

IUPUI FC Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes of November 17, 2006

Present: A. Barth, H. Besch, C. Bostrom, A. De Tienne (chair), J. Dynlacht,
S. Hamilton (Administrative liaison), J. Hehman, R. Osgood, L. Schwecke,
M. Wolf, M. Wagner (Executive Committee liaison), R. Yost
Visitor: Bart Ng
Excused: B. Blazer-Yost, S. Fox, R. Gunderman, K. Robertson, U. Sukhatme
Absent: D. Agarwal, Y. Chen, T. Cummins, R. Nickolson, K. Petsche, L. Riolo

1. De Tienne called the meeting to order at 2:10 P.M. in the meeting room of the Institute for American Thought (ES0014). A revised agenda was handed out and corrected again to accommodate IFC President Bart Ng's presence at the start of the meeting. Minutes of the 20 October 2006 meeting were approved with no correction.

2. **THREE-YEAR REVIEW POLICY** [DISCUSSION ITEM]. De Tienne summarized the latest developments, from the FAC comments on the policy to the 7 November discussion that Jennifer Hehman led of it at the IFC, to Associate Dean of the Faculties Sharon Hamilton's subsequent revision of the policy, to Bart Ng's complete rewrite of it, and its discussion and unanimous approval by the IFC Executive Committee on November 16. Ng explained the rationale of his rewrite (see document "Policy on Three-Year Formative Review of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty & Librarians"). A new clean document was needed that took into account a variety of comments and concerns while focusing more pointedly on the spirit of the policy, which is to spell out general guidelines that schools without an existing policy ought to follow in order to conduct three-year reviews. Ng singled out some of the main features of the new document: a clear definition of what is meant by "three years," the deans' responsibilities in submitting copies of the review to the Office of the Dean of Faculties (ODF), and what documents the faculty under review should "only" submit. Hamilton stated she was perfectly happy with the rewrite and the spirit of faculty-administration collaboration that presided over it. The rewrite focuses on the substance of what a three-year review ought to consist of, and no longer seeks to specify the kind of course of action the ODF will take once it is in possession of the three-year reviews. Ng argued that the IFC should neither do the job of the administration nor tell it how to conduct its business: it's a matter of mutual pragmatic trust. Some latitude must be given to the Dean of the Faculties as far as deciding what steps ought to be taken in order to improve performance and raise expectations. As Hamilton remarked that she was also busy updating the *Academic Handbook* (which has not be overhauled since 1999 despite many policy changes in the interval), the question was raised whether the formative review policy ought to become an IFC policy, or an administrative policy endorsed by the IFC. Ng favors the latter but is open to either, depending on what faculty prefer, and Hamilton shared the same view. Wolf raised a question regarding how the feedback from the ODF would trickle down to individual faculty. Ng stated that this was a matter best left to the ODF's own judgment, on a case by case basis. The new policy makes it very clear that no supervisor or administrator can use the review for (non-)reappointment decision, and that the only thrust of it is to ensure faculty receive the best advice in order to succeed. Wolf remarked that clinical faculty might also benefit

from a similar kind of policy, and Ng said he would take up the matter with the Dean of the Faculties, cautioning however that this would represent an additional workload of such amplitude that the wisdom of it would have to be seriously examined. De Tienne reminded that one important advantage of the policy, as Ng has insisted upon, is that the Dean of the Faculties would get a much better idea of what the IUPUI faculty are doing, and of how well they are doing it. To show the ODF's helpful mindset, he drew attention to the draft of a letter prepared by Hamilton the day before, at the conclusion of a workshop with faculty having just undergone the three-year review, a letter in which the latter share they experience with new faculty and tell them how to go about preparing for their own three-year review. Besch offered a few editorial corrections to the policy. It was decided that De Tienne would circulate the document with proposed changes to the entire committee by email, and that once it would reach an acceptable stage, the Committee would be asked to vote on whether or not to endorse the document. A straw poll among members present indicated general approval of the policy. The policy is slated for discussion (possibly as an action item) at the December 5 meeting of the IFC.

3. FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW [DISCUSSION ITEM]. De Tienne handed out a document put together with IFC Coordinator Molly Martin's help that provides data about the frequency of faculty board of reviews over the last three years; it also includes Martin's testimony on how hard it is for the Nominating Committee to come up with a slate of nominees for the Board of Review pool (30 names for 20 elected positions), and how harrowing the experience of sitting on a board can be. Ng explained the difficulty of putting together review boards while avoiding conflicts of interest, described in general terms the kinds of cases that come in front of a board of review, and testified how board members invariably conduct their difficult work with unfailing conscientiousness, thoroughness, and remarkable impartiality. Ng also alluded to current difficulties involving the sometimes callous, occasionally even unacceptable kind of response the IUPUI administration offers to those painstaking reviews, and that this was becoming a problem that our Committee would need to address. Regarding the possibility of increasing the review pool, De Tienne represented that it would be difficult to make a case for it on the basis of the numbers provided, and that Martin had suggested that a more judicious preselection of nominees could probably help solve the problem. The bylaws also allow the Executive Committee (section IV.E.2.b) to repeat the nomination/election process during the course of a year if needed. Ng said he would look into it, and re-discuss the issue with the Executive Committee before getting back to us.

4. STUDENTS SATISFACTION SURVEYS. There was again no time to initiate discussion of this question. De Tienne asked Robert Yost to prepare a document that identifies issues to be addressed at a future meeting.

5. NEW BUSINESS. There was none.

6. SPRING MEETINGS. Committee members will be polled by email regarding best meeting times.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 P.M.

Submitted by André De Tienne, 17 November 2006