

## **Indianapolis Faculty Council (IFC) Minutes**

**March 2, 2010 ~ University Place Conference Center, Room 137 ~ 2:15 – 4:30 p.m.  
Executive Session: 1:00 – 2:00 p.m. – Chancellor’s Review Summary Report**

**Faculty and Guests Present:** Laurie Ackerman, William Agbor-Baiyee, Jeff Anglen, John Applegate, Rachel Applegate, Simon Atkinson, Carol Baird, Sarah Baker, Trudy Banta, Charles Bantz (IFC only), Martin Bard, Terry Baumer, Anne Belcher, Ed Berbari, Robert Bigsby, Jacqueline Blackwell, Bonnie Blazer-Yost, William Blomquist, Polly Boruff-Jones, Terri Bourus, Marion Broome, Debra Sue Burns, Janice Cox, Todd Daniels-Howell, Andre De Tienne, Nancy Eckerman, George Edwards, Garland Elmore, Scott Evenbeck, Vance Farrow, John Finnell, Mary Fisher, Jan Fulton, Jan Froehlich, Jay Gladden, Philip Goff, Linda Adele Goodine, Charles Goodlett, Cliff Goodwin, Brady Harman, Joseph Harmon, Nate Harris, John Hassell, Jennifer Hehman, Sue Herrell, Marilyn Irwin, Kathy Johnson, Sheila Kennedy, Debomoy Lahiri, Kathy Lay, David Lewis, Chris Long, Jane Luzar, Joyce MacKinnon, Brenna McDonald, Michael McRobbie (Bantz Review Only) Henry Merrill, Bethany Neal-Beliveau, Bart Ng, C. Subah Packer, Megan Palmer, Michael Patchner, Narayanan Perumal, G. David Peters, Rebecca Porter, William Potter, Stephen Randall, Fred Rees, Dawn Rhodes, Lisa Riolo, Chuck Schalliol (Bantz Review Only), Alan Schmetzer, Jodi Smith, Uday Sukhatme, David Suzuki, G. Marie Swanson, Rosalie Vermette, Marwan Wafa, Richard Ward, Stuart Warden, Amy Conrad Warner, John Watson, Jeff Watt, Elizabeth Whipple, Karen Whitney, Jack Windsor, Marianne Wokeck, Wanda Worley, Frank Yang, and Oner Yurtseven

**Faculty Absent:** Ron Ackerman, Margaret Adamek, Austin Agho, Stephen Allen, Enrica Ardemagni, Samantha Bartholomew, Teri Belecky-Adams, Marc Bilodeau, D. Craig Brater, James Brown, Janice Buelow, John Butterworth, Daniel Callison, Amanda Cecil, Ellen Chernoff, Philip Cochran, Oscar Cummings, Valerie Eickmeier, Anthony Faiola, Carol Brooks Gardner, Greg Garrett, Lawrence Goldblatt, Allison Howland, Susan Hyatt, Pamela Ironside, Joan Kowolik, Pam Laucella, Carmen Luca-Sugawara, Virginia Majewski, Deanna Malatesta, Mary Beth Minick, Mathew Palakal, Simon Rhodes, Kevin Robbins, Gary Roberts, Patricia Rogan, Robert Schnabel, Bill Schneider, Clark Wells, Frank Witzmann, and William Wooden

### **Special Meeting of the IFC: Review of Chancellor Bantz**

As is the policy of Indiana University, a special meeting of the voting members of the IUPUI Faculty Council (IFC) and the Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council (UFC) met in Executive Session, prior to the IFC meeting, to hear the final report of the review committee for Chancellor Charles R. Bantz. The meeting began at 1:00 p.m. and was chaired by Chuck Schalliol, Chair of the Review Committee, as well as President Michael McRobbie.

### **Agenda Item I: Welcome and Call to Order**

IUPUI Faculty Council Vice President, Jeff Watt, called the meeting to order at 2:17 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 February 2, 2010, Minutes**

A correction was made in Agenda Item VII as follows:

- Correction: The IU *Academic Handbook* does not say the NIH grant is a ~~not~~-standard.

Hearing no further objections, the IFC February 2, 2010, minutes stood as corrected and was entered into record. ([http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/minutes/Minutes\\_IFC-2-2-10.pdf](http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/minutes/Minutes_IFC-2-2-10.pdf))

#### **Agenda Item IV: Updates/Remarks from the Chancellor**

Charles Banta, Chancellor, IUPUI

Chancellor Bantz gave the following report:

- Budget hearings: Bantz distributed a handout, "[IUPUI Priorities by the Faculty Council Planning and Budgetary Affairs Committees, January 2010.](#)" Budget hearings have been held on Saturdays with school clusters and service units and a lengthy list of suggestions has been generated. The PBAC will be reviewing those items for redundancy and for what can be done at the campus level. The priorities will be joined with the Academic Plan and will be assessed where the progress is and begin to map the process to bring it forward.
- IUPUI Impact Campaign: The campaign is in the silent phase. In the State of the University address, President McRobbie endorsed the four themes of the campaign which are extraordinary student success, health and life sciences, urban public research, and civic engagement.
- McRobbie mentioned in his speech the New Directions Committee which will look at the academic structure of the university. He will charge the committee soon. Bantz and Provost Karen Hanson will chair the committee. The description of the committee can be found in the State of the University speech found here: <http://www.iu.edu/~pres/speeches/022310.shtml>.
- McRobbie also spoke of the consolidation of the police departments. The department will report under Vice President John Applegate. Each campus will continue to have a Chief of Police, but will report directly to a university director for public safety. <http://newsinfo.iu.edu/news/page/normal/13615.html>
- Board of Trustees have approved two new buildings: (1) Schools of Science and Engineering and Technology lab building which will be built next to the Library and near the Science complex, (2) parking garage near the Natatorium to hold 1300 cars.
- School of Engineering and Technology Dean Search: The committee and administration will move expeditiously to bring candidates in for interviews.
- Dean Sukhatme reported on Town Hall Meetings which center on the academic mission. The schedule follows:
  - RISE (Mary Fisher): February 15, 2010, 4:30 – 6:00 p.m., University Library Lilly Auditorium – COMPLETED.
  - IUPUI Honors College (Jane Luzar): March 8, 2010, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., University Library Lilly Auditorium
  - IUPUI's Role in the STEM Teacher Preparation (Kathy Marrs and Pat Rogan): March 22, 2010, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., University Library Lilly Auditorium
  - Improving Graduate Education and Support (Sherry Queener and John Omachonu): April 1, 2010, 4:30 – 6:00 p.m., University Library Lilly Auditorium
  - 2012 Accreditation – Connecting Courses with PULs and Assessment (Mary Fisher and Trudy Banta): April 28, 2010, 4:00 – 5:30 p.m., University Library Lilly Auditorium

#### **Agenda Item V: Updates/Remarks from the IFC President**

Simon Atkinson, President of the Faculty, gave the following report:

- Executive Committee (EC): The EC is reviewing the function of the Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee after having been appointed two years ago and the extent to which some international programs should pass through this committee as well as the International Affairs Committee.
- Bill Blomquist gave an outstanding presentation to the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee on the School of Liberal Arts.
- Carol Brooks Gardner has had to step down from the EC for health reasons. The EC, based on the elections results of the previous year, has appointed Todd Daniels-Howell in her place.

- The University Faculty Council (UFC) Agenda Committee has met and is discussing how to restructure the UFC to find a function and role to be of more use. A task force is being constructed. The UFC will meet again soon and will review the policy for the core school deans.
- Thanks were given by Marilyn Irwin about the process to get faculty members to serve on the Blaise Cronin Administrative Review Committee.

**Agenda Item VI: [Action Item] Extension of the Tenure Clock Policy**

Andre De Tienne, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

Policy: [http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/policies/tenure\\_clock\\_final\\_2010.pdf](http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/policies/tenure_clock_final_2010.pdf)

De Tienne reviewed the policy then addressed the questions posed to the Faculty Affairs Committees (FAC) from the last meeting of the IFC:

- Whether to extend the nine years to ten years instead: De Tienne said, “one motive behind the suggestion was a misunderstanding that the representation was made that no other medical school that extended the probationary period had adopted a nine-year period: they went to ten or beyond. The reality is that this is not exact. More than half of those schools extended the probationary period to eight or nine years. Another crucial reason against the suggestion is that legal counsel, Joe Scodro, advised that any extension beyond nine years would require the Board of Trustees' approval. The Trustees have already approved the stop-the-tenure-clock policy, which has a maximum of two years. Scodro infers that they would have no problem with a nine-year period on that account. But more than nine years would put IUPUI on a legal “quicksand,” given the language in the IU Handbook (p. 64 col. 2) states that “the total probationary period may not exceed seven years.” That statement, if anything, remains an Achilles' heel in this entire debate. The third counter-argument is that IUSM is perfectly content with the nine years, even if they began by requesting ten years, which is precisely because no one wants to bring the matter to the Trustees.”
- Whether to extend the policy to all current tenure-track faculty at IUSM because it would otherwise be “unfair:” “The FAC believes this is not a matter of unfairness. The main argument behind the new policy is to allow the School to be more competitive in recruiting new faculty. Current faculty have been recruited on the basis of current conditions that they freely consented to when they signed their contract, and their hiring was just as competitive as any other. They do not need to be recruited again, and therefore the best solution is to grandfather them. Revising the current contract would be impractical. Any decision to allow an extension to any portion of the current cohort under iffy criteria is fraught with difficulties. The claim that the new policy would be unfair to the current cohort is baseless. Any policy as this one has to come with a transitional period. Some members of the previous cohorts might be understandably envious, but we should not allow a psychological fallacy to derail the initiative.”

Watt moved to allow faculty members who are not voting members of the IFC to be able to speak. The Council agreed to allow this.

Questions:

- Bigsby: We are not voting on a policy to extend tenure, we are voting on a set of criteria that the school will have to meet to move a policy forward. This was agreed. 22 years ago when he was negotiating his contract, he was given the *Academic Handbook* as his guide. The *Handbook* is our contract and the policy change we are considering are an integral part of our contract. It is a fundamental change to the *Handbook*. The intentions were good in creating the policy. The intent is to enhance the success of young faculty members. We need to be careful in how we handle this policy change. Quoting from the *Handbook*, “The principle of tenure imposes reciprocal responsibilities on the University as a body politic and on the faculty member and

librarian. In order to meet its responsibilities to its students and to society, the University must attract and retain faculty and librarians of outstanding quality. To that end the University provides academic freedom and economic security, which are implicit in the principle of faculty and librarian tenure. The faculty members, on their part, are obligated to maintain high standards of teaching, research, service, and professional conduct.” We need to change the *Handbook* in order for this policy to take place. Bigsby feels that although faculty will not be discouraged in going up in a normal process, that they will be given consideration and elevation to the standards. The IU constitution is in the *Handbook* and speaks to faculty having the “legislative authority.” In Item H of the proposed policy, it states to “Hold a referendum (or the substantial equivalent) on the issue of extending the tenure probationary period in which all tenured/tenure-track faculty vote.” What does “moving the proposal forward” in that section mean? It is not up to the Executive Committee or the Dean of the Faculties to make a decision on a policy change on the standards for promotion and tenure. The legislative authority belongs to the faculty not administration.

- Applegate: When considering whether this applies to persons currently, the comment was made about recruitment. Has the committee reviewed data about the retention of faculty? Is any school having trouble with retaining faculty? De Tienne said retention at that level doesn’t seem to be an enormous factor for tenure-track faculty. Once they go up, the seven-year credence doesn’t seem to be that significant. The FAC looked at the policy from the standpoint of the argument for faculty competing with top medical schools. The policy wasn’t written to retain top faculty.
- Packer: Maybe we should reevaluate the driving force for this. The minutes reflect NIH funding and the *Handbook* actually states, “The rights of individual scholars to select their topics of research and sources of research support, draw conclusions for which they bear sole responsibility, and be protected from impositions on their work of external goals or criteria are paramount to this academic community.” NIH is gender biased against women and is proven by studies by the NIH itself. We should honor contracts to our faculty about protected time for research. De Tienne said the policy is not for the School of Medicine alone. He encouraged persons to debate the policy in the forum within the schools if the school decides to move forward to try for making the policy effective in that school.
- Atkinson went on record to support the policy. The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) has taken time to ensure that the policy reflects the *Academic Handbook*. Research funding is important component in making the medical school “go.” The policy is crafted with a large number of checks and balances to ensure that it is widely accepted and that the policy is continually reviewed subsequently to the initial appointment. He feels it is proper to delegate the authority of this policy to the Executive Committee.
- Vermette asked about the checks and balances. Bigsby said the checks and balances need to be reviewed more carefully. He disagrees that we can hand over the responsibility to the Executive Committee. It is tantamount to a constitutional change. He strongly feels we need to strengthen the checks and balances so that those who want to come up on a seven-year clock; they are able to do so.
- Eckerman: I am interested in enforcement of the policy. Who is going to enforce the policy? Fisher said that the faculty in a school has to approve the policy with 2/3 vote. They also have to disapprove the policy with the same margin. All the possible safeguards have been put into the policy.
- Suzuki: What are we really voting on? Atkinson said you would be approving the policy approved by FAC to extend the tenure clock within their own schools. Outside the School of Medicine, when very controversial discussions come up in respect to race and diversity, those persons shut down because they are afraid. Administrative control over persons to use and abuse faculty can occur if faculty do not have tenure.

- Wokeck: The School of Medicine, if it would be voted positively, would need to go through the motions to approve the policy within their own schools.
- Atkinson said the reality is there is an increase of non-tenure-track faculty in the school who are far more vulnerable than those who have tenure.
- Faculty member: We all rely on peer review. In the School of Medicine, funding is the “point of the realm” of the peer review. We need more time to meet the peer review standards. The standards are becoming more competitive nationally.
- Packer: Will it be 2/3 of the tenured faculty who vote to approve the policy in the school? It was stated that the policy only applies for new faculty; not existing.
- Vermette: If Bigsby is correct and this needs a constitutional change, should it not go to the UFC? Fisher said that legal counsel has said as long as we stay within the nine years, we do not need to change the constitution.

Watt said the policy came as an administrative policy. The IFC felt it should be a faculty policy. The policy comes out of our own body, so no motion or second is needed. A paper vote was taken.

Later the results of voting for the policy was announced: Yes 43 No 19 Abstain 2 for a total of 64 votes. The motion passed. It was voted to destroy the ballots.

#### **Agenda Item VII: [Information Item] PDP: Personal Development Plan**

Scott Evenbeck, Dean, University College

Cathy Buyarski, Assistant Dean, University College

PowerPoint: [http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/evenbeckPP\\_3-2-10.pdf](http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/evenbeckPP_3-2-10.pdf)

Buyarski and Evenbeck presented the Personal Development Plan per the information contained in the PowerPoint.

Questions:

- Rachel Applegate asked if the PDP is a tab in ePort. Buyarski said it is part of Oncourse, but resides in the Eport.

#### **Agenda Item VIII: [Information Item] Announcement of Faculty Board of Review and Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel elections**

Carol Baird, Chair, Nominating Committee

Baird read the election results listed as follows:

##### **Faculty Board of Review Pool**

Term Expiring Jan 31, 2012

Barth, Andrew (Science)  
Bennett, Robert (Social Work)  
Brooks Gardner, Carol (Liberal Arts)  
Dean, Jeffrey (Dentistry)  
Hehman, Jennifer (University Library)  
Mannheimer, Steven (Informatics)  
Rees, Fred (Engineering and Technology)  
Rhodes, Nancy (Liberal Arts)  
Riolo, Lisa (Health and Rehab Sciences)  
Vargus, Brian (Liberal Arts)

##### **Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel**

Term Expiring January 31, 2012

Daley, James (Social Work)  
Horton-Deutsch, Sara (Nursing)  
Rhodes, Nancy (Liberal Arts)  
Stocum, David (Science)

**Agenda Item IX: Report from the IUPUI Staff Council**

Sue Herrell, President

Herrell reported on the following:

- Staff Council Awareness Week: The Staff Council will host information tables the week of Spring Break to bring about awareness of the Staff Council.
- Komen Race for the Cure: The race will be April 17. Co-Captains are Patty Holt and Ali Godby-Schwab. If you would like to be part of the Staff Council team, let Karen Lee know ([klee2@iupui.edu](mailto:klee2@iupui.edu)). Our goal is to have 41 registered; there are currently 17. There will be a window decorating contest this year as well. A link to register is on the SC webpage.
- Legacy Project: The SC will plant spring flowers at the two main campus portals once it gets warmer. This project is done to help the campus appearance appeal to visitors and staff, faculty, and students for years to come.
- Spring Blood Drive: April 28
- Fine Arts and Crafts Fair will be on October 30. Proceeds go to campus scholarships.

**Agenda Item X: Call for IFC or UFC Standing Committee Reports**

No reports.

**Agenda Item XI: Question / Answer Period**

No questions.

**Agenda Item XII: Unfinished Business**

No Unfinished Business.

**Agenda Item XIII: New Business**

Packer asked if the body was looking at adding the Senior Academy members as possible Board of Review members. Atkinson said the Faculty Affairs Committee would need to look at this as it would take a constitutional change.

**Agenda Item XIV: Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The motion carried. Vice President Watt adjourned the meeting at 3:47 p.m.

**Report on Council Actions (per Bylaws Article 1. Section C.3):**

Items to be Completed:

- Unit Representatives: Inclusion of the Columbus Campus

Items Completed:

- Election: Faculty Board of Review Pool and Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee
- Policy: Review Procedures for Academic Administrators: Passed February 2010
- Policy: Extension of the Tenure Clock Policy: Passed March 2010.
- Election: At-Large Members for the TTF and NTTF faculty.

Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, Karen Lee  
UN 403 / 274-2215 / Fax: 274-2970 / [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) / <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil>