REVISED THREE-YEAR REVIEW POLICY

This document has three sections: (A) Molly Martin’s summary of the IFC discussion of the 3-year review policy conducted by Jennifer Hehman for André De Tienne (who was out of the country); (B) the text of an email from Associate Dean of the Faculties Sharon Hamilton explaining the gist of her subsequent revisions; (C) the text of the November 8 version of the revised policy.

A. SUMMARY OF IFC DISCUSSION OF THREE-YEAR REVIEW POLICY (11/07/2006) provided by Molly Martin

* Faculty Affairs Committee Member Jennifer Hehman (for Chair André De Tienne) gave a first reading of the proposed three-year review policy. Hehman announced a minor revision: the addition of the word “performance” to each mention of “teaching;” performance—as opposed to teaching—is one of the three components for which librarians go up for promotion and tenure (“P&T”). She and policy author Associate Dean of the Faculties Sharon Hamilton then accepted suggestions for clarification and revision from Richard Meiss and Rick Ward.

IFC members then offered feedback and raised questions:

Q: Who will serve on the three-year review committee?
A: Except in the case of librarians (whose P&T structure is unique), the school-level P&T committee will conduct the review.

Q: Will the timing of this policy’s processes be effective? What if reappointment or non-reappointment is already underway?
A: The feedback from the IFC Executive Committee was that the three-year review should be divorced from the reappointment process, i.e. that this review should not be used to make P&T or appointment decisions.

Q: If the intent of this policy is to ensure that all Deans follow procedures, why are the school P&T committees made the primary contact between the faculty member and the Dean of Faculties Office? Shouldn’t the Deans remain primarily accountable?
A: This was proposed to address concerns about the reviews being used by Deans in making certain decisions.

Q: Is this policy necessary?
A: The policy seeks not to create but to codify current practice to ensure fairness and adequate P&T mentorship. Hamilton, Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel Chair Giles Hoyt, IFC President Bart Ng, and other IFC members cited recent grievances arising from the surprising circumvention, ignorance, or misuse of P&T procedures and mentorship. This is, Hoyt noted, an important preventive measure. Subah Packer applauded the idea of the policy because of reasons listed above, but also suggested formal follow-up to the three-year review, scrutiny of cases in
which a positive three-year review is accompanied by an incongruently negative annual review in the third year. In response to related comments, Packer suggested that faculty use the discussion surrounding this policy as an opportunity to consider whether or not we are in a grant-getting equals tenure-granting climate, so to speak.

Referring to situations in the past in which three-year reviews were misused by an administrator, Jim Baldwin and Henry Karlson cautioned the policy authors and the IFC to be wary of whether or not this policy could devolve into a mini-tenure process.

In closing, Bill Schneider asked that this policy be put forward for action as an IFC policy as opposed to an administrative policy up for IFC endorsement. Others agreed. Vermette asked the FAC to work with Hamilton to revise the policy and return in December, at which time the IFC will formally act on the policy.

* Referring to the proposed three-year review policy, Ng noted that Dean Uday Sukhatme is very committed to ensuring that Promotion & Tenure procedures are followed at every level. Ng hopes the IFC will support the Dean in his efforts.

**B. Sharon Hamilton’s Email of 8 November 2006 Regarding Her Revisions**

I have revised the three-year guidelines based upon what I heard yesterday.

The only comment I did not act upon was the comment about the date, because we have spent a considerable amount of time on the date, and most people in most groups have determined that the stated date due – on or before the final day of spring classes – was the best of the options suggested.

Please see if you think these revisions reflect the comments made.

Here is a brief summary of the changes made:

1. no changes in the background (although I was tempted to underline and bold the phrase that says “To clarify and formalize this procedure,” since 2-3 of our colleagues thought that this three-year review was something completely new)
2. no changes in the wording of the policy
3. Implementation:
   a. First statement eliminates reference to specific examples, and adds the phrase “in relation to the department’s norms”
   b. 4th statement: I added “performance” and “research and creative activity.” The addition of “research and creative activity” somewhat changes the original intent of that statement, since the original idea was that some chairs or deans might want to lessen slightly the teaching or service load in order to provide more time for research and creative activity. Since it is unlikely that a chair would want to lessen a research or creative activity load in order to provide more time for teaching and service, the addition struck me initially as a bit strange. On the other hand, a chair might recommend certain changes in the direction of research and creative activity, and so, in that sense, the statement does make sense, even though its intent is slightly changed.
   c. I reinstated “Deans” as primary recipients (together with faculty and chairs of unit P&T committees) of the letters from Uday and me instead of being copied.
   d. I rephrased the sentence about the difference between the annual review in the third year
and three-year reviews as suggested during the meeting, and I added the phrase “and re-appointment” as recommended, so that there is a clear distinction between the role of the annual review in the third year and re-appointment, and the role of the three-year review to support faculty on their path toward P&T.

I hope that this responds to all the articulated concerns.

Sharon J. Hamilton
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Associate Dean of the Faculties

C. TEXT OF REVISED POLICY

DOCUMENT submitted by Associate Dean of the Faculties Sharon Hamilton

REVISED PROPOSED Policy AND Procedures FOR THREE-YEAR REVIEWS

November 8, 2006

Background
Three-year reviews were first instituted at IUPUI in the early 1990s. These comprehensive and cumulative reviews are conducted at the school level. Their primary purpose is to provide a frank and formative assessment of each tenure-track faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure near the mid-point of the probationary period of their academic career. They are intended to be constructive in nature, with concrete suggestions on how to progress successfully toward promotion and tenure.

In 2006, for the first time, schools were asked to forward the three-year reviews to the Academic Affairs office, where they received an additional reading. Responses were written to the dean of each school on the comprehensiveness, frankness, and potential helpfulness of the review. To clarify and formalize this procedure, after consultation with the Deans and the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council, the following policy has been formulated:

Policy

During the spring semester of their third year at IUPUI, all tenure-track faculty members will undergo a comprehensive review at the school level of their cumulative progress toward promotion and tenure. This review will be forwarded to the Office of the Dean of the Faculties on or before the final day of spring-semester classes.

Implementation Procedures

In order to be as informative and helpful as possible to faculty, three-year reviews should include the following:

1. an explicit statement that it is a three-year review which evaluates cumulative progress in all three areas in relation to the department’s norms and expectations.
2. a clear evaluative statement of progress toward promotion and tenure;
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3. concrete suggestions for the candidate to progress successfully
4. if and when applicable, recommendations concerning course load or number of course preparations per semester, research and creative activity, or changes in performance and service expectations in order to facilitate the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure
5. a current vita.

Since the primary purpose of the three-year review is to provide a frank evaluation of the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure, and to make appropriate recommendations for successful progress, the primary audience for the three-year review is the faculty member. However, a secondary purpose of the reviews is to help deans and chairs have a clear sense of the cumulative progress of their tenure-track faculty, so that they may consider any recommended supports or changes in curricular assignments or service expectations in order to help these faculty members be as successful as possible. Therefore, the committee writing the reviews will need to keep all three audiences in mind: the faculty member (primarily), the chair, and the dean.

The reading by the Dean of the Faculties and the Associate Dean of the Faculties is to provide a campus-level response to the reviews conducted by the school-level promotion and tenure committee. A response to the reviews from each school will be sent to each faculty member, the chair of the promotion and tenure committee of each school, and the dean, who will forward copies to the appropriate chairs. The Academic Affairs office will also organize a follow-up meeting for all reviewed faculty during the fall of their fourth year to ascertain the impact of the review process on their path toward promotion and tenure and also to determine what further support for faculty might be provided at the campus level.

It is important to note that the three-year reviews are not to be confused with or substituted for the annual review in the third year that occurs within the department and that determines re-appointment. While the annual reviews provide a department-level layer of support and evaluation, the more comprehensive review in the third year is intended to provide a school-level and campus-level layer of support for our tenure-track faculty colleagues, ensuring that they receive a fair, frank, and helpful evaluation to assist their progress toward tenure and promotion.