Indianapolis Faculty Council (IFC)
Minutes
March 4, 2014 ~ CE 409 ~ 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.


Agenda Item I: Welcome and Call to Order
IUPUI Faculty Council Vice President Ed Berbari called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Agenda Item II: Adoption of the Agenda as the Order of Business for the Day
The Agenda was adopted as the Order of Business for the Day.

Agenda Item III: [Memorial Resolution] Dr. Vincent H. Gattone II
Circular 2014-06 appended to the minutes.

A moment of silence was given by the assembly, and the resolution was entered into record.

Agenda IV: [Action Item] Approval of the IFC December 3, 2013, Minutes
The minutes of the December 3, 2013, Faculty Council meeting were approved and entered into record.

Agenda Item V: Updates/Remarks from the Chancellor
Charles R. Bantz, Chancellor

Chancellor Bantz gave the following report:
- Paydar introduced Melissa Lavitt, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, who began her position on February 1. AVP Lavitt replaced Mary Fisher in that role.
- The Performance Report has been completed and will be distributed as soon as it is available. The chancellor gave the report at the recent Report to the Community.
- Ground has been broken on University Hall, which will be the home of the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, and the School of Social Work.
• The kick-off function for the IUPUI Campus Campaign has taken place. Vice Chancellor Zeb Davenport and Senior Advisor to the Chancellor Trudy Banta are co-chairs.
• The budget hearings have begun. We have had all but two budget hearings and three sessions of the Cluster Conversations. The fourth conversation is after the meeting in this room.
• Vice Chancellor Dawn Rhodes has observed that 81 of 167 classrooms have furniture that is older than 14 years; 34% are older than 30 years. The campus will be improving the furniture as it is being considered under budget planning. In fall 2014, LE 104 will be renovated with a technology package. CA 229, LD 026, BS 3018 classroom renovations will be finished by the end of spring break.
• The women’s basketball team (21-8) are second in the conference. They will play North Dakota State and are favored to win the Summit League tournament.
• The students led the homecoming festivities. The homecoming court were chosen by competing through philanthropy. Whoever raised the most canned foods and dollars for scholarship won.

Agenda Item VI: Updates / Remarks from the IFC President
L. Jack Windsor, President

Windsor reported the Board of Trustees discussed parking at their meeting. Parking will remain under IU’s control. They also heard a presentation on the Wishard property obtained by the university through the land swap. Buildings were identified for demolition or renovation. The School of Dentistry, Fairbanks School of Public Health, and the School of Medicine will occupy some of the buildings. The University Faculty Council discussed the common calendar. The Academic Affairs Committee will be looking at the latest draft and reporting back to the IFC Executive Committee.

Agenda Item VII: [Information Item] Retirement Readiness Calculator and Transparency Tool
Dan Rives, Associate Vice President, University Human Resources Administration
Keatrick Johnson, University Director, Retirement Program and Worker’s Comp Services
Christian Royer, Manager of Healthcare Programs

Windsor thanked Rives who would retire after 23 years with the university in May. Rives spoke briefly about the value of IU retirement plans, then introduced Johnson who spoke about the Retirement Readiness Statement and calculator (http://www.indiana.edu/~uhrs/benefits/rrs/index.html). The statement lists many items to help employees estimate annual lifetime retirement income. The calculator is used to create the statement. The statement shows the retirement plan(s) the employee is registered with. The site is secure to use (using employee ID and date of birth with the ability to change your password at that time). Royer spoke about the Castlight Health Transparency Tool (http://www.indiana.edu/~uhrs/benefits/castlight.html). The tool is used by employees enrolled in the IU PPO medical plans and adult family members to show cost comparisons of procedures or services by several different providers. The site is secure and you can change your password once you log in. You are also able to keep track of your deductible throughout the year (pharmacy and medical).

Agenda Item VIII: [Information Item] Principles of Co-Curricular Learning
Zebulun Davenport, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Davenport spoke to the PowerPoint slides appended to the end of the minutes, including the organizational structure of the division, and the vision, mission, and values. The Principles of Co-Curricular Learning (PCLs) are:

1. Communication Skills
2. Critical Thinking
The PCLs were developed in consultation with key campus constituents with assessments targeted to students the division already is in contact with. Before the PCLs become final, Davenport will make (or has already made) contact with the Faculty Council Executive Committee, School of Liberal Arts Faculty Assembly, IUPUI Faculty Council, Graduate School Council, and the General Education Task Force. They will “create a common set of sample questions mapped to PCLs for use when developing measures for assessing learning and develop/adapt existing instruments for assessing learning” (PP slides). Data will be collected as well in spring 2014.

Agenda Item IX: [Action Item – Vote] Statement on Faculty Work
Josette Jones, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
Bill Babler, Member, Faculty Affairs Committee
Mary Ann Frank, Members, Faculty Affairs Committee
Circular 2014-01: Statement on Faculty Work (Draft with Tracking Changes)
Circular 2014-02: Statement on Faculty Work (FINAL)

On behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Jones moved to approve the Statement on Faculty Work. Frank described the changes the statement went through to get to its current level. Policies should be developed within the schools on the statement. Babler said the changes refer to the Academic Handbook as a guide. The statement is meant to update the original “Statement on Faculty Work” written by former Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties William Plater. Changes were made based on the comments and questions raised when the statement came to the council in May 2013. Each school is to produce their own faculty work statement with the input of their faculty.

Atkinson said the original statement was not a policy, but written as a memorandum in 1996. Is there any pressure from the trustees to have such a document? Do we really want to enshrine a six course load requirement for IUPUI versus whatever is at IUB, which he thought was less? Babler referred to the IFC-EC for the original charge. He said there is nothing in the document that says how many courses must be taught, but it is left up to the schools to determine that in consultation with the faculty. Windsor said the state wants to look at what the schools are doing, and it is an attempt to preempt any questions about faculty work. The Handbook Committee asked that the original statement be revised. Windsor said the Board of Trustees want the Faculty Annual Report looked at as well.

When the units generate the workload document, what does that look like; what is the process? Babler said the deans are to do this in consultation with the faculty. The intent is that the deans will not generate it by themselves, but to get faculty input into the document. It also looks at the teaching needs from departments at the time and change as needed. There is a reference in the statement that addresses this as a collaborative effort.

Berbari said the motion came out of committee, so no second is needed. A vote was taken with a few oppositions, but the affirmative vote won. Motion passed.
Agenda Item X: [First Read] Proposal to Change the Charge of the Campus Planning Committee
Laura Romito, Chair, Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Romito read the change in the charge to the Campus Planning Committee as follows:

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 (confirmed at committee meeting held August 15, 2013):
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.

The proposal will be up for a second read and vote at the April 1, 2014, IFC meeting.

Agenda Item XI: Election Slates: IFC Executive Committee, University Faculty Council, Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel, Board of Review, President of the Faculty, Vice President of the Faculty, At-Large Members (Tenure and Non-Tenure-Track), Nominating Committee
Jan Froehlich, Member, Nominating Committee

Froehlich presented the slates as follows:

Election Slate: Executive Committee
Term: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2016
Need to Elect: 4
Election can be electronic or paper ballot and must be conducted on or by May 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bannatyne</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>E &amp; T</td>
<td>E&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boukai</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Ten FT1</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattab</td>
<td>Eys</td>
<td>Ten FT1</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Josette</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>Info/Computing</td>
<td>Info/Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>Kristi</td>
<td>Ten LT2</td>
<td>Univ. Library</td>
<td>Univ. Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennels</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>E &amp; T</td>
<td>E &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schild</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>E &amp; T</td>
<td>E &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tezanos-Pinto</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watt</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election Slate: University Faculty Council
Term: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2016
Number to Elect: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynlacht</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hassell      John      Ten FT1      Business      Business
Jafari      Maymanat      Ten LT2      Univ. Library      University Library
Kowolik      Joan      Ten FT2      Dentistry      DSPE
Liu      Shih-Yao “Sean”      TT FT3      Dentistry      DSOF
Morrison      Wendy      Ten FT2      Liberal Arts      Economics
Motaganahalli      Raghu      TT FT3      Medicine      Surgery
Orme      Bill      Ten LT2      Univ. Library      University Library
Porter      Christopher      Ten FT2      Business      Business
Scheurich      James      Ten FT1      Education      Education
Watt      Jeff      Ten FT2      Science      Mathematics
Wokeck      Marianne      Ten FT1      Liberal Arts      History

[Second Read – Ready for Electronic Vote] Election Slate: Board of Review
Need to Elect: 10 (T=Tenured; TT=Tenure Track)

Alexander Dent      T02      Medicine
Joseph Dynlacht      T02      Medicine
Charles Goodlett      T01      Science
Eyas Hattab      T01      Medicine
Max Huffman      TT02      Law
Richard Humphrey      TL2      Law
Josette Jones      T02      Informatics and Computing
Debomoy Lahiri      T01      Medicine
Steven J Miller      T02      Medicine
Miriam Murphy      TL2      Law
Horia I. Petrache      T02      Science
Karen E. Pollok      TT02      Medicine
John Schild      T02      Engineering and Technology
Amy E Schmidt      TT03      Medicine
Jingyun Wang      TT03      Medicine
Jeffrey Watt      T02      Science
Clark Wells      T02      Medicine

Election Slate: Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel
Need to Elect: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bannatyne</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>E&amp;T</td>
<td>Comp, Info &amp; Graphics Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Microbiology &amp; Immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynlacht</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Ten LT2</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koniaris</td>
<td>Leonidas</td>
<td>Ten FT1</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Ten LT2</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riner</td>
<td>Mary Beth</td>
<td>Ten FT2</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Environments for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>TEN FT2</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election Slate: Nominating Committee
Term: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2016
Need to Elect: 4

TBA
**Election Slate: President and Vice President**
Term: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2016
Need to Elect: 1 in each category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President:</th>
<th>Marianne Wokeck</th>
<th>TEN</th>
<th>FT1</th>
<th>IN-LART</th>
<th>IN-HIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President:</td>
<td>Edward Berbari</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Watt</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
<td>IN-MATH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Election Slate: At-Large Representative (Tenure/Tenure Track)**
Term: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2016
Need to Elect: 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-PED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baich</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-RADY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannatyne</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barth</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbari</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
<td>IN-DSPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blum</td>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-MCIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruzzaniti</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
<td>IN-DSOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckwalter</td>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-RADY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coates</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>Dena</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-BUS</td>
<td>IN-BUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalsing</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-SURG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Corcia</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-OBGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dierks</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-AHLT</td>
<td>IN-AHLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynlacht</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-RAON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foroud</td>
<td>Tatiana</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-MMGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froehlich</td>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-MDEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>Chunyan</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-PBHL</td>
<td>IN-PBHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-PED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostroun</td>
<td>Daniella</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
<td>IN-HIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowolik</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
<td>IN-DSPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahiri</td>
<td>Debomoy</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-PSYC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Jiliang</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
<td>IN-BIOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>LT1</td>
<td>IN-LAW</td>
<td>IN-LAWL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNelis</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-NURS</td>
<td>IN-NURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minto</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
<td>IN-CHEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odell</td>
<td>Jere</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
<td>IN-BIOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racette</td>
<td>Lyne</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
<td>IN-OPTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romito</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
<td>IN-DSOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooney</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
<td>IN-CPHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saak</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
<td>IN-HIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
<td>IN-HIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tezanos-Pinto</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
<td>IN-LANG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-ACSP</td>
<td>IN-ACAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>L. Jack</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-IN</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Approval: 4-1-14

Witzmann  Frank  TEN  FT1  IN-MED  IN-PBIO
Woakeck  Marianne  TEN  FT1  IN-LART  IN-HIST

**Election Slate: At-Large Representative (Non-Tenure-Track)**
Term: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2016
Need to Elect: 5 Total

**Research Track (Need to Elect: 1):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barr</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>RS1</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
<td>IN-SCIEOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghoneima</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>RS3</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
<td>IN-DSOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallett</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>RS3</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
<td>IN-BIOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippert</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>RS3</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
<td>IN-DSOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pradhan</td>
<td>Meeta</td>
<td>RS3</td>
<td>IN-INFO</td>
<td>IN-INFO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lecturer Track (Need to Elect: 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>FL5</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giddings</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>FL5</td>
<td>IN-HERR</td>
<td>IN-HERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glidden</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>FL5</td>
<td>IN-LIBA</td>
<td>IN-ANTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillabaum</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>FL5</td>
<td>IN-BUS</td>
<td>IN-BUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russo</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>FL5</td>
<td>IN-NURS</td>
<td>IN-NURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheeler</td>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>FL5</td>
<td>IN-LIBA</td>
<td>IN-LIBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>FL5</td>
<td>IN-LIBA</td>
<td>IN-LIBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vargas-Vila</td>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>FL5</td>
<td>IN-LIBA</td>
<td>IN-LIBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clinical Track (Need to Elect: 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flynn</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>FC1</td>
<td>IN-BUS</td>
<td>IN-BUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>FC1</td>
<td>IN-LAW</td>
<td>IN-LAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>FC5</td>
<td>IN-EDUC</td>
<td>IN-EDUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoder</td>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>FC3</td>
<td>IN-EDUC</td>
<td>IN-EDUC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was concern about the lack of competitiveness for the election for president of the faculty. Froehlich said it was true the position would run unopposed, but the Nominating Committee would accept names of others who wish to serve before the election occurs.

**Agenda Item XII: Question / Answer Period**
Windsor announced the IFC would meet on both April 1 and 15 due to the weather closures earlier in the year resulting in meeting cancelations for January and February.

**Agenda Item XIII: Unfinished Business**
There was no Unfinished Business.

**Agenda Item XIV: New Business**
There was no New Business.

**Agenda Item XV: Call for IFC or UFC Standing Committee Reports**
The following report was given:
Academic Affairs Committee (John Watson, Chair): The committee was asked to review the participation of IUPUI in the Advance College Project dealing with dual credit courses. IUPUI’s program is called SPAN. All other IU campuses participate in the ACP. The following recommendation was brought forward for endorsement:

The Academic Affairs Committee carefully evaluated the Advance College Project (ACP) and the potential value of IUPUI’s participation in the ACP. The AAC recognizes the significant contribution that the ACP makes to the availability of dual credit courses to high school students. Therefore, the AAC endorses IUPUI becoming an active partner in the ACP as a means of enhancing college preparedness of high school students across the state.

How is this different than the SPAN program? Paydar said SPAN would continue at IUPUI as the students come to IUPUI for the courses. They pay the course fee getting high school and college course credit. ACP has teachers going through ACP training so that when students in high school take AP courses, the students will get the. The teaching is done by the high school teachers, but we make sure the course is relevant and taught the way we want it taught. IUB will do the accreditation portion. IUPUI will go to the high schools to admit students and review the course to be sure it meets our standards. The courses will be credited to IUPUI rather than IUB. We will communicate with the students instead of IUB.

Do we need to send faculty to the classrooms to do a field visit? Porter said we need to make sure the student in the classroom receives the quality standards as if it were taught here. We do send someone to the classroom to make the observation. It does not need to be a tenured faculty member; just someone that understands what is being taught and can make the judgment. The person is compensated. The ACP people take care of all the paperwork and do the course assessments. They allow us to focus on the quality of the course being presented.

Will we see a rise in the program by our participation? Paydar said there are already 3,000 students taking courses for AP credit, but they will now have a tie to the campus.

Berbari asked the members for endorsement of the recommendation with the administration working out the details of the program. The endorsement was approved by the body.

Agenda Item XVI: Report from the IUPUI Staff Council
Lee Stone, President

Stone reported on the following:
- Stone met with the Bloomington Professional Council during the summer. That group has funds they can use to give grants to staff for professional development. He charged the Staff Development Committee to look at the possibility of doing that here.
- The council continues to working on the strategic plan.
- A career ladder plan is being developed by Human Resources, and the council hopes the adoption of it will lead to the advancement of staff to higher positions on campus.
- Stone attended a mentoring workshop through HRA, and is excited to perhaps have a mentoring program for staff in the future.
- The Membership Committee is preparing to hold council elections.
- The council participated in a very successful workshop with other interested employees called Conversations for a Civil Community: The Significance of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity at IUPUI. The session was moderated by Nancy Robertson, Dan Griffith, and Margo Foreman.
• Stone suggested thanking the Campus Facility Services personnel for their work in keeping the snow and ice off campus sidewalks and parking lots.

Agenda Item XVII: Final Remarks and Adjournment
With no further business appearing, a motion was made to adjourn. The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, Karen Lee
UL 3115N / 274-2215 / Fax: 274-2970 / fcouncil@iupui.edu / http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil

Report on Council Actions (per Bylaws Article I. Section C.3):

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

Academic Affairs Committee
• 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.)
  ○ 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?
• Grade Forgiveness Policy

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.)
**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.
- 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.
- Review of campus Post Tenure Review policy (Faculty and Librarian Review and Enhancement)
- Discuss the grievance process and the Board of Review procedures with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.)*

**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. Mary Fisher’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.
- 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

**Student Affairs Committee**
- RISE Initiative
- Wellness Center
- Student Services capabilities given the number of students

**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.)

**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**
Revised 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.)

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.)

Technology Committee:
- Follow-up on final transition of student technology fee spending and impact on units. – Report received on 1-14-14.

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.)
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION
ON BEHALF OF
VINCENT H. GATTONE II
June 8, 1951 – January 21, 2014
PROFESSOR OF ANATOMY AND CELL BIOLOGY AND ADJUNCT
PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE IN NEPHROLOGY
INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

It is with great sadness that the Indiana University School of Medicine announces the untimely death of Dr. Vincent H. Gattone, who passed away peacefully at his home surrounded by family on January 21st, 2014. Dr. Gattone’s death is a loss to his family, his friends, and to Indiana University.

Vince earned his BS in Chemistry from Ursinus College, an MS in Academic Pathology from George Washington University, and his PhD in Medical Sciences from the Medical College of Ohio in 1980. He completed a postdoctoral fellowship at Indiana University in 1983 and taught at the Pennsylvania State University and the University of Kansas Medical Schools, before returning to the Indiana University School of Medicine in 2000 as Professor of Anatomy and Cell Biology and Adjunct Professor of Medicine in Nephrology. Dr. Gattone also served as a Visiting Scientist at the University of Michigan (1994), the Mayo Clinic (2010) and at the University College of London (2011).

Vince loved teaching anatomy and research ethics, and believed strongly in the need to foster young investigators. He won several teaching awards both at the University of Kansas and at Indiana University. He was the Director of the Electron Microscopy Laboratory, a core facility of the IU School of Medicine. He was widely known and highly regarded for his research into the causes of cystic kidney disease, and renal hypertension. He developed and characterized numerous animal models of cystic disease that mimic the human condition. These models allowed the identification of treatment targets, most
notably Tolvaptan. He had multiple patents, over 150 publications and textbooks, and gave multiple national and international lectures. He chaired the Internal Scientific Research Advisory Board for IU's O'Brien Center, and served on the Editorial Boards of the Journal of Histochemistry and Cytochemistry, and Experiment Biology and Medicine. He was the Founding President of the Indiana Microscopy Society. In 2013, Dr. Gattone received the prestigious Lillian Jean Kaplan International Prize for the Advancement in the Understanding of Polycystic Kidney Disease (PKD) from the International Society of Nephrology, its highest research award.

Vince was an avid traveler and photographer, and was passionate about his family. He is survived by his wife of 26 years, Diane, their five children, and Vince's two sisters.

Vince was a close friend and collaborator to many of us. His collegiality, his broad interests, and his engaging manner will be sorely missed, as will his future contributions to his science, to which he was so dedicated.

**THUS, BE IT RESOLVED:** that this memorial resolution be adopted by the Faculty Council of Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis and also be placed in the minutes of Faculty Council with a moment of silence observed in his honor; and that a copy of this memorial resolution be delivered to his wife, Diane Gattone.

This resolution is written on behalf of Professor Gattone's students, trainees, and the staff and faculty of the Departments of Anatomy and Cell Biology, and Medicine. This resolution was prepared by Robert Bacallao, David Burr, James McAteer and Sharon Moe.

Approved by the IUPUI Faculty Council at their meeting on March 4, 2014.
Faculty Work

2013

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 supervisor (chair) 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.
The Academic Handbook contains two sections that pertain generally to the conditions of faculty work ("Academic Appointments" and "Conditions of Work"), but there is no specific policy or procedure regarding the assignment of faculty to particular activities. This responsibility rests with departmental chairs and school deans through authority delegated from the President to the campus Chancellor.

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. Clinical faculty members teach an additional section over what is taught by tenured faculty. Variation in teaching loads is based on the differing missions and work expectations related to research (only tenure track/tenured faculty have research in their direct mission, while scholarship in the area of excellence is required of all faculty members). Faculty often receive additional teaching load release time for funded research where funds are returned to the school to cover such expenses. 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 (FAR).

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 obtain 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 University or campus policy states this assignment of time. Exceptions could be made by the chair or dean within the context of a faculty member’s overall responsibilities with an expectation of demonstrated outcomes.

**Teaching Assignments**

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

It is always in the best interest of the unit to take advantage of individual faculty members' competencies, strengths, and interests when matching them to specific departmental needs. Chairs and deans must develop a schedule of classes each term based on curricular requirements, direct and indirect promises of course availability, and student needs. The process should involve the unit's faculty and derive from the faculty's authority to determine curriculum. In acting on behalf of the faculty to implement the curriculum, academic administrators should assume that their peers will scrutinize and review their judgments. They also are expected to give priority to unit needs and responsibilities over those of individual faculty, who do not have an unrestricted right to teach a specific course where and when they want to teach it. In most situations, 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 entitled to a one-month vacation (generally interpreted as 22 working days — Academic Handbook, Appendix A). They 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 not, however, engage in remunerated outside work in accordance to university policies, during the entire 12-month period, except only as permitted during the academic year (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. Moreover,

The scheduling of vacations and assigning of faculty time during semester breaks must be coordinated are mutual responsibilities with chairs and deans, not a unilateral right of faculty. If advising or other student services ordinarily provided by faculty are required during a vacation or semester break, faculty may be asked to provide these on a fair and equitable basis. Chaire and deans are obligated to know how 12-month faculty members spend their time, and these faculty members are responsible for reporting that information to their 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.

Commented [FML3]: Why would we not want to put this in this document where our faculty could easily find it? I get questions about this all the time. MLF
Although Faculty may engage in outside remunerated activities are as listed and described in the Academic Handbook (Outside Activities and Extra Compensation) that do not involve leaves of absence, taking part in paid outside activities requires prior approval of the faculty member’s chair and dean as provided in school-specific policies. Faculty also must report periodically to their chair and dean on their continuing activities, which must remain compatible with the unit’s mission and continue to enhance the faculty member’s effectiveness as a member of the unit.

**Initial Faculty Appointment**

Conditions at time of initial appointment vary for many faculty members at IUPUI were appointed at times when conditions were different in many ways, and differences will continue in the years ahead. Other faculty received letters of appointment that may have specified certain conditions of work, such as number of courses to be taught or type of staff support. In either case, faculty may feel they have a “contract” with the University regarding conditions of work—Letters of appointments. Although not “contracts,” the Academic Handbook and the IUPUI Academic Handbook Supplement contain policy statements on which faculty can rely and for which the University and campus must be responsible. 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 current and emerging program departmental or, school-norms for the faculty collectively. In some units, for example, research and/or teaching expectations were lower when some faculty members were initially appointed. Accordingly, those faculty members should expect it would be unreasonable to expect or to require these colleagues to contribute to the school’s research mission to the same degree as more recently appointed colleagues. However, it would be reasonable to expect them to accept added teaching or service responsibilities that would bring their overall level of contribution to the program departmental or school norm. As noted earlier, the balance of teaching, research, and service, as reflected in assignments, must be contingent on many factors, where all faculty are expected to contribute. When the University awards tenure to faculty, they in turn accept a responsibility to grow and change to meet evolving needs. Faculty members have a right to expect their colleagues to develop new competencies that keep departments and schools current. Department chairs must be able to rely on the support of all faculty when encouraging individuals to develop competencies needed for the unit’s vitality.

**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 Boards 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. Even 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 accepting 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.
Faculty Work
Proposal by the IFC Faculty Affairs Committee

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.
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Overview

• Organizational Structure
• Strategic Plan
• Student Learning and Engagement
  – Principles of Co-Curricular Learning
• Connection To Retention
• Next Steps
Vision

To impact the success of students by delivering nationally recognized programs and services that broaden the educational experience and promote campus and civic engagement.
Mission

The mission of the Division of Student Affairs is to...

Provide quality co-curricular programs and services that facilitate intellectual growth and personal development, creating pathways to success for all students.
Values

• Students First
• Integrity
• Diversity
• Social Justice
• Best Practices
• Collaboration
• Civic Engagement
• Health & Wellness
Goals

• #1: Campus Life
  Improve and enrich campus life while ensuring that the Division and its departments meet nationally recognized standards for programs, services, and facilities.

• #2: Campus Climate
  Foster an inclusive, welcoming, supportive, and affirming community that contributes to student success.
Goals

• **#3: Campus and Community Partnerships**
  Create and sustain *mutually beneficial* relationships that *advance* student *learning*, maximize *resources*, and *facilitate* civic engagement.

• **#4: Division Effectiveness**
  Demonstrate *excellence* in professional practice through *effective* leadership and *responsible* stewardship of *resources*. 
Student Learning and Engagement

Student Affairs:

Partners with our colleagues in Academic Affairs whereby the classroom provides the FORMAL learning and the out of classroom provides FORMATIVE learning creating a holistic experience for our students.

We contribute to the academy by grounding our programs and services in learning objectives.
Student Learning and Engagement

Principles of Co-Curricular Learning (PCLs)

• PCLs are based on IUPUI’s Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) and Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning (PGPLs)

• Provide a conceptual framework for learning outside of the classroom

• PCLs complement the PULs and PGPLs
  – Address learning both inside and outside of the classroom
Student Learning and Engagement

Development of PCLs

• Reviewed relevant student affairs literature and analyzed student learning models at other institutions

• Recognized the overlap between literature, other institutional models, and what we had drafted

• We knew we were on the right track!
Student Learning and Engagement

Development of PCLs

• Adapted the existing PULs to accommodate our work and added two new domains:

  **Intrapersonal Development**
  The ability of students to be aware of their emotions, behaviors, and motivations, analyze their strengths and weaknesses, and take responsibility for their decisions and actions.

  **Interpersonal Development**
  The ability of students to navigate social and organizational systems such that they acknowledge and respect the values of others in their interactions while creating conditions of mutual benefit for themselves and those around them.

http://studentaffairs.iupui.edu/about/assessment/learning-outcomes.shtml
Principles of Co-Curricular Learning

1. Communication Skills
2. Critical Thinking
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge
4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness
5. Understanding Society and Culture
6. Values and Ethics
7. Intrapersonal Development
8. Interpersonal Development
Principles of Co-Curricular Learning

Development of PCLs

Consulted with key campus constituents:
- Academic Affairs (M. Fisher, S. Hundley)
- Assessment (T. Banta, S. Kahn)
- Graduate Learning (S. Queener)
- Undergraduate Learning (K. Johnson, S. Baker)
- Higher Education (L. Patton Davis)

Assessments targeted to students with whom we have ongoing contact:
(e.g., Student Leaders, Employees, Resident Advisors)
Connecting Student Affairs to Retention

Retention

• Complex issue with many factors. There is a lot that we know and can control and much that we cannot control.

• Students who are engaged tend to persist at higher rates compared to those who are not.

• Connecting and engaging with the students on our campus is a plus.
Correlation between Engagement and Student Success

There are many touch points for students both in and out of the classroom.

Out of classroom examples:

- Leadership opportunities
- Student employment
- Resident advisors
- CAPS
- Student mentors
- Internships
- Student Activities Programming Board
- Residential Based Learning Communities
- Service scholars (community service and civic engagement)
- Student organizations
- Fraternities and sororities
- Student governance
- Democracy Plaza
Connection to Retention

• Robbins et al (2009) established three determinants of academic success:
  1. Self-Regulatory Control
     (ability to self-manage & self-regulate attitudes & feelings)
  2. Motivational Control
     (ability to respond to prescribed behaviors)
  3. Social Control
     (Reinforce learning environments and maintain appropriate interactions with formal and informal networks)
Connection to Retention

• Academic Success is defined as:
  – Academic Performance
  – Academic Retention
Connection to Retention

Adapted Model from Steven Robbins Meta-analysis Research

- Self-Regulatory Control
- Motivational Control
- Social Control

Academic Performance

Academic Retention

Co-Curricular Alignment Project

• The Division conducted a co-curricular alignment in the fall 2013 semester.

• All functional units selected at least one program from each area and mapped it to the PCLs.
  – 51 programs or points of service for students
  – Connected to over 140 outcomes within the eight learning domains.
  – The next slide shows how these programs and services align with the eight PCL domains
### Principles of Co-Curricular Learning

#### Co-Curricular Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCL 1</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>PCL 2</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>PCL 3</th>
<th>Integration &amp; Application of Knowledge</th>
<th>PCL 4</th>
<th>Intellectual Depth, Breadth, &amp; Adaptiveness</th>
<th>PCL 5</th>
<th>Understanding Society &amp; Culture</th>
<th>PCL 6</th>
<th>Values &amp; Ethics</th>
<th>PCL 7</th>
<th>Intrapersonal Development</th>
<th>PCL 8</th>
<th>Interpersonal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**IUPUI Division of Student Affairs**

**Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis**
Integration of PCLs into Retention Model

• The Co-Curricular Alignment data were linked back to the Retention Model by mapping the percent of programs and services by the determinants for academic success:
  – Self-Regulatory Control = 48%
  – Motivational Control = 16%
  – Social Control = 36%

• On the next slide, note how the PCLs are aligned with the academic success determinants (Robbins et al, 2009)
Connection to Retention
Adapted Model from Steven Robbins Meta-analysis Research

PCLs: Next Steps

Next Steps for sharing details of our process:

✓ Faculty Council Executive Committee
✓ School of Liberal Arts Faculty Assembly
✓ Faculty Council
✓ Graduate School Council
✓ General Education Task Force

Next Steps for further developing of our learning outcomes:

✓ Create a common set of sample questions mapped to PCLs for use when developing measures for assessing learning (under review)
  – Develop/adapt existing instruments for assessing learning

Spring 2014: Data Collection