

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL

Annual Report 2013-2014

Prepared by:
Karen E. Lee
Faculty Council Coordinator

We, the faculty members of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, in recognition of our common goal to better human conditions through the process of education, and in recognition and appreciation of the rights and responsibilities bestowed upon us by the State of Indiana through the Indiana University and the Purdue University Boards of Trustees for the accomplishment of this goal, do establish this Constitution for the purpose of creating a system which will aid in the identification, definition, and accomplishments of major specific objectives of this faculty.

~IUPUI Faculty Council Constitution Preamble

Getting the Job Done

Policies/Amendments Passed:

- Statement on Faculty Work (Approved March 4, 2014)
- Change to the Charge to the Athletics Affairs Committee (Approved on April 15, 2014)
- Change to the Charge to the Campus Planning Committee (Approved on April 15, 2014)

Endorsements:

- Code of Student Ethics (May 6, 2014)

Resolutions:

- Resolution to Support the Freedom Indiana Coalition and Indiana University (Proposed and Approved on November 5, 2013) – Appendix A
- Memorial Resolutions:
 - Vincent Gattone, II (Medicine)
 - Rebecca Markel (School of Nursing)
 - Daniel Nutzel (School of Liberal Arts)

Administrative Reviews:

- Reviews Assigned:
 - William Blomquist, Dean, School of Liberal Arts
 - Patricia Rogan, Executive Associate Dean, School of Education
 - Kody Varahramyan, Vice Chancellor for Research
 - Amy Conrad Warner, Vice Chancellor for External Affairs

Schools/Units:

- Establishment of the Fairbanks School of Public Health
- Establishment of the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy
- School Merger: School of Library and Information Science and School of Informatics to the Informatics and Computing
- School Merger: School of Journalism became a department in the School of Liberal Arts called the Department of Journalism and Public Relations.

Elections:

Elected to the Promotion and Tenure Committee (October 5, 2010):

- Ed Berbari (3 year term)

Unit Representatives:

Fairbanks School of Public Health

6/15: Ross Silverman

Herron School of Art

6/15: Vance Farrow

IUPU Columbus

6/14: Catherine Brown

Kelley School of Business

6/14: Sasha Fedorikhin

Lilly Family School of Philanthropy

6/15: Dwight Burlingame

McKinney School of Law

6/14: Jim Nehf

School of Dentistry

6/14: William Babler

6/14: Joan Kowolik

School of Education

6/14: Chalmer Thompson

School of Engineering and Technology

6/14: Alan Jones

6/15: Charles Feldhaus

School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

6/15: Jeffrey Crabtree

School of Informatics and Computing

6/15: Josette Jones

6/15: Mark Pfaff

School of Journalism

6/15: Kim Walker

School of Liberal Arts

6/14: David Craig

6/15: Daniella Kostroun

6/14: Tom Marvin (Finishing Philip Goff's second year)

School of Medicine

~~6/14: Robert Bigsby~~

6/14: Patrick Fueger

6/14: Eric Horn

6/14: Kenneth White

6/14: Karmen Yoder

6/15: Rafat Abonour

6/15: Alan Ladd

6/15: Richard Nass

6/15: Mehdi Nassiri

6/15: Jodi Smith

6/15: Frank Yang

6/15: Marc Mendonca

6/15: VACANT

School of Nursing

6:15: Pamela Ironside

School of Phys Ed & Tourism Man

~~6/15: Susan Alvarez~~

School of Public & Environ Affairs

6/15: Deanna Malatesta

School of Science

6/14: Michael McLeish

6/14: Xianzhong Wang

6/15: John Watson

School of Social Work

6/14: ~~Carmen Luca~~

~~Sugawara~~Gail Folaron

University Library

6/14: Todd Daniels-Howell

| | |
|---|--|
| University Faculty Council: | <u>Term Expires June 30, 2015</u> Charles Davis (Social Work) Jan Froehlich (Medicine) Linda Adele Goodine (Herron) |
| IFC Executive Committee: | <u>Term Expiring June 30, 2015</u> Rachel Applegate (Informatics and Computing) Simon Atkinson (Science) Jan Froehlich (Medicine) Rick Ward (Liberal Arts) |
| IFC Nominating Committee: | <u>Term Expiring June 30, 2015</u> Julie Belz (Liberal Arts) Rodrigo Perez (Science) Mary Beth Riner (Nursing) |
| Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee: | Beth Goering (Liberal Arts) – 3 year term Sue Lasiter (Nursing) – 3 year term |
| At-Large representatives: | Tenured/Tenure-Track: <u>Term Expiring June 30, 2015</u> Margaret Adamek (Social Work) Gregory Anderson (Science) Simon Atkinson (Science) Anne Belcher (Nursing) Gabrielle Bersier (Liberal Arts) Mary Dankoski (Medicine) Susan DeMaine (Law Library) Andy Gavrin (Science) Gina Gibau (Liberal Arts) Linda Adele Goodine (Herron) John Hassell (Business) Pamela Ironside (Nursing) Andrew Kusmierczyk (Science) Mary Maluccio (Medicine) Thomas Marvin (Liberal Arts) Megan Palmer (Medicine) William Potter (Herron) Deborah Stiffler (Nursing) Yuichiro Takagi (Medicine) Thomas Upton (Liberal Arts) Elizabeth Whipple (Medicine Library) |
| Non-Tenure-Track: | <u>Term Expiring June 30, 2015</u> <u>Clinical Category</u> Marcus Schamberger (Medicine) |

Lecturer Category

Keith Anliker (Science)

Kate Thedwall (Liberal Arts)

Michael Yard (Science)

Research Category

Michele Schneider (Medicine)

Faculty Board of Review Pool:

Term Expiring January 31, 2015

Rachel Applegate (Informatics and Computing)

Enrica Ardemagni (Liberal Arts)

Brenda Burk (University Library)

Charles Goodlett (Science)

Dean Hawley (Medicine)

Rodrigo Perez (Science)

Mary Beth Riner (Nursing)

Rosa Tezanos-Pinto (Liberal Arts)

Elee Wood (Education)

Wanda Worley (E&T)

Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel:

Term Expiring January 31, 2015

Jeffrey Bennett (Dentistry)

Jeff Watt (Science)

Patricia Wittberg (Liberal Arts)

Annual Report on Board of Review Activity (Since May 2013)

L. Jack Windsor, President

IUPUI Faculty Council meeting

May 6, 2014

Total Number of Board of Review Cases: 1

Total Number of Requests Denied: 0

Number of Board of Review Cases for: 1

- Dismissal
- Academic Freedom
- Non-Reappointment 1
- Tenure
- Promotion
- Salary Adjustment
- Nature or Conditions of Work
- Office of Equal Opportunity

Board of Review Case 12-01 remains on hold.

Board of Review Case 13-01: A Board of Review was appointed and a formal hearing was held on September 30, 2013, regarding non-reappointment. The board's recommendation supported the

grievant. The chancellor accepted the board's findings, but rejected a few recommendations by the board and provided documentation for the rejections per the bylaws of the Faculty Council.

Total Number of Grievances **1**

Members of the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel reported one contact by a faculty member or librarian during the 2013-2014 academic year.

- 0 Grievances were resolved prior to any request for a Board of Review.
- 1 Grievance was sent to a Board of Review.
- 0 Grievances have not been referred to a Board of Review.

Applauding Excellence

The following faculty members were recognized as having served on the IUPUI faculty for 20 years:

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Marta Anton | Charles Goodlett | Sharon Moe |
| Trudy Banta | John Guare | Ann Ociepka |
| Teresa Bennett | Brian Herring | Zhe-Yu Ou |
| Lorraine Blackman | Ann Holmes | Kenna Quinet |
| Herbert Brant | Carol Hofstetter | Rick Ralston |
| Ralph Buschbacher | Thomas Hurley | Brian Sloan |
| Herbert Cushing | Gary Hutchins | Rajiv Sood |
| Deborah Demeester | Vanchit John | Andrew Stasic |
| Paul Dexter | Michael Kraus | Christopher Steinmetz |
| Kimberly Donahue | Yun Liang | Wilfredo Torres-Martinez |
| Asuncion Dorotheo | Laura Littlepage | Mark Urtel |
| Jonathan Eller | Thomas Marvin | Gautam Vemuri |
| Andrea Ferreira-Zondona | Debra Mesch | Laurence Walsh |
| Patricia Gallagher | Michal Misiurewicz | David Wilkes |

Continuing the Work

Per the IFC Constitution, Chancellor Charles Bantz gave the annual State of the Campus address on November 5, 2013.

The Faculty Census was presented on December 3, 2013, and can be found attached to the minutes of that meeting.

The IFC participated on campus committees such as the Task Force for Re-Classification Application for Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement, Campus Sustainability Committee, E-Port Liaison, Task Force on Sexual Assault and Prevention, Parking Monetization Committee, Resource Planning Committee, Campus Center Advisory Board, Task Force for Inclusive Campus Climate Setting, and Campus Administrative Policy Advisory Committee.

Committee Reports:

See the individual full reports on the committee webpages at <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/committees/>. A Report on Council Actions follows:

Report on Council Actions (per Bylaws Article 1. Section C.3)
2013 - 2014
June 30, 2014

Items to be Completed (Items in red have been brought to the IFC for a first read):

Academic Affairs Committee

- UCAC Recommendation Regarding Changes in Admission Standards for 2013
- **Attending Classes Without Being Enrolled: Policy to be voted on by AAFC, EC, and IFC fall 2013.** (Oct. 2013: The AAC has put the policy on hold and will do further fact-finding.)
- Calculation of GPAs. How much campus policy harmonization is going to be suggested as a part of the student services initiative?

Campus Planning Committee

- Review the IUPUI Strategic Plan, “A Commitment to Indiana and Beyond” and its implementation in the coming year.
- Review and comment on National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) survey and other tools that gather information about students and faculty.
- Review and comment on PULSE surveys; the data gathered by these surveys may be reviewed by this committee; examples: campus safety; diversity; common theme.
- Review and comment on campus survey (first and second years – in house); (every third year NSSE is administered)
- Advise IUPUI Administration: Planning and Institutional Improvement Administrative Liaison on outcomes.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

- Verbatim Minutes: Review proposal to exclude notation of taking verbatim minutes if a recording is being made during council meetings.
- Nominations Committee: Review and change bylaws so that the Nominations Committee is made up of faculty governance leaders of the schools.
- Rewrite the charge to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.
- Discuss the grievance process and the Board of Review procedures with the Faculty Affairs Committee.
- Recognition of Honors College
- Recognition of the Fairbanks School of Public Health (*Provisional recognition granted by IFC-EC until a Post-Tenure Review and Enhancement Committee is included in the bylaws. The FSPH approved the change on 9/23/13 and modifications to the bylaws will be sent to the IFC-EC in spring 2014.*)
- FGAP Bylaws revision (problem raised by Handbook Committee/Faculty Affairs Committee last year)
- Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee: Is the committee doing what the vision for the committee was set out to do. (*Update 2-25-14: With the Strategic Plan, this committee is under review by the Academic Affairs Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee as they determine whether the IFC should endorse an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee will be asked to make a motion to remove the UCAC from the IFC Bylaws should the IFC endorse the new committee.*)
- Limit the amount of time a Board of Review can be heard before time runs out once it has been assigned by the IFC-EC. (Motion made by IFC-EC on March 27, 2014.)

Distance Education Committee

- IU Online: Schedule a joint meeting between the Distance Education Committee and the Technology Committee, with leadership from IU Online. – (*The meeting was held only by the Technology Committee. The DEC did not participate in the meeting.*)

Faculty Affairs Committee

- School of Medicine policy issued for tenure compensation guideline for tenured faculty.
- Review of campus Post Tenure Review policy (Faculty and Librarian Review and Enhancement) (*Report submitted to the IFC-EC. Discussion at the April 17, 2014, EC meeting.*)
- Discuss the grievance process and the Board of Review procedures with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. (*On 4-21-14 committee agenda.*)

- Materials for chairs and deans dealing with behavioral issues: Subcommittee, chaired by Larry Garetto, presented the most recent version of materials at the February 13, 2013, committee meeting. Work continues on this project.
- Faculty Academic Misconduct: The Academic Handbook makes reference to this, but the procedure of how to deal with it is not clear. The FAC is to identify procedures. *(On 4-21-14 committee agenda.)*
- Continued interest in creating a new rank, called Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor (that would mirror the research ranks). This would not eliminate the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer rank. This item was tabled in 2012-2013, but interest continues. *(On 4-21-14 committee agenda.)*
- Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee: Is the committee doing what the vision for the committee was set out to do. *(Update 2-25-14: With the Strategic Plan, this committee is under review by the Academic Affairs Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee as they determine whether the IFC should endorse an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.) (On 4-21-14 committee agenda.)*
- Review draft Adjunct Faculty Policy/Procedures for Promotion *(On 4-21-14 committee agenda.)*
- IUPUI Faculty Credo *(Report submitted to the IFC-EC. Discussion at the April 17, 2014, EC meeting.) (On 4-21-14 committee agenda.)*
- Parking Changes *(On 4-21-14 committee agenda.)*

For 2014-15:

- NTTF's position on the IFC. Make a motion for continuing (or not) by the end of the next academic year. NTTF numbers are growing and in some schools, they outnumber the TTF. What are the best practices at other universities?
- IUPUI Faculty Librarian Review and Enhancement: President McRobbie asked each campus to look at the policy and tweak it for their needs. At the 4-24-14 EC meeting, an administrative committee was formed composed of Melissa Lavitt, Rick Ward, Simon Atkinson, Jack Windsor, and the chair of the FAC.

Faculty Handbook Committee

- Completed revision of timeline for approving the supplement. *(Will be presented to the IFC in fall 2014.)*

Fringe Benefits Committee

- Benefits: Keep pushing to get the message out about benefits in a timely manner.
- Get the word out to faculty: Clinical Care Services at IUPUI (<http://hr.iu.edu/benefits/CCServices/index.html>)
- Comparison of benefits for IUPUI and IUB faculty. Melissa Lavitt's office has a salary comparison and the cost of living comparison for both campuses.
- Maternity and Family leave
- Benefits for part-time faculty
- How does the IUPUI benefits plan compare to other institutions?
- Benefits for gay married couples should a law be passed.

Research Affairs Committee

- Limited submission
- Biomedical Research Institute
- Policy on Centers and Institutes
- Animal safety
- Update on Research Advisory Committee from VP Jorge Jose.
- Update on the transparency and funding of programs
- Presentation of the Indirect Cost Recovery guidelines to the IFC.
- Return of NIH funds from the administrators to the PI.
- Human Subjects Research (IRB Process).
- Other study approvals – especially biosafety approvals and IACUC as centralization of oversight continues.
- Center designation process – inventory of active/inactive centers as a first fact-finding step.
- IUCRG Program – faculty input into future directions/funding priorities if the program continues.

Staff Relations Committee

- TIME Timekeeping System
- Health Insurance Rates

- Performance Management
- Service with Distinction
- Intergroup Dialogue and Campus Civility
- Campus Safety

Technology Committee

- Research File System (RFS): Technology Committee will review again in 2013-14. Updates were planned for the system, and the committee had already planned this item for 2013-14.
- Review of FLAGS system to review enhancements made during summer 2013.
- Review of Endnote and potential switch to open source product.
- Review status of end-user evaluation of Unicom services and deployment of clearly identified emergency phones.
- IU Online
- Review status of funding for new testing center. (*Sept. 2013: Revisit status.*)
- Review survey data and funding mechanisms for proctoring of exams in the testing center. (*Sept. 2013: At this time, proctoring in the testing center in SL and BS are free. The Classroom Testing Advisory Committee has a working group that will work to establish recommendations for a sustainable funding model.*)

Items Completed:

Academic Affairs Committee:

- Campus Policy on Limits in Withdrawal: Policy to be voted on by AAFC, EC, and IFC fall 2013. (*Oct. 2013: The AAC agreed that the policy was too restrictive. They agreed that students should not be allowed to enroll and withdraw (or fail) a given course numerous times. Perhaps an alternative solution is to block registration for such students, initiated at the unit level. The registrar will investigate creating lists of students who enroll repeatedly in the same course. These lists could be provided to the appropriate unit for action (registration block), if the units choose to do so.*)
- Recommendation Regarding the Participation of IUPUI in the Advance College Project (January 13, 2014)
 - AP course teacher training and fees accepted for students.
- RISE Initiative: Discussion/endorsement on the proposal to change the counting/tracking system. (*Oct. 2013: The AAC members have requested to find out what policies their home units have with regard to this situation and report back at their November 25 meeting. Jan. 2014: Made recommendations to the IFC-EC to enhance the development of RISE.*)
- Review Proposed Unified Academic Calendar (*Report submitted to the EC 2-19-14. Recommendations were accepted by the EC 3-13-14.*)
- Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee: Is the committee doing what the vision for the committee was set out to do. (*Update 2-25-14: With the Strategic Plan, this committee is under review by the Academic Affairs Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee as they determine whether the IFC should endorse an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. UPDATE 5-1-14: The AAC supported the creation of the new committee and suggested a few changes.*)
- Grade Forgiveness Policy (*Update: Mary Beth Myers suggested wording changes that the IFC-EC agreed to on May 15. This may or may not have been the issue the AAC was assigned to.*)

Budgetary Affairs Committee:

- Parking Monetization (*Oct. 2013: The monetization steering committee did not recommend to the Board of Trustees for IUB and IUPUI to privatize.*)
- Return to attending budget hearings annually. (*Dec. 2013: This has been agreed upon and both the BAC and CPC have created questions for the deans during Cluster Conversations in January.*)

Campus Planning Committee:

- Parking Monetization: What happens if the campus privatizes? (*Oct. 2013: The monetization steering committee did not recommend to the Board of Trustees for IUB and IUPUI to privatize.*)
- Return to attending budget hearings annually. (*Dec. 2013: This has been agreed upon and both the BAC and CPC have created questions for the deans during Cluster Conversations in January.*)

- Revised committee charge. (*Sent to the Bylaws Committee on 12-18-13 for review and first read. Passed by the IFC on March 4, 2014.*)

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

- Athletics Affairs Committee: Change the committee size. (*Dec. 2013: Approved by the IFC.*)
- Campus Planning Committee charge – Sent to committee on 12-18-13. (*Passed by the IFC on March 4, 2014.*)

Faculty Affairs Committee

- Revision of Statement of Faculty Work: First read at April 2013 IFC meeting. Tabled until September 2013 at May 2013, IFC meeting. (*Passed by the IFC on March 4, 2014.*)
- NTTF Representation: End of trial period for their representation. Review and consider making this a permanent part of the bylaws. IFC-EC approves with their continuation. (*Report submitted to the IFC-EC. Discussion at the April 17, 2014, EC meeting. The EC (at the 4-24-14 meeting) asked that the FAC make a motion at the 5-6-14 IFC meeting to extend the NTTF's participation on the council for one more year. The committee will be assigned to look at NTTF participation more broadly in the next academic year.*)

Fringe Benefits Committee

- Get the word out to faculty: Shopping the best deal using the Castlight Health Transparency Tool (<http://hr.iu.edu/benefits/castlight.html>) (*An extensive mailing was sent out by the campus to all employees.*)

Library Affairs Committee

- Open Access (*Report submitted to the IFC-EC on 2-19-14; Discussed on 2-27-14 EC agenda.*)
- eText (*Report on eText Availability given to the IFC on April 15, 2014.*)

Staff Relations Committee

- Parking Privatization (*Oct. 2013: Privatization did not go through. The committee will continue to watch the proposals for changes in parking fees.*)

Student Affairs Committee

- RISE Initiative: The committee agreed that a letter of support for the program should be sent to the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor.
- Wellness Center: No wellness fee is being assessed. Student Life is setting aside funds each year that is not allocated to any individual group or project.
- Student Services capabilities given the number of students: V.C. Davenport said there has been no consolidation of services. As to usage, on a ratio basis, the graduate students are using CAPS more than the undergraduates. CAPS has been able to hire one additional councilor and to replace one who resigned.
- Bike and pedestrian interaction on campus: There have been several close calls with “speeding” bikes on campus sidewalks. It was suggested that a special committee might be established to look at these issues. Bike paths may be a good idea to separate the two traffic patterns.
- Student Personal Misconduct: Procedures for the Adjudication of Allegations of Personal Misconduct were approved by the IFC at their meeting on May 6, 2014.

Technology Committee:

- Follow-up on final transition of student technology fee spending and impact on units. (*Report received on 1-14-14.*)

APPENDIX

Policies and Amendments Passed

Faculty Work

Proposal by the IFC Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved by the IFC at their March 4, 2014, Meeting

2014

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

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

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

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

No one definition of an equitable faculty workload can meet the unique needs of each unit. Nevertheless, any definition of faculty workload should address research and creative activity, teaching activity, service expectations, and percentage of time/effort for these activities according to type of faculty appointment. For example, lecturers generally teach additional sections over what is taught by clinical faculty. Each school should define faculty workload expectations for its needs and the faculty categories it employs. In response to questions raised by faculty members, the remainder of this statement deals with these areas.

Research and Creative Activity

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

Tenure-track faculty members are encouraged (in some schools expected) to actively seek and acquire the kinds of support needed to carry out and support their research programs. The type of support needed can vary across disciplines and faculty members. Some

schools or programs expect faculty members to work towards obtaining externally funded teaching/research grants and awards. These kinds of support would sustain a faculty member's research and scholarly activity, promote teaching graduate students, post-docs and fellows, nurture the research infrastructure of the university and generate high-skilled workforce for the Indiana and national economy. For a higher learning institution, the effort by the faculty to secure research support should be appropriately recognized by the university.

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

Teaching Assignments

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

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

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

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

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

Finally, the concept of peer review underlies policies associated with observing and assessing faculty performance. The academic world has long recognized the necessity and value of peer review in research, but has only recently embraced the process as an inherently valuable aspect of teaching and professional service. Although each unit should develop its own practices in regard to peer review, faculty must also acknowledge the obligation of chairs/deans or their delegates to observe colleagues' teaching activities, in both physical and online teaching environments. Peer review should be formative and allow sufficient opportunity for improvement of performance.

Ten Month Appointments

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

Summer Teaching

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

Service

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

Twelve Month Appointments

Outside Work

This section addresses several policies associated with faculty members' obtaining compensation from outside sources. Faculty members with 12-month appointments are expected to devote their primary professional time and energy to carrying out their administrative teaching, research, and service responsibilities of the university. Faculty members may engage in remunerated outside work in accordance to university policies (see the Academic Handbook - [Outside Activities and Extra Compensation](#)). Faculty members will report outside work to the appropriate unit administrator (chair, division head, etc.) and will insure that such activities do not interfere with their primary professional responsibilities.

The scheduling of vacations must be coordinated with chairs and deans.

Faculty Leave of Absence

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

Initial Faculty Appointment

Conditions at time of initial appointment vary.

Letters of appointments: While letters of offer must be reviewed carefully and while the university, campus, and school are each committed to honoring them, faculty must recognize that conditions of work can change. Individual faculty 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 Conflict of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment Involving Outside Professional Activities as stated in the Academic Handbook ([Policy on Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research](#) and [Policy on Conflicts of Commitment Involving Outside Professional Activities](#)).

Faculty Complaints

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

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

Summary

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

Procedures for the Adjudication of Allegations of Personal Misconduct

IUPUI

Approved by the IFC at their May 6, 2014, Meeting

Article I: Preamble

The Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) **Procedures for the Adjudications of Allegations of Personal Misconduct** is the mechanism by which the university will investigate reports of alleged acts of personal misconduct by students and resolve the alleged violations through a process consistent with both the Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct (the "Code") and the mission of the university. The procedures are designed to provide students with due process, to ensure equal protection for all students, and to provide for the imposition of appropriate outcomes for matters of personal misconduct. The university adjudication process is not to be considered a substitute for criminal or civil proceedings. Rather, the procedures are meant to provide a fair disciplinary process which fosters development and accountability for the students involved.

Article II: Definitions

- A. **University:** "University" refers to Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI).
- B. **University Premises:** "University Premises" includes all land, buildings, facilities, and other property in the possession of or owned, used, or controlled by the university, including adjacent streets and sidewalks.
- C. **Member of the university community:** "Member of the university community" includes any person who is a student, faculty member, university official, university organization or person employed by the university.
- D. **University official:** "University official" includes any employee of the university performing administrative professional or staff responsibilities.
- E. **Faculty or faculty member:** "Faculty or faculty member" includes all who teach and/or do research at the university, including but not limited to tenure track faculty, librarians, holders of research or clinical ranks, lecturers, graduate students with teaching responsibilities, visiting and part-time faculty, and other instructional personnel, including coaches, advisors,

and counselors.

- F. **Student:** A “Student” is
1. a person who is admitted or enrolled in any credit bearing course or program in any school or division of Indiana University;
 2. a person who is admitted to Indiana University and is present on a campus for the purpose of being enrolled in any credit bearing course or program in any school or division of Indiana University;
 3. a person who has been admitted and enrolled in any credit bearing course or program in any school or division of Indiana University and continues to be associated with Indiana University because of failure to complete the course or the program in which the person is enrolled;
 4. a person who is not admitted to the university but who is taking classes to transfer to another university, for personal enrichment, or in preparation to apply to a graduate program (non-degree student);
 5. “Student” includes all students enrolled on the campuses of Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) or Columbus (IUPUC).
- G. **Student Organization:** “Student Organization” refers to any number of persons who have complied with any necessary requirements and are formally recognized by the university.
- H. **Business Day:** “Business Day” includes any day, Monday through Friday, in which the university offices are open.
- I. **Office of Student Conduct (Student Conduct or Office):** “Office of Student Conduct” refers the office designated to administer the Code on the IUPUI campus.
- J. **Conduct Officer (Hearing Officer):** “Conduct Officer” refers to designee of the Office of Student Conduct who is authorized to investigate and adjudicate student disciplinary cases and to impose sanctions upon any student or student organization found to have violated the Code.
- K. **Reporting Party:** “Reporting Party” includes any person(s) who submits a referral alleging that a student or organization has violated the Code.
- L. **Accused Student:** “Accused Student” refers to any student for whom an allegation of a violation of the Code has been filed with the university.
- M. **Referral:** “Referral” includes any documentation or information provided to the Office of Student Conduct alleging that a violation of the Code has occurred.
- N. **Notice:** “Notice” will be conclusively presumed to include documentation sent to the student through official university email; mailed to the address appearing on either the student’s current local address or permanent address on record in the IUPUI system; or provided to the student in person.
- O. **Sanction:** “Sanction” refers to the disciplinary outcome(s) imposed on a student for violations of the Code.
- P. **Tier I Offense:** “Tier I Offense” refers to an alleged violation of the Code, when in consideration of all aggravating and mitigating factors, is likely not to result in separation from the university as defined in Article IX of this document.
- Q. **Tier II Offense:** “Tier II Offense” refers to an alleged violation of the Code, when in consideration of all aggravating and mitigating factors, is likely to result in separation from the university as defined in Article IX of this document.
- R. **Consent:** Consent is expressed through affirmative, and voluntary words or actions mutually understandable to all parties involved. Consent is given for a specific sexual act at a specific time and can be withdrawn at any time. Consent cannot be coerced or compelled by duress, threat, or force. Consent cannot be given by someone who, for any reason, cannot understand the facts, nature, extent, or implications of the sexual situation occurring, including, but not limited to, those who are under the legal age of consent, asleep, unconscious, or mentally or physically impaired through the effects of drugs or alcohol. Consent cannot be assumed based on silence, the absence of “no” or “stop,” the existence of a prior or current relationship, or prior sexual activity.

Article III: Authority and Jurisdiction

- A. These procedures apply to the adjudication of the Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct provisions on Personal Misconduct. Authority to establish these procedures is provided in the Code under *Part III: Procedures for Implementation of the Code*.
- B. These procedures apply to all students, as defined under the Code (which is consistent with II.F. above), at the campus of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI).
- C. Should a student withdraw from the university, no longer remain enrolled, or otherwise not meet the definition of a student while a disciplinary matter is pending, the university will retain authority to adjudicate the matter under these procedures.
- D. As established under the Code *Part IV, Section C.3*. “any unit of the university may adopt additional or alternative substantive or procedural standards to this code, provided the alternative or additional standards:

1. Are necessary to meet academic concerns or to comply with the professional or accreditation standards; and
 2. Guarantee students in the unit a fair opportunity to be heard consistent with the standards of evidence and due process found in this code.”
- E. If, after a degree has been conferred, the university determines that the student committed misconduct prior to the conferral, the university may recommend the revocation of the degree to the Board of Trustees.
1. When an allegation of academic misconduct is made prior to degree conferral, the unit/school/division that awarded the degree will conduct an investigation to determine whether misconduct occurred, and if so, whether to recommend revocation of the degree to the Board of Trustees. The unit/school/division, in consultation with the Dean of Faculties and the Director for the Office of Student Conduct, will determine the procedures to be followed in conducting its investigation. The unit/school/division will make every reasonable effort to notify the student regarding the misconduct allegation and permit the student to respond to the allegation.
 2. When an allegation of personal misconduct is made which would have occurred prior to degree conferral and if the allegation would be considered a Tier II offense and/or would have influenced or affected the academic process, the Office of Student Conduct may adjudicate the case consistent with the procedures to adjudicate allegations of personal misconduct.

Article IV: Standard of Proof

The standard of proof for a finding of misconduct will be based upon a preponderance of evidence. Preponderance of evidence is defined as evidence that a reasonable person would find persuasive or more likely than not that the violation occurred. The burden to demonstrate that the preponderance standard has been met will be upon the university.

Article V: Procedures for Adjudication of Allegations of Academic Misconduct

- A. The Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct prohibits academic misconduct in *Part II, Section G*. The Student Disciplinary Procedures for Academic Misconduct Involving the IUPUI Campus are the procedures used to resolve allegations of academic misconduct. The procedures are available through the student’s school and the Office of Student Conduct and available online at <http://studentaffairs.iupui.edu>.
- B. Prior violations of academic or personal misconduct may be considered aggravating circumstances when sanctions are determined for a new case of either academic or personal misconduct.

Article VI: Referring and Investigating Allegations of Personal Misconduct

- A. **Initiation of a Referral:** Any person may make a referral of alleged acts of personal misconduct by a student to the university. Such referral will be made to the appropriate university official as soon as practicable, absent any extraordinary circumstances.
 1. Referrals of alleged acts of personal misconduct occurring on or off campus will be referred to the Director of Student Conduct or his or her designee.
 2. Referrals of alleged acts of personal misconduct occurring within a university residence may be directed to the Director of Housing and Residence Life or his or her designee, excluding acts which may result in separation from the university. Acts of personal misconduct which may result in separation from the university will be referred to the Director of Student Conduct or his or her designee.
- B. **Investigation:** The conduct officer may conduct an investigation to determine if the alleged violations of personal misconduct have merit and/or warrant further investigation or adjudication. The conduct officer, upon the completion of the investigation, will determine the appropriate course of action, which may include, but is not limited to:
 1. Taking no further action on the referral, which may include deferring the investigation if it is plausible that more information will be available at a later time;
 2. Providing the accused student written notice of charges and options to resolve the charges under the university discipline procedures.
- C. **Role of the University:** The Indiana University Police Department or other appropriate law enforcement agency will have the primary responsibility to investigate acts of misconduct which are subject to federal, state, and/or local laws. The conduct officer and other designated university officials are authorized to investigate alleged acts of personal misconduct, independent and/or in collaboration with the police department and other appropriate officials.
- D. **Role of the Accused Student:** Through the course of the investigation, the accused student will be sent notice of the alleged violation and is required to attend an informal conference with the conduct officer. The notice will include information related to the referral made to the university as well as reference to the applicable disciplinary procedures which will be used to adjudicate the matter. Failure to schedule and/or keep a requested appointment will not preclude the conduct officer from

continuing with the disciplinary process, which may include, but is not limited to, placing an administrative hold on a student's university account, filing of charges, or other appropriate actions.

- E. **Role of Other Participants:** Any other party believed to have information relevant to the investigation may be requested to meet with the conduct officer.
- F. **Role of an Advisor:** An accused student, or any other student requested to participate in the disciplinary process, may select at his/her sole expense an advisor of his/her choice to accompany him/her at any point in the disciplinary process, with the exception of any person who may also have had involvement in the matter referred to the conduct officer. The role of the advisor is limited to a supportive role and will not be interpreted as that of a representative of the student. The student is responsible for making necessary arrangements to have his/her advisor present. The advisor may not participate in the disciplinary process, unless an allowance is approved by the conduct officer or hearing commission chair.
- G. **Informal Conference:** An informal conference is a meeting between an accused student and a conduct officer. The purpose of the informal conference is for the conduct officer and the student to review the conduct process, to provide the student an opportunity to review the referral, and to discuss the student's understanding of the circumstances regarding the referral, including presenting information for review by the conduct officer.
- H. **Notice of charges:** The university will submit notice of charges to the accused student following the discovery of the alleged violation and any such charges will be resolved through the university discipline procedures.

Article VII: Resolving Charges of Personal Misconduct

- A. **Adjudication – Acceptance of Charges:** Accused students who receive written notice of charges for allegations of personal misconduct have the right to a formal hearing on the matter. However, in cases when the accused student wishes to accept responsibility for all charges in a case, the student may waive the right to a formal hearing and all related procedural guarantees, and receive a sanction from the conduct officer by whom charges were brought. In such situations, the student also waives the right to appeal a finding or sanction except on the grounds that the sanction imposed is grossly disproportionate to the violation(s) committed, in light of all relevant aggravating and mitigating factors, and in consideration of applicable university guidelines.
- B. **Adjudication – Requesting a Formal Hearing:** Accused students who wish to dispute responsibility for charges brought by the conduct officer may choose to have their case resolved in a formal hearing. Students who are charged with a Tier I offense may choose to have their case resolved by either a single administrative hearing officer or the hearing commission. Students who are charged with a Tier II offense must have their charges resolved in a hearing before the hearing commission only.
- C. **Formal Hearing Procedures:** A formal hearing provides an administrative hearing officer or hearing commission the opportunity to consider charges brought against an accused student; the opportunity to hear testimony provided by the accused student, the conduct officer, reporting party, and witnesses; the opportunity to review facts gathered in the investigation; and the opportunity to consider new material made available at the hearing. The administrative hearing officer or hearing commission may also consider information relevant to aggravating and mitigating circumstances necessary to administer a sanction if the accused student is found responsible for one or more charges.
- D. **Notice of Hearing:** An accused student will receive notice of a formal hearing no less than ten (10) calendar days from the date of the scheduled hearing, unless the accused student submits, in writing, a reasonable request to waive the ten day notice and schedule the hearing earlier, if practicable. The notice will include the date, time, and location of the hearing as well as information on the hearing process.
- E. **Attendance:** Attendance and participation at the formal hearing by the accused student is expected, unless the student accepts his/her charges in accordance with section A above. The university will make reasonable efforts to request witnesses and other parties to attend the hearing. Should an accused student fail to attend the hearing, absent extraordinary circumstances, the administrative hearing officer or hearing commission will not delay the proceedings. Rather, the administrative hearing officer or hearing commission will render a decision based on the information available. A student will, in no way, be assumed responsible for a charge solely on the basis of his/her failure to appear or to offer information at the hearing.
- F. **Procedures for a Prompt Review:** In circumstances where an accused student is nearing graduation or the end of a term, an accused student may be offered a prompt review of the case, thereby waiving the ten day notice of hearing requirement. The conduct officer may place an administrative hold on the student's account until the disciplinary matter has been resolved. An accused student may refuse a proposal for prompt review.
- G. **Record of the proceedings:** A record of the proceedings, whether written, audio or video recorded or any combination of these formats will be made of the hearing. The record is the sole property of the university.
- H. **Witness Participation:** An accused student and the conduct officer may each call upon witnesses to present information in

the hearing. Accused students must notify the Office of Student Conduct of the witnesses they wish to invite to participate in the hearing in order for the witnesses to be included in the notice of the scheduled hearing. The witnesses are expected to present relevant and factual information. Character witnesses are not permitted to participate in the hearing; however, such witnesses may submit a written statement. Written character statements must be provided to the Office of Student Conduct no less than five business days prior to the scheduled hearing.

- I. **Deliberations and Notice of Outcome:** The administrative hearing officer or hearing commission will deliberate in a closed session after the completion of the formal hearing. Only members of the hearing commission, a representative of the Office of the Dean of Students, and individuals permitted by the chair to remain for reasonable cause will be present during the deliberations. Deliberations are not recorded. A decision of the hearing commission will be reached by majority vote. Once a decision has been reached by the administrative hearing officer or hearing commission, the Office of Student Conduct will provide the notice of outcome to the accused student.

Article VIII: The University Hearing Commission

- A. **Appointment Process:** Members of the hearing commission are appointed to serve per the appointment process described below. Appointing bodies must appoint a sustainable membership to the hearing commission.
 1. The IUPUI Faculty Council will appoint faculty representatives to the hearing commission. A minimum of seven faculty members is recommended.
 2. The Dean of Students will appoint twelve at-large members to serve on the hearing commission. The Dean of Students will appoint five at-large members from the group of twelve to serve as administrative hearing officers for Tier I offenses.
 3. The IUPUI Undergraduate Student Government and IUPUI Graduate and Professional Student Government will each appoint student representatives to the hearing commission. It is recommended that each student governing body appoint a minimum of three representatives to the hearing commission.
 4. A chair of a meeting of the hearing commission will be selected by the Dean of Students or his or her designee and hold faculty status.
- B. A hearing commission will consist of at least one faculty representative, one staff representative, and one student representative.

Removal Process: Members of the hearing commission are expected to remain in good standing with all federal, state, and local laws as well as all university policies and standards. Members of the hearing commission are expected to participate in all training and development deemed necessary by the university. Members of the hearing commission must conduct themselves in a professional manner at all times. Members of the commission who fail to meet the requirements of their appointment may be removed per the policy of their representative governing bodies or at the recommendation of the Director of Student Conduct to the Dean of Students.

Article IX: University Sanctions and Disciplinary Outcomes

The following sanctions may be imposed upon any student found to have violated the Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct:

- A. **Formal Warning:** A warning is a written notification resulting from violations of the Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.
- B. **Probation:** Students placed on probation are further warned that any violation of the conditions of the probation or any further acts of misconduct may result in additional disciplinary action, including suspension or expulsion from the university. Students placed on probation may be restricted from other university activities.
- C. **Suspension:** Students suspended from the university are separated from Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis and all Indiana University campuses for a specified period of time, over which time their enrollment is terminated. Conditions for readmission may be specified.
- D. **Expulsion:** Students dismissed from the university are permanently separated from Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis and all Indiana University campuses with full termination of the student's enrollment.
- E. **Conditions of Suspension and Expulsion:** An individual separated from the university through suspension or expulsion will be denied all privileges afforded to a student. The conduct officer may determine that the student must be required to vacate the university premises at a specified time. The suspended or expelled student may not re-enter campus, for any purpose, in the absence of express written permission of the Dean of Students or his or her designee. The conduct officer may notify other members of the university as needed of the student's separation.
- F. **Transcript Notation:** The conduct officer is required to notify the Office of the Registrar to indicate a suspension or expulsion

has been issued. A notation of the separation will appear on the student's academic transcript, including a notation of withdrawal (W) for all enrolled courses. When the term of suspension has ended, the Registrar will remove the notation from the student's transcript. Expulsion notations on transcripts are permanent. A record of suspension or expulsion will also remain a permanent part of the student's disciplinary record.

- G. **Additional Disciplinary Outcomes:** The conduct officer is authorized to impose additional sanctions, which may include, but are not limited to, attendance at educational experiences, restitution, orders of no contact and/or no trespass, residence hall assignment relocation or contract termination, or other restrictions.
- H. **Sanction Guidelines:** The Office of Student Conduct will periodically publish a guidance document on the administration of sanctions for conduct officers.

Article X: The Appeal Process

- 1. **Submitting an Appeal:** A sanction issued by a conduct officer, with the restrictions on such appeal as specified in VII.A, or the decision of the administrative hearing officer or hearing commission may be appealed by the accused student to the appropriate appeals officer, or his or her designee. Such appeals shall be received in writing by the appeals officer no later than five (5) business days from the date the notice of outcome was sent to the student. The appeal must clearly state the specific grounds for appeal (see C. below) and must include all supporting documentation. A student is limited to one opportunity to appeal.
- B. **Designated Appeals Officers:** Appeals related to alleged personal misconduct of graduate and professional students will be received by the Director of the Graduate Office or similar administrator. Appeals related to alleged personal misconduct of undergraduate students and other non-graduate or non-professional students will be received by the Dean of Students or similar administrator.
- C. **Grounds for Appeal:** An appeal will be considered if submitted on one or more of the following grounds:
 - 1. The discovery of new and substantial information, which was unavailable at the time the conduct officer imposed a sanction or at the time of the formal hearing, and is now available and, if had been available, reasonably would have affected the outcome of the student's case.
 - 2. A significant procedural error occurred which that reasonably would have affected the outcome of the student's case.
 - 3. The sanction imposed is grossly disproportionate to the violation(s) committed, in light of all relevant aggravating and mitigating factors, and in consideration of applicable university guidelines.
- D. **Possible Outcomes of Appeal:** An appeals officer may reach one or more of the following outcomes after a review of the appeal and supporting documentation, including prior disciplinary history, if applicable.
 - 1. The appeals officer will dismiss the appeal if the appeal is not clearly based upon one or more of the grounds set forth above.
 - 2. The original decision and/or sanction(s) reached by the conduct officer, administrative hearing officer or hearing commission is upheld.
 - 3. The original case, individual charge, and/or sanction(s), or any portion of the three, may be dismissed or vacated.
 - 4. The original sanction(s) may be modified.
 - 5. The case may be remanded back to the original conduct officer, administrative hearing officer or hearing commission for consideration or rehearing. If practicable, a new conduct officer, administrative hearing officer or hearing commission will be sought to administer the rehearing. A case which is reheard may result in dismissal, modification of the finding, or a finding and/or sanction of greater or lesser severity than the original outcome.
 - 6. The outcome provided by the appeals officer is final.

Article XI: Procedures for the Adjudication of Sexual Misconduct

- A. The procedures which will be used to adjudicate matters of sexual misconduct, including, but not limited to, acts of sexual harassment, sexual violence, sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking or related behaviors can be found under *Appendix E of the Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct*.
 - 1. These procedures can be found online at http://www.indiana.edu/~code/bloomington/discipline/appendix_e.shtml

Article XII: Minor Deviations from Procedure

- A. A student and conduct officer may agree in advance to minor deviations from procedure, which will be documented in writing. Such deviations are not then subject to appeal.

Article XIII: Interim Suspension

- A. When the Dean of Students or the Director of the Graduate Office and/or their designees have reasonable cause to believe that a student's presence poses a significant risk of substantial harm to the safety or security of others or to property, the student may be immediately suspended from any and all portions of university premises, university-related activities or registered student organization activities. Notice of this measure will be provided to the student in writing as soon as practicable. The interim suspension will remain in effect until the conclusion of the disciplinary process or upon modification by the Dean of Students or the Director of the Graduate Office and/or their designees.
- B. Upon the issuance of a notice of interim suspension, the Director of Student Conduct or his or her designated conduct officer will initiate the disciplinary process without undue delay.
- C. The student may, within three (3) business days of the imposition of the interim suspension, petition the Dean of Students or the Director of the Graduate Office and/or their designees to have the interim suspension modified or removed. The petition must be made in writing by the student, and must include supporting documentation which would demonstrate that the student does not pose, or no longer poses, a significant risk of substantial harm to the safety or security to others or to property. The Dean of Students or the Director of the Graduate Office and/or their designees will render a decision without undue delay.

Article XIV: Resolving Allegations of Misconduct Committed by Student Organizations

- A. Student organizations are expected to maintain appropriate standards of conduct that are commensurate with those expected of individual students in the university community. All student organizations will be held responsible by the university for abiding by federal, state, and local laws, as well as all university policies.
- B. Student organizations are collectively responsible for any actions committed by members that serve to reflect upon the organization as a whole or upon the university community. Disciplinary action against organizations is separate from disciplinary action taken against individuals. Proper adjudication of an incident may necessitate actions against both an organization and its individual members.
- C. Any organization with restrictive membership clauses which discriminates on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex (except as exempted by Federal Regulations), sexual orientation, marital status, age, disability, or veteran status will not obtain or maintain university registration or recognition.
- D. Student organizations may not engage in hazing activities.
- E. When a student organization, including social Greek organizations, is charged with a violation of the Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, the case is referred to the Office of Student Involvement and disciplinary actions will be pursued as outlined in the student organization conduct process.
- F. Student organizations in violation of the Indiana University Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct will be subjected to sanctions, including, but not limited to, termination of university registration, restriction or suspension of the use of university facilities or services, suspension of the privilege to sponsor events or recruit new members, the loss of university funds, and restitution of damage(s).

Article XV: Interpretation and Revision

- A. Questions of interpretation of these procedures will be referred to the Dean of Students or his or her designee for final determination. These procedures will be reviewed every five (5) calendar years or at the request of the Dean of Students under the direction of the Director of Student Conduct or his or her designee.

Approved by the IUPUI Faculty Council
May 6, 2014 Effective May 12, 2014
Amended per the Office of the Vice
President and General Counsel May 27,
2014 and August 16, 2014

Amendment to the Bylaws

Change to the Charge of the Athletics Affairs Committee

Scope

This amendment to the IUPUI Faculty Council Bylaws changes the charge to the Athletics Affairs Committee.

Policy Statement

Athletics Affairs Committee

This committee participates in the development of general athletics policies related to academic matters, team competition, and practice schedules within the scope of athletics conference and association rules. The committee participates in the approval of plans for addition / elimination of sports and plans for significant modification of athletics facilities. The Chancellor shall appoint the IUPUI Athletic Affairs Committee on the recommendation of the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee. The Committee shall consist of 7 voting members. The Committee's voting membership shall have a majority of faculty.

Reason for Policy

The motion to change the number of voting members from 27 to 7 was brought to the EC by the Athletics Affairs Committee and is due to the inability to get a quorum at meetings to conduct business, etc.

Voting Members: 7 Total

- Faculty: 5 including the committee chair, the faculty athletic representative, and three additional faculty (preferably involved in undergraduate academics) appointed by the chancellor.
- Student: 1 Student Athletic Advisory Committee
- Community Leader (non-employee, possibly alumni member): 1

Non-Voting, Ex Officio Members: 5 Total:

- Staff: 4 including the athletic director, senior women's administrator, assistant athletics director for compliance, associate athletics director for academics
- Faculty: 1 chief of staff, chancellor's office

Total Committee Membership: 12

Total Needed for a Quorum: 4 of the voting members and to guarantee faculty control of athletics, committee action may not be taken unless the majority of voting committee members present, in person or by proxy, are faculty members.

Term limits will be for three years and will renew automatically at the discretion of the chancellor and with the agreement of the individual faculty member. As with all appointments such as this, diversity of membership will be a priority.

History

The change was approved by the IFC Executive Committee on October 24, 2013.

The change was approved by the IFC Constitution and Bylaws Committee on November 5, 2013.

The change was approved by the IUPUI Faculty Council on December 3, 2013.

Amendment to the Bylaws

Change to the Charge of the Campus Planning Committee

Scope

This amendment to the IUPUI Faculty Council Bylaws changes the charge to the Campus Planning Committee.

Policy Statement

Campus Planning Committee

This committee shall act as a representative of the Council in offering to the IUPUI Chancellor and the Campus Administration its continuing advice and the Faculty perspectives on academic and strategic planning.

Reason for Policy

The motion to change the committee charge was brought to the EC by the Campus Planning Committee. The prior charge gave the composition of the committee, not what the committee was charged to do.

Current Language:

This committee shall include at least one representative from the IUPUI Executive Committee and from the other IUPUI Faculty Council standing committees, plus other members appointed by the Executive Committee. The IUPUI Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement (or Senior Advisor to the Chancellor) shall be an ex officio member. The Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council may appoint one or more students as non-voting members of the standing committee. The Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council shall make this appointment based on nominations submitted by the Undergraduate Student Government and Graduate Student Organization (Bylaw III.B.4).

Proposed Language:

This committee shall act as a representative of the Council in offering to the IUPUI Chancellor and the Campus Administration its continuing advice and the Faculty perspectives on academic and strategic planning.

History

The change was approved by the IFC Executive Committee on December 17, 2013, by email.

The change was approved by the IFC Constitution and Bylaws Committee on January 3, 2014.

The change was approved by the IUPUI Faculty Council on April 15, 2014.

Resolutions Passed

Resolution to Support the Freedom Indiana Coalition and Indiana University in Opposition of House Joint Resolution 6

Proposed and Approved: November 5, 2013

Whereas Indiana University joined the Freedom Indiana coalition¹, a bipartisan grassroots campaign to oppose the constitutional amendment proposed in House Joint Resolution 6 (HJR6) that seeks to define marriage as between a man and a woman,

Whereas President McRobbie has stated the proposed amendment “runs counter to IU’s deeply held values” of tolerance,

Whereas Indiana University believes HJR6 would cause prospective and current faculty, staff, and students to feel unwelcome and be “a disincentive to locate in Indiana, adding to the state’s challenges to remain economically competitive,”

Whereas the University Faculty Council supports the action of the university in joining the coalition,

And Whereas Indiana University joins notable Indiana businesses working to ensure the state Constitution is not altered to enshrine intolerance “that is not representative in the best of Hoosier values,”

We, the IUPUI Faculty Council, support the action of President McRobbie and the University Faculty Council to join Freedom Indiana and oppose the amendment proposed in HJR6.

¹ <http://news.iu.edu/releases/iu/university-wide/2013/10/iu-joins-freedom-indiana.shtml>