Excerpt from the Minutes of the 16 January 2007 Called Meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council (“IFC”)

Agenda Item VI: [ACTION ITEM] Policy on Three-Year Formative Review of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty & Librarians: Andre De Tienne (Chair – Faculty Affairs Committee, 4.2033, adetienn@iupui.edu).

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

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

IFC members shared the following comments:
BERBARI: by reiterating the point about limitations, it seems that faculty member is guaranteed to keep position it diminishes this as an opportunity for guidance.
KARLSON: The idea of this formative review is to give advice/aid as opposed to be used for “un-tenuring.” The limitations are the key to the spirit of the policy.
WOKECK: Spell out the distinction: it is in the third year of appointment.
SPECHLER: Will vote against, because he thinks it has become complicated and time-consuming. Now is the time to be more selective and this is biased against that. This should be an oral, confidential process. This policy deprives deans of responsibility.
PACKER: All reviews do need to be somewhat predictive.
AKAY: A three-year review is important. It should be a Promotion & Tenure “dress rehearsal.”
BALDWIN: Annual reviews for probationary faculty are already in place; that is the dress rehearsal for Promotion & Tenure.

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

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