If the DO determines that an investigation is not warranted, the RIO shall secure and maintain for seven (7) years after the termination of the inquiry sufficiently detailed documentation of the inquiry to permit a later assessment of the reasons why an investigation was not conducted. These documents shall be provided to ORI or other authorized government personnel upon request.
  o Time for Completion. The inquiry, including preparation of the final inquiry report and the decision of the DO on whether an investigation is warranted, must be completed within 60 calendar days of initiation of the inquiry, unless the DO approves an extension. The inquiry record must include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the 60-day period.

• The Investigation Process
  o Initiation and Purpose of the Investigation. Within fifteen (15) calendar days of any determination by the DO that an investigation is warranted, the DO shall appoint an Investigation Committee. The DO may extend this time for good cause. The purpose of the investigation is to develop a factual record by exploring the allegations in detail and examining the evidence in depth, leading to recommended findings on whether research misconduct has been committed, by whom, and to what extent, and steps to be taken to correct the research
record. The investigation will also determine whether there are additional instances of possible research misconduct that would justify broadening the scope beyond the initial allegations. This is particularly important where the alleged research misconduct involves clinical trials or potential harm to human subjects or the general public or if it affects research that forms the basis for public policy, clinical practice, or public health practice.

- Sequestration of Research Records. As soon as practicable upon the initiation of an investigation, the RIO shall take all reasonable and practical steps to obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding, that were not previously sequestered during the inquiry. The need for additional sequestration of records for the investigation may occur for any number of reasons, including the institution’s decision to investigate additional allegations not considered during the inquiry stage or the identification of records during the inquiry process that had not been previously secured. Wherever possible, custody will be limited to copies of the data or evidence, so long as those copies have substantially equivalent evidentiary value as the originals. Where appropriate, the RIO shall give the respondent copies of, or reasonable, supervised access to the research records.

- Role of Counsel. The respondent may be accompanied by counsel or a non-lawyer personal adviser (who is not otherwise involved in the case) when interviewed in the course of an investigation. Respondent’s counsel or adviser may provide the respondent advice, but may not participate in the proceedings.

- Notice. Upon initiation of the investigation, the RIO shall provide the respondent with written notice of the allegations to be investigated, including any new allegations of research misconduct, and of the respondent’s right to have counsel present when interviewed as soon as practicable after the decision to pursue allegations not addressed during the inquiry or in the initial notice of the investigation.

- Appointment of the Investigation Committee. The investigation shall be conducted by an Investigation Committee of no fewer than three persons appointed by the DO. Members of the Investigation Committee shall have no conflicts of interest with the respondent or other parties to the case in question, and shall, together possess the necessary expertise to enable them to evaluate authoritatively the relevant evidence of the alleged research misconduct and to conduct an investigation. To the extent practicable, a majority of the members of the Investigation Committee shall be from the same campus as the respondent. The DO shall designate a chair of the committee, who shall be a tenured member of the University faculty. Where the respondent is a member of the faculty, all appointees to the Investigation Committee shall be tenured faculty.

- Notification of Appointment of Investigation Committee
  a. The RIO shall notify the respondent of the committee membership and shall be given an opportunity to object to the committee membership on the grounds that one or more members do not meet the above-stated criteria. Objections shall be made in writing to the RIO within ten (10) calendar days of notification of the committee’s membership. The DO may extend this time for good cause.
  b. The DO shall consider the objection, and if it is reasonable, the DO shall replace the person with one who meets the stated criteria. The DO’s decision as to whether the challenge is reasonable shall be final.

7. Charge to the Investigation Committee
   a. The RIO shall provide a written charge to the Investigation Committee that:
      i. Describes the allegations and related issues identified during the inquiry;
      ii. Identifies the respondent;
      iii. Informs the committee that it must conduct the investigation as prescribed in this policy;
      iv. Defines research misconduct;
v. Informs the committee that it must evaluate the evidence and testimony to determine whether, based on a preponderance of the evidence, research misconduct occurred and, if so, the type and extent of it and who was responsible;
vi. Informs the committee that if it determines that the respondent committed research misconduct it must do so according to the standard of review set forth in the Research Misconduct Policy; and
vii. Informs the committee that it must prepare or direct the preparation of a written investigation report that meets the requirements of this policy.

8. Investigation Process. The Investigation Committee, assisted by the RIO, shall use diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough, impartial, fair, and appropriately documented. This includes making diligent efforts to:
   a. Examine all research records and other relevant evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of each allegation;
   b. Interview each respondent, complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the respondent;
   c. Record or transcribe each interview, provide the recording or transcript to the interviewee for correction, and include the recording or transcript in the record of the investigation; and
   d. Pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of any additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion.

9. The Investigation Report. The Investigation Committee, with the assistance of the RIO, is responsible for preparing a written report of the investigation that:
   a. Describes the nature of the allegation of research misconduct, including identification of the respondent;
   b. Describes and documents the federal support, including, for example, the numbers of any grants that are involved, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing federal support;
   c. Describes the specific allegations of research misconduct considered in the investigation;
   d. Identifies and summarizes the research records and evidence reviewed and identifies any evidence taken into custody but not reviewed;
   e. Includes a statement of findings for each allegation of research misconduct identified during the investigation. Each statement of findings must:
      i. Identify whether the research misconduct was falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism, and whether it was committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly;
      ii. Summarize the facts and the analysis that support the conclusion and consider the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent, including any effort by respondent to establish that they did not engage in Research Misconduct because of honest error or a difference of opinion;
      iii. Identify the specific federal support;
      iv. Identify whether any publications need correction or retraction;
      v. Identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct; and
      vi. List any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent has pending with all federal agencies; and
   f. Recommends appropriate corrective actions and/or sanctions if research misconduct is found.

10. Notification to the Respondent, Access to Evidence, and Opportunity to Comment
a. The RIO shall give the respondent a copy of the draft investigation report for comment and, concurrently, a copy of, or supervised access to the evidence on which the report is based. The respondent will be allowed thirty (30) calendar days from the date he/she received the draft report to submit comments to the RIO. Any comments that are submitted by the respondent will be attached to the final investigation report. Based on the comments, the Investigation Committee may revise the draft report as appropriate before preparing it in final form.

b. In distributing the draft report, or portions thereof, to the respondent, the RIO will inform the recipient of the confidentiality under which the draft report is made available and may establish reasonable conditions to ensure such confidentiality. For example, the RIO may require that the recipient sign a confidentiality agreement.

11. Institutional Decision and Notification

a. Decision by Deciding Official. The RIO will transmit the final inquiry report and any comments to the DO, who within ten (10) calendar days will determine in writing (1) whether the institution accepts the investigation report, its findings, and the recommended institutional actions; and, if so, (2) the appropriate institutional actions in response to the accepted findings of research misconduct. In the event the DO disagrees with any of the Investigation Committee’s recommendations, they will document the basis for their decision in writing. Alternatively, the DO may return the report to the investigation Committee with a request for further fact-finding or analysis.

b. Notification of Decision

i. When a final decision on the case has been reached, the RIO (or, in the case of federal agencies required to be notified, the DO), shall notify the respondent; the complainant; the relevant dean(s); the Chancellor, Provost, or other senior official of the campus on which the respondent holds primary appointment; the University General Counsel; the members of the Investigation Committee; and any government officials required to be notified of the DO’s decision.

ii. The DO will determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the respondent in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the case.

iii. If the DO decides that there was no research misconduct, the RIO shall take reasonable steps to inform anyone else known to have knowledge of the investigation. Depending on the particular circumstances and the views of the respondent, the RIO shall also advise the DO concerning other measures to restore the reputation of the respondent, including publicizing the final outcome in any forum in which the allegation of research misconduct was previously publicized.

12. Time for Completion

a. The investigation, including preparing the report of findings, providing the draft report for comment, and the decision of the DO, must be completed within 120 calendar days of initiation of the inquiry, unless the DO approves an extension. The investigation record must include documentation of the reasons for exceeding the 120-day period.

b. If the DO approves an extension, if applicable, the RIO will submit to ORI a written request for an extension, setting forth the reasons for the delay. The RIO will ensure that periodic progress reports are filed with ORI, if ORI grants the request for an extension and directs the filing of such reports.
The document provides guidelines for handling research misconduct, including institutional administrative actions, appeals, allegations against complainants, and correction of erroneous findings. It also emphasizes maintaining records to ensure proper documentation of proceedings. The text is structured into sections, each addressing a specific aspect of the research misconduct process.
Committees and copies of all documents and other materials furnished to the RIO or to the Inquiry or Investigation Committee. The RIO shall seal the file and retain it for seven (7) years after completion of the proceeding or the completion of any subsequent government proceeding involving the alleged research misconduct.

b. Access to the materials in the file shall be available only upon authorization of the DO for good cause.

c. The RIO shall return all original documents and materials to the persons who furnished them.

d. After seven (7) years from the completion of the investigation and all ensuing related actions, if any, the RIO will destroy the file unless the RIO makes a written finding that there is reason to retain it. The finding will state explicitly the reasons why and the period during which the file is to be maintained, and will be entered in the file. The RIO shall provide to the respondent either a notice that the file has been destroyed or a copy of the written finding that the file will be retained.

III. Interim Administrative Actions

a. The DO shall, at any time during a research misconduct proceeding, take appropriate interim actions as required by law or as necessary to protect public health or safety, the integrity of research, fundamental fairness to the respondent or other parties, or an overriding interest of the University.

b. If the research involves federal funding, the DO shall notify ORI immediately if they has reason to believe that any of the following conditions exist:
   1. Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects;
   2. Federal government resources or interests are threatened;
   3. There is a reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law;
   4. Federal action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding;
   5. The research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely and federal action may be necessary to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved; or
   6. The research community or public should otherwise be informed.

c. Interim actions include, but are not limited to, a temporary suspension of research, additional monitoring of the research process and the handling of federal funds and equipment, reassignment of personnel or of the responsibility for the handling of federal funds and equipment, additional review of research data and results, delaying publication, or informing the research community or the public.

IV. Reporting to Federal Agencies

a. Premature Termination. The DO shall notify ORI in advance if there are plans to close a case at the inquiry, investigation, or appeal stage on the basis that respondent has admitted guilt, a settlement with the respondent has been reached, or for any other reason, except:
   1. Closing of a case at the inquiry stage on the basis that an investigation is not warranted; or
   2. Finding of no misconduct at the investigation stage, which must be reported to the federal agency, as prescribed in this policy.

b. Notice to ORI of Institutional Findings and Actions. Unless an extension has been granted, the RIO must, within the 120-day period for completing the investigation, or the 120-day period for completion of any appeal, submit the following to ORI:
   1. A copy of the final investigation report with all attachments and any appeal;
   2. A statement of whether the institution accepts the findings of the investigation report or the outcome of the appeal;
   3. A statement of whether the institution found misconduct and, if so, who committed the misconduct; and
   4. A description of any pending or completed administrative actions against the respondent.
V. Termination or Resignation Prior to Completing Inquiry or Investigation. The termination of the respondent’s institutional employment, by resignation or otherwise, before or after an allegation of possible research misconduct has been reported, will not preclude or terminate the research misconduct proceeding or otherwise limit any of the institution’s responsibilities. If the respondent refuses to participate in the process after resignation, the RIO and any inquiry or investigation Committee will use their best efforts to reach a conclusion concerning the allegations, noting in the report the respondent’s failure to cooperate and its effect on the evidence.

VI. Protection of the Complainant, Witnesses and Committee Members. During the research misconduct proceeding and upon its completion, regardless of whether the institution or ORI determines that research misconduct occurred, the RIO must undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to protect the position and reputation of, or to counter potential or actual retaliation against, any complainant who made allegations of research misconduct in good faith and of any witnesses and committee members who cooperate in good faith with the research misconduct proceeding. The DO will determine, after consulting with the RIO, and with the complainant, witnesses, or committee members, respectively, what steps, if any, are needed to restore their respective positions or reputations or to counter potential or actual retaliation against them. The RIO is responsible for implementing any steps the DO approves.

VII. Allegations Not Made in Good Faith. If the DO determines that the complainant’s allegation of research misconduct was made with knowledge that the allegation was false, or with reckless disregard for or willful ignorance of facts that would disprove the allegation, or that any member of the University community acted in violation of this Policy, the DO will determine whether any administrative action should be taken against such person.

VIII. Departure from Procedures. The DO may approve departures from these procedures as required by law or as necessary to protect public health or safety, the integrity of research, fundamental fairness to the respondent or other parties, or an overriding interest of the University. The DO shall document any significant departures in writing and shall provide written notice to the Research Affairs Committees of the Bloomington and Indianapolis Faculty Councils of any systematically recurring departures from these procedures.

**Definitions**

**Allegation**: A written disclosure of possible research misconduct to the RIO or DO that triggers the procedures described by this Policy. An allegation must be more than a conclusory statement, and should provide sufficient specificity to allow a determination as to whether the conduct alleged, if true, falls within this Policy.

**Complainant**: A person who submits an allegation of research misconduct.

**Conflict of Interest**: A professional or personal relationship or activity with the respondent or other parties, beyond that of a mere acquaintance or colleague, that might affect, or reasonably appear to affect, the individual’s ability to be impartial.

**Deciding Official (DO)**: The University official appointed by the President to implement and oversee this policy consistent with applicable laws.

**Inquiry**: The process under the Policy for information gathering and preliminary fact-finding to determine if an allegation or apparent instance of research misconduct has substance and therefore warrants an investigation.
**Investigation**: The process under the Policy for the formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine whether research misconduct has occurred, and, if so, the responsible person and the seriousness of the misconduct.

**ORI**: The federal Office of Research Integrity.

**Reckless**:
1. The researcher, in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results, was or should have been aware that an act or omission:
   a. was a significant departure from accepted standards of the relevant research community; and b. posed a substantial risk that such conduct could result in falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism; and
   b. The researcher, either by action or inaction, failed to do what a researcher adhering to the standards of research practice and oversight in the relevant research community would have done under these circumstances to prevent the falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism.

**Research**: A systematic investigation designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. The term encompasses basic and applied research, as well as research training activities.

**Research Integrity Officer (RIO)**: A person identified by the DO to have primary responsibility for assuring adherence to these procedures.

**Research Misconduct**: The fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.
1. Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
2. Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
3. Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
4. Research misconduct does not include disputes regarding honest error or good faith differences in interpretations or judgments of data, and is not intended to resolve good faith scientific or scholarly disagreement. Research misconduct is also not intended to include “authorship” disputes such as complaints about appropriate ranking of co-authors in publications, presentations, or other work, unless the dispute constitutes plagiarism.

**Research Record**: Any data, document, computer file, digital medium, or any other written or non-written account or object that reasonably may be expected to provide evidence or information regarding the proposed, conducted, or reported research that constitutes the subject of an allegation of research misconduct. A research record includes, but is not limited to, grant or contract applications, whether funded or unfunded; grant or contract progress and other reports; laboratory notebooks; notes; printed or electronic correspondence; memoranda of telephone calls; videos; photographs; X-ray film; slides; biological materials; computer files and printouts; manuscripts and publications; equipment use logs; laboratory procurement records; animal facility records; human and animal subject protocols; consent forms; medical charts; and patient research files.

**Respondent**: The person against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed, or the person whose actions are the subject of an inquiry or investigation.
**Sponsored Programs:** Research, training, and instructional projects involving funds, materials, gifts, or other compensation from external entities (including any individual and government agencies) under agreements with the University.

**History**

(By Action of the University Faculty Council: February 10, 1998; By Action of the University Faculty Council: April 24, 2007; Adapted from Policy On Research Integrity And Guidelines For Establishing Procedures For Responding To Allegations Of Research Misconduct, By Action of the University Faculty Council: November 24, 2009 By Action of the University Faculty Council: March 27, 2012)

Revisions to policy approved by UFC and University President, April 18, 2017
Edited pronouns (he/she) for inclusivity (their), 7/1/20