Indianapolis Faculty Council (IFC)  
Minutes  
December 1, 2009 ~ Campus Center, Room 409 ~ 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.  


Agenda Item I: Welcome and Call to Order
IUPUI Faculty Council Vice President, Jeff Watt, called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

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

Agenda Item III: [Action Item] Approval of the IFC November 3, 2009, Minutes
Hearing no objections, the IFC November 3, 2009, minutes stood as written and were entered into record.  
(http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/minutes/Minutes_IFC 11-3-09.pdf)

Agenda Item IV: Updates/Remarks from the Chancellor
Chancellor Bantz gave the following report:

- Vice Chancellor Karen Whitney gave the State of the Student Address on Monday evening.
- The Wishard Hospital referendum passed. Today’s Indianapolis Star shows the drawing of the new hospital and parking areas. The garage will take bids in January. The time schedule for building construction and destruction will also be given after the New Year. We will lose parking in the lots around LaRue Carter and the State Board of Health buildings.
- Parking: The bids on the east side parking garage (on the old Mary Cable Building spot) have come in below estimate. Construction will begin this month. Parking in the Vermont Street Garage is available and students have been encouraged to park there.
- The Board of Trustees will meet this Thursday and Friday at IUPUI. The agenda includes a presentation on the campus by Bantz. It will be similar to the State of the Campus address, but will show that parking is a challenge, timing for students getting to class, and using the Master Plan to ask for support for facilities to help with these problems and others. Athletics will also give a report.
• Planning and budget meetings will be held on two Saturdays in January.
• Senior Vice President for Development (IU Foundation), Marti Heil, visited campus today to discuss the Campaign for IUPUI which will be called the Impact Campaign.
• The campus marketing campaign is geared for those over 35 who can influence college attendance. Chancellor Bantz appears in advertisements on television as well as on billboards and advertisements in shopping malls.
• Oxford University Press will issue a new Shakespeare edition that Teri Bourus co-edits.

Questions:
• Schneider asked to have the Chancellor speak about the Wishard land swap at a future meeting.
• Ward asked for a budget update: The Chancellor said there is no news. The Governor has done nothing more than the original cut announced three weeks ago. The Chancellor has no expectation that the revenue forecast will be met and it is very possible that we will not make it to January without the Governor taking additional action. The deans have set aside cash in case cash needs to be given back.

Agenda Item V: Updates/Remarks from the IFC President
IUPUI Faculty President Simon Atkinson gave the following report:
• The Chancellor’s review process is gradually coming to fruition. The committee has finished its work, the Chancellor has responded to the committee, and the President is working on a formal response. The IFC and the UFC will meet in closed session with the chair of the committee. That will be in the spring semester probably in conjunction with an IFC meeting.
• The FAC has been working hard on the Review Procedures for Administrators on the IUPUI campus. We will have a first reading in January.
• A UFC working group has been working on review procedures for deans of core schools that work on both the BL and IN campuses. Windsor and Belcher have represented our campus on the working group. This will come to the UFC for approval and we will ask for input from the FAC as well.
• University Vice President for Research candidates are on campus this week. Members of the IFC-EC and Associate Deans for Research are meeting with the candidates.
• The faculty in the School of Engineering and Technology has been concerned about the university’s policies on publications which keep them from accepting contracts on export control on research. Purdue colleagues are able to accept proposals. Research administration has prepared a document that removes some restrictions on grants and contracts that allow publication delays. The next step will be for the President’s Office to appoint a working group that will include faculty and to inform all campuses to look at the issues to see if there is room to update the current policy and whether planning would include a stand-alone institute, whether this is a change in policy for all of IU, or one campus or one unit. That group should be appointed in the spring semester.
• The UFC met last week and heard a presentation from Dean Goodman on the Bloomington School of Public Health as well as detailed plans for the School of Public Health at IUPUI. Dean David Lewis gave a presentation on claiming the scholarly record (i.e., the escalating cost of textbooks and journals and how faculty can become engaged).
• The Bloomington Academic Guide was approved in the UFC to make some structural changes.
• The IFC Handbook Committee has a draft of the new version of the Supplement to the Academic Handbook almost ready. The committee will meet one more time to consider some changes made by Mary Fisher.
• The School of Public Health planning is progressing along. The IFC-EC would like to see the final proposals to get the input from faculty in the affected schools.
Agenda Item VI: [Action Item] Determination of “N”  
Simon Atkinson  
Handout: [link]

Atkinson reviewed the handout and discussed the following:
- “N” determines the number of representatives allowed on the Faculty Council. Dean Ng provided the documentation.
- The recommendation from the Executive Committee is to maintain N as 51 which is unchanged from the previous N. This would be in effect for the next two years.

Questions:
- Wokeck asked if the Dean of Honors College should be included in the Ex-Officio members. Atkinson said the Honors College has not been formally included in the IFC as they have not submitted a constitution.
- Hassell asked about Columbus representation. Could we provide them with one representative? Ng said that there are no tenure-track faculty members in Education in Columbus (there is in Business). To include representation from Columbus, this would require a change in the constitution. Atkinson said this would be included on the next IFC-EC agenda.

A motion came out of the Executive Committee so did not need to be seconded. A vote was taken and “N” was passed at 51.

Agenda Item VII: [Information Item] School Tenure Clock – Extension Policy  
Mary Fisher, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
Handout: [link]  
PowerPoint: [link]

Fisher discussed the handout and PowerPoint and reported on the following:
- The policy is administrative and was requested by the School of Medicine.
- There are conditions for a school to meet to offer the automatic extended probationary period of up to nine years to new faculty whose primary tenure will reside in that school.

The policy reads as follows (with more specific guidelines in the handout link above):

The IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculties will entertain approving extension of the tenure probationary period to up to nine years for all new tenure track faculty in a School if certain conditions are met. This policy applies only to faculty hired after the approval date of the school’s request. The 9 year probationary period would have to be clearly expressed in the initial appointment letter and acknowledged by the appointee by signature. Extension of the School’s tenure probationary period does not alter the existing school performance expectations for tenure in place at the time of appointment. Schools retain the right to update their faculty performance expectations in the future in keeping with campus and University guidelines.

Questions:
- Berbari asked about whether a dossier is equal in character for six years or nine years. Fisher said schools have submitted excellence documents that show how a candidate may need to have a longer probationary period due to the nature of their work (grants, etc). Individuals could go up for tenure at years six, seven, eight, or nine. Hassell said Item G should be changed to reflect this.
Ng asked why current policy isn’t sufficient. Fisher said recruiting becomes difficult when other programs have a different promotion policy that works for the betterment of the faculty members. Many medical school peers are using ten years as their probationary period. Bogdewic said the competition is great. Of the top 25 schools, 22 of them offer a ten year probationary period. Grant funding has dropped due to research to complete probation.

Packer expressed concern about academic freedom. Persons without tenure have no academic freedom and extending the time to achieve promotion keeps them from achieving academic freedom. Fisher said monitoring will take place because it is not known how this will go. Individuals can go up in the normal time frame if they want to.

Schneider said we do have academic freedom without tenure. He asked if Bogdewic has contacted the AAUP about the statistics of 22 schools offering a ten year period. He said they did attend an AAUP meeting in Bloomington and that group did not have a problem with the policy extension. Schneider asked if the IFC will take a vote on this. Fisher said the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) will review the proposal, but it is being presented as an administrative policy. Schneider said he would like to see the IFC approve the policy and a motion come out of FAC. Fisher said the decision rests with the Dean of the Faculties to make the decision. Schneider said he believes the policy should go through the formal policy process through the IFC.

Hassell said he presumes core schools cannot use this policy. Fisher said core schools will need to deal with this internally. Hassell said it is hard for him to see that this is pure administrative policy. He said the seven year probationary period is the one thing that holds us all together and a new policy will split us apart. This will create a different class of faculty. It was stated that most of the 22 schools are public schools. Hassell asked why we don’t just move to have this be a policy for the entire campus. Fisher said there needs to be a national movement by each of the schools that states there is a movement to go to nine years.

Will consideration for life events that is in the current policy extend a nine year extension to actually 11? Fisher said consideration for life events does remain in effect, but this will need to be taken into consideration on an individual basis.

Ng asked Bogdewic if he extends his schools probationary period to nine years, what happens if a faculty member could not receive an extension on his grant before the end of the time period. Would he grant the faculty member tenure? Bogdewic said new faculty are not “hitting the ground running” and receiving R01 grants as soon as possible. The extension will assist those persons in receiving the needed grants.

L. Ackerman said her ability to have a day to write a grant, as one of three practicing neurosurgeons on campus and continually on call, is difficult. Medicine faculty’s schedules are unique and it is difficult to achieve promotion in a ten year timeframe. She urged the Council to consider that as discussions continue.

Baumer asked if this was a school faculty vote. Fisher said the school would need to go through the procedural process. There may be some schools that are less homogenous. The policy was written as a school policy. Baumer said if there were disciplines that needed the assistance but not the entire school; it should be on a departmental policy.

Ward asked if the faculty as a whole body should make the decision or does this involve administration only. Promotion and tenure is a faculty decision. In effect, the decision of how long the tenure clock runs is no longer a faculty decision. Fisher said the faculty in the school needs to vote to make the change, so it is a faculty decision.

Bard asked if the faculty in Medicine are receiving tenure at a lower rate than others on campus and are faculty judged on different criteria during the timeframe.

Packer said that all faculty members are to have protected time to do research and if faculty are not being given that time, then that policy needs to be reconsidered.

Baird expressed concern that the policy was administrative, not faculty driven.
Schneider moved that this policy be given to the Faculty Affairs Committee for review. The motion was seconded. MacKinnon consulted Parliamentary Procedure that said that a referendum needed to be brought to the faculty body before action could be taken. Atkinson said this item would be discussed at the next IFC-EC meeting and if they feel it should be given to the FAC, they would do so. MacKinnon said a motion was made and seconded and that the only way it cannot go forward is if Schneider rescinds the vote. De Tienne spoke about the FAC seeing the policy. The committee wanted to move to a policy that was more general and not just designed for the School of Medicine. He feels this policy should be handled by the wider body and should come to the IFC. Watt said the motion on the floor was to send the policy to the Faculty Affairs Committee to discuss further based on this conversation. A vote was taken and passed to send the draft policy to the FAC for further discussion.

As more time was taken on this policy than originally allotted, Watt restructured the agenda to remove the question and answer period as well as Old and New Business.

**Agenda Item VIII: [Discussion Item] Signature Centers**
Kody Varahramyan, Vice Chancellor for Research

Varahramyan discussed the PowerPoint:
- The new deadline to submit a proposal is April 1, 2010.

**Agenda Item IX: [Information Item] Undergraduate Student Government**
Brady Harman, Student Body President, Undergraduate Student Government

Harman reported on what the USG does and how the IFC can work with them. Their action items are action item creation, facilities, food services, student services, campus sustainability, student involvement, academics, and empowerment. Vermette asked if the USG is considering running the student evaluations of faculty. Harman said the USG wants to look at how that is done, what happens to the evaluations once they are submitted, etc. Vermette suggested they look at other school processes.

**Agenda Item X: Report from the IUPUI Staff Council**
This item was stricken from the agenda due to the lack of time.

**Agenda Item XI: Question / Answer Period**
This item was stricken from the agenda due to the lack of time.

**Agenda Item XII: Unfinished Business**
This item was stricken from the agenda due to the lack of time.

**Agenda Item XIII: New Business**
This item was stricken from the agenda due to the lack of time.

**Agenda Item XIV: Adjournment**
A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The motion carried. Vice President Watt adjourned the meeting.
Report on Council Actions (per Bylaws Article 1. Section C.3):

Items to be Completed:

- School Tenure Probationary Period Extension Policy: Review by the Faculty Affairs Committee
- Unit Representatives: Inclusion of the Columbus Campus

Items Completed:
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