

IUPUI Faculty Council

Annual Report 2014-15

Prepared by:
Lori Klosterman
Academic Affairs Coordinator

We, the faculty members of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, in recognition of our common goal to better human conditions through the process of education, and in recognition and appreciation of the rights and responsibilities bestowed upon us by the state of Indiana through the Indiana University and the Purdue University Boards of Trustees for the accomplishment of this goal, do establish this Constitution for the purpose of creating a system which will aid in the identification, definition, and accomplishments of major specific objectives of this faculty.

~IUPUI Faculty Council Constitution Preamble

Getting the Job Done

Policies/Amendments Passed:

- Sustainability of Research Centers (Approved September 2, 2014)
- Open Access (Approved October 7, 2014)
- [Ad Hoc] Distance Education Committee moved from ad hoc status to a standing committee (Approved May 5, 2015)
- Approval of the University Faculty Council to have three co-chairs (Approved May 5, 2015)
- Change in name and charge of the IUPUI Faculty Handbook Committee to the IUPUI Faculty Guide Committee (Approved May 5, 2015)
- Faculty Bonus Plan for IUPUI (Approved May 5, 2015)

Resolutions:

- Memorial Resolutions:
 - Marilyn Bartlett (School of Medicine)
 - Jerome Clark (School of Engineering and Technology)
 - David Gibson (School of Medicine)
 - Hiremagalur Jayaram (School of Medicine)
 - Marie Turner-Wright (University Library)

Elections:

Elected to the Promotion and Tenure Committee

- Rick Ward (through 2017)

Unit Representatives:

Fairbanks School of Public Health*

6/15 Ross Silverman

*Given provisional approval by the EC on 6-14-13; granted approval 5-21-14

Herron School of Art

6/15 Vance Farrow

IUPU Columbus

6/16 Crystal Walcott

Kelley School of Business

6/16 Sasha Fedorikhin

Tod Perry (spring 2015)

Lilly Family School of Philanthropy*

6/15 Dwight Burlingame

*Given provisional approval by the EC on 1-23-14 beginning fall 2014

McKinney School of Law

6/16 Jim Nehf

School of Dentistry

6/16 Richard Jackson

6/16 Joan Kowolik

School of Education

6/16 Erik Tillema

Jim Scheurich (alternate)

School of Engineering and Technology

6/16 Dan Koo

Doug Acheson (fall 2014)

6/15 Charles Feldhaus

School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences

6/15 Jeffrey Crabtree

School of Informatics and Computing

6/15 Josette Jones

Katherine Schilling

School of Liberal Arts

6/16 Julie Belz

6/15 Daniella Kostroun

Ben Van Wyke (alternate/fall)

6/16 Tim Lyons

School of Medicine

6/16 Jan Froehlich

6/16 Amber Mosley

6/16 Elizabeth Whipple

6/16 Tim Corson

6/16 Dan Rusyniak

6/15 Rafat Abonour

6/15 Alan Ladd

6/15 Richard Nass

6/15 Mehdi Nassiri

6/16 Robert Siwec

6/15 Frank Yang

6/15 Marc Mendonca

6/15 Abigail Klemsz

6/15 Emily Walvoord

School of Nursing

6/15 Pamela Ironside

School of Physical Education and Tourism Management

6/16 Rafael Bahamonde

School of Public and Environmental Affairs

6/15 Deanna Malatesta

Jody Sundt (alternate)

School of Science

6/16 Charles Goodlett

6/16 Robert Minto

6/15 John Watson

School of Social Work

6/16 Barbara Pierce

Heather McCabe

(alternate)

University Library

6/16 Tina Baich

University Faculty Council:

Term Expires June 30, 2016

John Hassell (Business)

Wendy Morrison (Liberal Arts)

Bill Orme (University Library)

Jeff Watt (Science)*

*Indicates members of the UFC Executive Committee

IFC Executive Committee:

Term Expiring June 30, 2016

Josette Jones (Informatics and Computing)
Kristi Palmer (University Library)
Ken Rennels (Engineering and Technology)
Jeff Watt (Science)

IFC Nominating Committee:

Term Expiring June 30, 2016

John Hassell (Business)
Kathy Marrs (Science)
Deb Stiffler (Nursing)
Jack Windsor (Dentistry)

At-Large Representatives:

Tenured/Tenure Track

Term Expiring June 30, 2016

Ryan Anderson (Medicine)
Sarah Baker (Medicine)
Edward Berbari (Engineering and Technology)
Janice Blum (Medicine)
Angela Bruzzaniti (Dentistry)
Heather Coates (University Library)
Tatiana Foroud (Medicine)
Jan Froehlich (Medicine)
Mark Kaplan (Medicine)
Daniella Kostroun (Liberal Arts)
Angela McNelis (Nursing)
Christine Picard (Science)
William Schneider (Liberal Arts)
Rosa Tezanos-Pinto (Liberal Arts)
Richard Ward (Liberal Arts/CRL)
L. Jack Windsor (Dentistry)

Non-Tenure Track

Term Expiring June 30, 2016

Clinical Category

Monica Medina (Education)
James Flynn (Business)

Lecturer Category

Nancy Evans (Engineering and Technology)
Barbara Russo (Nursing)

Research Category

Robert Barr (Science)

Faculty Board of Review Pool:

Term Expiring January 31, 2016

Alexander Dent (Medicine)
Charles Goodlett (Science)
Josette Jones (Informatics & Computing)
Miriam Murphy (Law)

Horia Petrache (Science)
Karen Pollok (Medicine)
John Schild (Engineering and Technology)
Amy Schmidt (Medicine)
Jeff Watt (Science)
Clark Wells (Medicine)

Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel: Term Expiring January 31, 2016
Leonidas Koniaris (Medicine)
Miriam Murphy (Law)
Mary Beth Riner (Nursing)
L. Jack Windsor (Dentistry)

Annual Report on Board of Review Activity (Since May 2014)

Marianne S. Wokeck, President
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
May 5, 2015

Total Number of Board of Review Cases: 0
Total Number of Requests Denied: 0

Number of Board of Review Cases for:

- Dismissal
- Academic Freedom
- Nonreappointment
- Tenure
- Promotion
- Salary Adjustment
- Nature or Conditions of Work
- Office of Equal Opportunity

Board of Review Case 12-01 disbanded due to inaction by the grievant.

Total Number of Grievances 0

Members of the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel reported one contact by a faculty member or librarian during the 2014-2015 academic year.

0 Grievances were resolved prior to any request for a Board of Review
0 Grievances were sent to a Board of Review
0 Grievances have not been referred to a Board of Review

Applauding Excellence

The following faculty members were recognized as having served on the IUPUI faculty for 20 years:

Alex Aisen	Kathy Johnson	Kent Redman
Carla Aldrich	James Jones	Patricia Rogan
Masatoshi Ando	Mark Kelley	Steven Russell
Mary Austrom	Christian Kraatz	Stuart Schrader
Joseph Bidwell	Frederick Leickly	Robert Schweitzer
Bonnie Blazer-Yost	Charles Lewis	Stanley Spinola
Daniel Clark	David Lewis	Sharon Stoten
Catherine Dobris	Chris Long	W. Sullivan
Mohamed El-Sharkawy	Michael Lykens	Robert Sweazey
Gary Felsten	Deborah McGregor	Darlene West
James Fortenberry	Bruce Molitoris	Karen Wolf
Julia Foster	David Nakata	Robert Yost
Sandeep Gupta	Bethany Neal-Beliveau	Xin Zhang
Kenneth Gwartz	Eric Nordgulen	Gregory Zimet
Alexander Its	Samuel Nunn	

Continuing the Work

Per the IFC Constitution, Chancellor Charles Bantz gave the annual State of the Campus address on November 18, 2014.

The Faculty Census was presented on December 4, 2014, and can be found attached to the minutes of that meeting.

The IFC participated on campus committees such as the Campus Sustainability Committee, Chancellor's Professor Selection Committee, e-Port Liaison, Task Force on Sexual Assault and Prevention, Resource Planning Committee, Campus Center Advisory Board, Campus Administrative Policy Advisory Committee, Intergroup Dialogue Steering Committee, UFC Compensation and Benefits Committee, and various search and screen committees.

The Staff Relations Committee worked with the Faculty Relations Committee and the Campus Planning Committee to submit a combined response to the university's Bicentennial Strategic Plan.

Committee Reports:

See the individual full reports on the committee web pages at <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/committees>. A Report on Council Actions follows:

Report on Council Actions (per Bylaws Article 1. Section C.3)
2014-2015
June 30, 2015

Items to be 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. Annual Report 2014: The proposed policy was put on hold pending further fact-finding and deliberation.)*
- Grade Forgiveness Policy *(Annual Report 2014: Carried over from 2012-2013. Should this assignment be eliminated?)*
- Investigate what, if any, "University Sanctioned Events" should be included in the Registrar's list of Course Policies *(Annual Report 2014: Committee added this assignment for the 2014-15 AY.)*
- IUPUI Policy on International Teaching Assistants
- Potential Policy on Credit Hour Overlap Between Minor to Major or Major to Second Major (Porter email of 5-14-14) *(Reported at February 3, 2015, IFC Meeting: The committee concludes that the academic units should have such policies and is generating a draft.)*
- Evaluation of IUPUI Withdrawal Deadlines
- For 2015-16: Decide whether or not common questions should be adopted for course evaluations at IUPUI. Determine how common questions should be handled within core schools at IUPUI.

Budgetary Affairs Committee:

- Assessments (School of Medicine)

Campus Planning Committee:

- Review IUPUI Strategic Plan including performance indicators and identify important goals and formulate priorities recommendation from the faculty's point of view. *(Update: review ongoing.)*
- Review and comment on National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) survey and other tools that gather information about students and faculty. *(May 2014/May 2015: No action taken due to priority given to other action items.)*
- Review and comment on PULSE surveys; the data gathered by these surveys may be reviewed by this committee; examples: campus safety; diversity; common theme. *(May 2014/May 2015: No action taken due to priority given to other action items.)*
- Review and comment on Continuing Student Campus survey (first and second years – in house); (every third year NSSE is administered) *(May 2014/May 2015: No action taken due to priority given to other action items.)*
- Advise IUPUI Administration: Planning and Institutional Improvement Administrative Liaison on outcomes. *(May 2014: Ongoing.)*
- Investigate and report/recommend a response on space utilization plans for campus buildings and plans on renting space to non-IU entities. *(No action taken due to lack of information available to the committee.)*

Constitution and Bylaws Committee:

- Verbatim Minutes: Review proposal to exclude notation of taking verbatim minutes if a recording is being made during council meetings. *(Committee discussed this item; will suggest wording.)*
- Nominations Committee: Review and change bylaws so that the Nominations Committee is made up of faculty governance leaders of the schools. *(Update 7-10-14 and 6-10-15: keep on agenda.)*
- Review and rewrite the charge to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. *(Update 7-10-14 and 6-10-15: keep on agenda.)*
- Recognition of Honors College *(Update 7-10-14 and 6-10-15: Recognition was discussion, but until the school submits a constitution and bylaws for review, no action is taken. Keep on agenda until C&B submitted by Honors College.)*
- FGAP Bylaws revision (problem raised by Handbook Committee/Faculty Affairs Committee in 2013-2014). *(Update 7-10-14 and 6-10-15: keep on agenda.)*
- Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee: *(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. The committee has been endorsed, so a motion is needed.)*
- Limit the amount of time a Board of Review can be heard before time runs out once it has been assigned by the IFC-EC. (Motion made by IFC-EC on March 27, 2014.) *(Update 7-10-14 and 6-10-15: keep on agenda.)*

Faculty Affairs Committee:

- Discuss the grievance process and the Board of Review procedures with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. *(Update from annual report: Ongoing discussion: Theme of grievance = due process. Remaining questions: 1) good cause=not defined in bylaws; 2) full-time=100% or benefit eligibility (eligible for reappointment regular?); 3) What is grievance process for part-time faculty? Type of employment – serve at will (administrators, PG); 4) Adjunct faculty-freelance contract? – See handbook 2006 needs further investigation / Bylaws p. 18. Committee to continue the discussion in 2014-15. Will be carried over to 2015-16.)*
- “Term Contracts” in the School of Medicine for faculty not complying with standards set by the school. *(Update from annual report: Committee not able to identify the problem to be addressed during 2014-15.)*
- School of Medicine policy issued for compensation guidelines for tenured faculty. *(Update from annual report: Lengthy discussion eventually foundered on the question of academic freedom. Is the SoM required to bow to the university in deciding standards?)*
- Review draft Adjunct Faculty Policy/Procedures for Promotion *(Update: Will be addressed at the September 2015 meeting.)*
- Definition of Tenure Status *(Update from annual report: Not able to identify the problem to be addressed.)*

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.
- 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:

- Biomedical Research Institute
- Policy on Centers and Institutes
- Animal safety
- 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.
- Human Subjects Research (IRB Process).
- 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.
- Monitor aspects of compliance across the university
- Purchasing and expenses on grants – detailed reporting

Staff Relations Committee:

- TIME Timekeeping System
- Health Insurance Rates – John Whelan should have a positive impact on this.
- Performance Management – John Whelan should have a positive impact on this.
- Service with Distinction
- Intergroup Dialogue and Campus Civility
- Campus Safety

Student Affairs Committee:

- Student Wellness
- Sexual Assault and Prevention

Technology Committee:

- How does the committee become informed about policies, guidelines, recommendations, proposed technologies, etc., and how can it provide input before a decision is made? *(Discussed, concerns expressed to various administrators about the lack of input until it is too late and the decisions about technology are already made. Same issue was discussed by the IFC Distance Education Committee. Continue discussion in 2015-2016.)*
- Blue course evaluation system *(Continue discussion in 2015-2016.)*
- FAR system *(Continue discussion in 2015-2016.)*
- Oncourse project sites – what do we use now?

Items Completed

Academic Affairs Committee

- Attending Classes Without Being Enrolled: Policy to be voted on by AAFC, EC, and IFC fall 2013. *(Oct. 2013 & Annual Report: The AAC has put the policy on hold and will do further fact-finding. Annual Report 2014-15: The APPC passed an administrative policy covering this; therefore, no additional action was taken.)*

- Calculation of GPAs. How much campus policy harmonization is going to be suggested as a part of the student services initiative? (*Annual Report 2014: Carried over from 2012-2013. Should this assignment be eliminated? Annual Report 2014-15: Recommends removal from action list.*)
- Policy for Acceptance of Prior Learning (PLA) Credit for Veterans (*Minutes AAC 11-10-14: The committee unanimously agreed that the proposed policy will greatly benefit Indiana's veterans and meets the goals set forth in SB 331 and aligns well with the general policies and procedures at IUPUI. Presented at 12-2-14 IFC Meeting.*)
- UFC Policy on Transfer of Credit from Two-Year Institutions (*Minutes 11-10-14: The members agreed that the current policy (ACA-56) should remain as is. They also agreed that changing the title of the current policy as suggested would be appropriate. The suggested deletion of the background paragraph appears to be unnecessary since it is not included in the document posed on the IU Policies website.*)
- Evaluation of PULs 2.0 – Focusing on Student Learning to Evaluate and Improve General Education at IUPUI (*Reported at February 3, 2015, IFC Meeting: With the goal to "enhance faculty leadership for the PULs as the foundation for general education at IUPUI," the AAC endorsed the major concepts in the report. Report filed on committee's website.*)
- UFC Policy ACA-56, Transfer of Credit from Two-Year Institutions (*Report from AAC 11-17-14 filed on committee's website. Reported at February 3, 2015, IFC Meeting: The main wording of the policy should not be changed.*)
- Review the Blue Online Course Evaluations regard to security (protection of privacy of faculty and faculty work); the analytics capabilities of the platform and how they should be used (FARS, promotion and tenure), and by whom (chairs, deans, etc.). Suggest a procedure by which the campus-wide questions should be determined and who should determine those questions and review and revise them. (*AAC Report of 4-2015 filed on committee's website.*)
- Free Exchange of Ideas – Report from the University of Chicago: Should IUPUI develop a similar statement? (*Annual Report 2014-15: Potential ramifications should be analyzed prior to adopting a similar document at IUPUI.*)
- Review the Use of Campus-wide Questions on Course Evaluations (*Annual Report 2014-15: Recommends discussions of this concept proceed across campus during the 2015-16 AY to establish whether or not campus-wide questions should be implemented here.*)

Budgetary Affairs Committee

- Parking Business Plan – Ask Dawn Rhodes and Camy Broeker to bring the plan to the committee and discuss it. Ask Rhodes to report on the plan to the IFC.

Campus Planning Committee

- Review Bicentennial Strategic Plan and compare it to the IUPUI Strategic Plan. (*Update: Submitted findings to IFC-EC.*)
- Review Bicentennial Strategic Plan and comment back to IFC-EC. (*Update: Submitted response to IFC-EC and endorsed by IFC.*)
- Review Bicentennial Strategic Plan to see if it was modified in response to IUPUI comments. (*Update: No significant changes found.*)
- Review IUPUI Strategic Plan including performance indicators and identify important goals and formulate priorities recommendation from the faculty's point of view. (*Update: Submitted comments to IFC-EC; review ongoing.*)
- Review and comment on spring 2015 faculty survey results. (*Update: Comments submitted to the IFC-EC.*)
- Attend Planning and Budget Hearings, create and submit questions for discussion, and generate report following hearings. (*Update: Report submitted to the IFC-EC.*)

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

- UFC Constitution change to reflect the change from “co-secretaries” to “co-chairs.” *(Update: Approved at 5-5-15 IFC Meeting.)*
- [Ad Hoc] Distance Education Committee’s status changed from *ad hoc* to a standing committee. *(Update: Approved at 5-5-15 IFC Meeting.)*
- With the move to using a University Policies website versus an IU Academic Handbook, the Faculty Handbook Committee’s name was changed to Faculty Guide Committee to better reflect the committee’s charge. The IFC bylaws were changed as well. *(Update: Approved at the 5-5-15 IFC Meeting.)*

Distance Education Committee

- IU Online: Schedule a joint meeting between the Distance Education Committee and the Technology Committee, with leadership from IU Online. – *(Update: The meeting was held on November 11, 2014.)*
 - Update on state authorization process
 - Status of differential funding or fee for online courses
 - ADA compliance for distance education
 - Canvas transition
 - Unizin Consortium
- Canvas transition – *(Update: Canvas has been selected as Unizin’s first learning management system, and progress is being made to add pilot content sources and analytical tools. Minutes of 11-11-14 meeting. Committee continues to monitor the progress at each meeting.)*
- Unizin Consortium – *(See update on Canvas transition.)*
- Respondus and Monitor Pilot *(Update from annual report: Received update on the pilot 3-12-15. A proctoring guideline was distributed. Will want to follow the next steps of this document, will it become a policy or just a guideline?)*
- Update on State Authorization process and ADA compliance for distance education – *(Update from annual report: Received update from Bichelmeyer and Foley 4-9-15. Discussed briefly new concerns related to video technologies and faculty development needs at IUPUI related to online instruction.)*
- Move from ad hoc status to standing committee – *(Update from annual report: Updated committee description and recommended change in status in April 2015. Change was approved in May, 2015.)*

Faculty Affairs Committee

- IUPUI Faculty Credo *(Report submitted to the IFC-EC. Discussion at the April 17, 2014, EC meeting. Developed guidelines for department chairs/not performance review. Revised Credo. Suggest adding Civility Statement.) (On IFC-EC agenda for discussion. 9-18-14: IFC-EC determined the Code of Academic Ethics takes care of the Credo. This item will not be discussed further.)*
- IUPUI Faculty Librarian Review and Enhancement: President McRobbie asked each campus to look at the policy and tweak it for their needs. At the 4-24-14 EC meeting, an administrative committee was formed composed of Melissa Lavitt, Rick Ward, Simon Atkinson, Jack Windsor, and the chair of the FAC. *(Note: 1-22-15 IFC-EC: The IFC-EC heard a report from Melissa Lavitt on the usage of the policy. It was decided the academic deans would be surveyed to see how often the policy is used. No further action will be taken by the FAC at this time.)*
 - NTTF representation on the IFC. A task force will be established by the IFC Executive Committee to review the NTTF and how they are affected through the Constitution and Bylaws, handbooks, and policies and procedures. The Faculty Affairs Committee would manage the work of the task force. The FAC should send names to the EC for inclusion in the membership of the task force. Member need to come from the schools including the School of Medicine and one member from the Handbook Committee. *(Update: On 1-15-15, the IFC-EC developed a charge to the committee. On 1-30-15, the charge and proposed committee members were sent to the FAC to pare down the list. The task force will be charged once the list is received from the FAC. 3-11-15: Task Force was charged and had first meeting.)*

- Parking Changes (*On 4-21-14 committee agenda. Annual Report: Committee decided not to take up the issue.*)
- Faculty Bonus Plan (*Update: Approved by the IFC at their 5-5-15 meeting.*)

Faculty Handbook Committee

- Completed revision of timeline for approving the supplement. (*Presented to the IFC 10-7-14.*)
- Revised the handbook to reflect the change in links to the Academic Handbook to policy numbers from the University Policies website.
- Applied numbering system to the Faculty guide as was used in the online version of the IU Academic Handbook.
- Brought the Faculty Guide into conformance with the *Chicago Manual of Style* and the IU Style Guide, including updating titles and other miscellaneous grammar and style content.
- Confirmed reliable annual archiving process with IUPUI University Library.
- Revised committee charge, changed committee name to Faculty Guide Committee, and removed references to the former IU Academic Handbook. (*Update: Approved by IFC at their 5-5-15 meeting.*)

Library Affairs Committee

- Open Access (*Passed as policy on 10-7-14.*)
- Ongoing outreach to schools. Nursing used as test site for outreach with good response. Established Open Access website for article submission: <https://openaccess.iupui.edu/>.

Research Affairs Committee

- Center Sustainability / ICR Policy (*Passed as policy on 8-15-14.*)
- Limited submission (*Update: Discussed this IFC-EC in April 2015.*)
- IRB updates (*Update: Committee was satisfied with current metrics.*)
- Research Strategic Plan (*Update: Reviewed final draft, periodic updates on status from OVCR.*)
- Search and Screen for Center for Research and Learning Director (*Update: Committee commented on position description.*)
- IU Strategic Plan (*Update: Committee offered comments related to research.*)
- Meeting with Vice President for Research (*Update: Committee met with VP Jose, reviewed current initiatives in his office. Items highlighted included limited submission policies and procedures, VPR office strategic plan.*)
- Search and Screen for Vice President for Research (*Update: Committee offered suggestions for the search and position description.*)

Staff Relations Committee

- Monitor Parking (*Update: Met with VC Dawn Rhodes, Sheri Eggleton, and Emily Wren and recommended a presentation to each of the councils. Completed.*)

Student Affairs Committee

- Personal Misconduct Procedures have changed, but there may be training that needs to be addressed. (*Update from annual report: Ongoing discussion. The 2014 changes to personal misconduct procedures were summarized, explained, and discussed.*)
- Review of Revised Student Misconduct Procedures (*Update from Annual Report: Based on recent instances several questions arose about policies and processes. Three recommendations were offered.*)
- Academic misconduct reporting form – (*Update from Annual Report: Provided feedback and suggestions regarding the form used by the Office of Student Conduct.*)

- Academic misconduct – *(Update from Annual Report: Schools may not be reporting academic misconduct instances to the Office of Student Misconduct. Moreover, there is inconsistency in the application of academic misconduct instances across schools.)*
- Transgender Students – *(Update from Annual Report: Students reported that instructors were not calling students by their correct name when taking roll. The recent change to preferred name through OneStart and Oncourse/canvas has helped.)*
- LGBTQ Students – *(Update from Annual Report: LGBTQ students' perceptions of campus climate differ on some aspects than non-LGBTQ students. Recommend that a presentation of the results of the 2014 IUPUI Climate Survey specific to the LGBTQ student population be given to the IFC.)*

Technology Committee

- Product to replace the FAR (will work with Melissa Lavitt) *(NOTE: 11-26-14 KEL: A product was selected and discussion lends to what kind of data will be received once the product is used.)*
- Conduct joint meeting of Distance Education Committee with IU Online Office Leadership - *(Update: The meeting was held on November 11, 2014.)*
- Review of FLAGS system to review enhancements made during summer 2013. *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on October 14, 2014.)*
- Review updates to the RFS system *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on February 10, 2015.)*
- Monitor transition from Oncourse to Canvas. *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on October 14, 2014.)*
- Testing Center/Online Testing Systems (Respondus) *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on January 13, 2015, and March 10, 2015.)*
- Learning Spaces on the IUPUI campus *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on January 13, 2015.)*
- Update on collaborative technologies *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on February 10, 2015.)*
- Update on the Jetstream system and IUanyWare *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on February 10, 2015.)*
- IT Dashboards *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on March 10, 2015.)*
- IU Online Update *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on March 10, 2015.)*
- Status of IUPUI ScholarWorks *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on April 14, 2015.)*
- Open Access Journal initiative *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on April 14, 2015.)*
- Evaluate Blue Online Course evaluations system IT Dashboards *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on April 14, 2015.)*
- Reviewed and approved revisions to the charge of the IFC Distance Education Committee *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on March 10, 2015.)*
- Update on new e-portfolio system (Taskstream) *(Update: Presentation/Discussion on April 14, 2015.)*

Sustainability of Research Centers

Definition of the Problem

The IUPUI campus, comprised of ~20 distinct Schools, enjoys a breadth of disciplinary excellence that is unique in the state of Indiana. IUPUI is thus well positioned to excel in inter-disciplinary endeavors to tackle complex societal problems that characterize our urban environment. This has led in recent years to the development of inter-disciplinary “Centers” that span traditional school boundaries and draw strength from units across the IUPUI campus. An ongoing challenge, however, is how to sustain such Centers after the exhaustion of start-up dollars. Funding to support or develop infrastructure is typically not available from traditional external funding agencies. Such funds are necessary for administrative functions, equipment, pilot and feasibility grants to young investigators, and continued coordination of interdisciplinary grant activity. The responsibility centered management (RCM) budget model utilized at IUPUI further limits the ability to effectively marshal resources at the campus level to respond to research opportunities. Some IUPUI Schools return a portion of “Center grant” indirect cost recovery (ICR) to the relevant Center, but these practices are unevenly applied across the campus.

The problem of how to sustain Centers once initial seed funding has been expended has been identified by the IUPUI Strategic Plan (Innovation and Discovery subgroup), the School of Medicine’s Transforming Research Initiative, and the Research Affairs Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council.

Goal

Define ongoing support for campus and university-designated research centers that span more than one School (eg, Signature Centers, Biomechanics and Biomaterials Research Center).

Ongoing support would create a structure in which larger programs and greater funding could be developed.

Proposal

A faculty member who is also a member of an inter-School Center should be allowed to designate a grant proposal submission as a Center proposal. Not all proposals a faculty member submits may be designated as such, but if the Center has provided pilot funds, research facilities and equipment, or other tangible support to a project that is submitted extramurally, that proposal should qualify for a return of 10% of the ICR that comes to the campus directly to the Center if the proposal is funded.

The source of these funds is as follows:

For every \$100 of ICR generated by a qualifying “Center Grant”, \$97.50 comes to IUPUI. Ten percent of this number (\$9.75) will be provided to the relevant Center. The campus, which

retains 20% of the \$97.50 ICR, will contribute \$4.88 to the Center. This contribution will be contingent on the relevant School(s) making a matching ICR contribution (\$4.87) to the Center.

In addition, the School contribution must not affect the distribution of ICR funds that would normally be provided to the PI and relevant department.

All proposals that are considered a part of a Center should be identified as such at the time of submission, with the agreement of the Deans of the Schools. A Credit Split Agreement between the investigators and the Schools should be completed and signed by a representative of each School and by the investigators at the time of submission. This approach would distribute funds fairly as a component of a School's participation in inter-School research centers, and not place the burden on any single School.

What is an Inter-School Center?

The policy governing Centers can be found at: http://www.indiana.edu/~vpr/centers_policy.shtml

There are several criteria that must be met for a Center to be considered an inter-school Center:

- (1) The Center must have formal designation as a Center at the campus or university levels
- (2) An inter-school Center will involve faculty members from at least two different Schools
- (3) The Center provides shared resources or Core Facilities that provide for joint use by faculty of at least two different Schools

Who is a member of a Center?

There could be several criteria by which a faculty member could be a designated member of a Center:

- (1) The faculty member is listed on a website and materials produced by the Center as a designated member of the Center
- (2) The faculty member has received tangible support from the Center that was important to developing the idea that resulted in a successful grant proposal

How much could ICR generate in support of a Center?

It is not clear, although an estimate could perhaps be developed by reviewing the ORA database or proposals. Accepting the figures of the Task Force on Sustainability of Research Centers, and assuming that only 10% of all proposals would be submitted as Center proposals, the plan could generate ~ \$500,000 per year. However, this relies on the School of Medicine having numerous inter-school connections and proposals and is probably unrealistic. Removing the School of Medicine entirely from this equation could still generate about \$75,000/yr.



IUPUI
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY
COUNCIL

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY
INDIANAPOLIS

Open Access

Circular 2014-10

FULL POLICY CONTENTS

[Scope](#)
[Policy Statement](#)
[Reason for Policy](#)
[FAQs](#)
[Definitions](#)

Effective: *October 7, 2014, by the IUPUI Faculty Council*
Last Updated:

Faculty Council Committee:
Library Affairs

Policy Contact:
Angela Bruzzaniti, Chair
abruzzan@iupui.edu

Scope

PREAMBLE

The faculty of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis is committed to disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In keeping with that commitment, the faculty adopts the following policy.

Policy Statement

GRANT OF LICENSE AND LIMITATIONS

Each Faculty member grants to The Trustees of Indiana University permission to make available his or her scholarly articles which are deemed Traditional Works of Scholarship under the Intellectual Property Policy <http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/administration-operations/intellectual-property/intellectual-property.shtml> and to exercise the copyright in those articles. More specifically, each Faculty member retains copyright and grants to the Trustees of Indiana University a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, for the purpose of making their articles widely and freely available in an open access repository, provided that the articles are not sold, and appropriate attribution is given to authors, and to authorize others to do the same.

SCOPE AND WAIVER (OPT-OUT)

The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty, except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. Faculty members retain responsibility for complying with any incompatible licensing or assignment agreements they have executed before the adoption of this policy. Upon express direction by the Faculty member, the Executive Vice Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer, or his or her designate will waive application of the license for a particular article or delay access for a specified period of time. Likewise, upon express direction by the Faculty member, a particular article's archival status (open access, no access, or delayed access) may be changed at any time.

DEPOSIT OF ARTICLES

Each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of the author's final version of each article no later than the date of its publication at no charge to the appropriate representative of the Academic Affairs Office in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by the Academic Affairs Office. The Academic Affairs Office may make the article available to the public in an open access repository. The Academic Affairs Office, in consultation with Faculty governance, is responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the faculty from time to time. The policy will be reviewed after three years and as needed thereafter.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

This policy is based on a model open access policy developed by Stuart Shieber of the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication. It includes a freely waivable rights-retaining license and a deposit requirement. This language is based on and informed by the policies voted by faculties at Harvard, MIT, Stanford University School of Education, Duke University, the University of California, and others. Information explaining the motivation for and implementation of open access policies, including an annotated model policy, is available at the web site of Harvard's Office for Scholarly Communication (<http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/>). Extensive information about good practices for university open access policies is provided in a widely endorsed guide from the Harvard Open Access Project (<http://bit.ly/goodoa>).

Reason for Policy

Among the many changes that are taking place in academic research is the growing expectation by funders that the findings of this research be made widely and freely available. Responding to these expectations, an increasing number of universities are creating open access repositories for scholarly articles produced by their faculties, to be made available to anyone with Internet access.

In response to these changes, IUPUI Faculty members are asked to consider implementing an open access policy to help disseminate the fruits of their research and scholarship. The "IUPUI Open Access Policy" was created with the goal of disseminating the research and scholarship successes of IUPUI Faculty members. The "IUPUI Open Access Policy" is in alignment with the current IUPUI Intellectual Property Policy. Additional information regarding the benefits and potential concerns of the proposed policy are provided in "Frequently Asked Questions" and "Notes Concerning Specific Language."

The IUPUI Open Access Policy is based on a model open access policy developed by Stuart Shieber of the Harvard Office for Scholarly Communication. Its language is based on and informed by the policies voted by faculties at Harvard, MIT, Stanford University School of Education, Duke University, the University of California, and others.

FAQs

BASICS

- 1. What would faculty submit?** Faculty authors would submit accepted, post peer-reviewed articles and proceedings to IUPUIScholarWorks. This policy would include co-authored articles and proceedings. Other items (book chapters, monographs, working papers, posters, presentations) would be welcomed, but not required.
- 2. How might faculty submit articles to IUPUIScholarWorks?** Upon acceptance, faculty will complete a simple web form (name, email address, department, and citation) and attach the author's accepted manuscript. *Note:* In most cases, the "accepted manuscript" (sometimes called a "post-print") is a final Microsoft Word document, with tables and images.
- 3. How might faculty opt-out of this policy?** The second screen of the submission process will give faculty three options: 1) submit; 2) embargo until a selected date; 3) opt out. Following the selection, the submitter (and other parties) will receive an automated email and transaction number.

BENEFITS

- 4. How would this policy benefit IUPUI faculty members?** This is an author's rights policy. By adopting this policy, faculty retain rights to their scholarly articles and proceedings. This policy helps faculty disseminate scholarship to any reader with Internet access. Articles openly archived in IUPUIScholarWorks are indexed by search engines, receive a stable hyperlink and are more likely to be read and cited.
- 5. How would this policy benefit IUPUI students, alumni and other communities?** By joining with other leading research universities (Harvard, Duke, MIT, Kansas, California, Stanford and more), IUPUI would show its commitment to disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible. By providing free access to scholarship, the policy would facilitate IUPUI's efforts to be "a leader in fostering collaborative relationships" and would demonstrate that "IUPUI values collegiality, cooperation, creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship as well as honesty, integrity, and support for open inquiry and dissemination of findings" (IUPUI Vision, Mission & Values: <http://www.iupui.edu/about/vision.html>).
- 6. How would this policy benefit the university?** By providing access to articles by IUPUI faculty, this policy would increase the impact of IUPUI research and creativity both on a local and global scale. Furthermore, the archive would ensure that scholarship is preserved and accessible long after journals and publishers move, consolidate or cease publication.

CONCERNS

- 7. Would this policy restrict my publishing options?** No. Faculty would be free to submit and to publish in any journal they choose.

- 8. Would journals refuse to publish my article if IUPUI adopts this open access policy?** No. Journals gladly accept articles from faculty at MIT, Harvard, California and other institutions with open access policies. If a journal refuses to publish an article under the policy, faculty always have the ability to opt out of the policy for that article.
- 9. Do I have to pay an “open access fee” in order to submit my article to IUPUIScholarWorks?** No. Most journal publishers (including Elsevier, Sage, Springer, Taylor & Francis, and Wiley) permit authors to archive manuscripts in institutional repositories at no cost to the author. Over 80% of the world’s 1.1 million articles published in 2010 could be archived under current copyright law within one year of publication (Laakso, M. 2014, *Scientometrics*, In Press. <http://www.openaccesspublishing.org/?p=146>). Ask a librarian before you pay or, if necessary, opt out of the policy.
- 10. Would the policy mean that faculty authors would give copyrights to IUPUI?** No. As the author, you own the copyright to your work until you transfer it to someone else. This policy does not result in a transfer of copyright. Rather, authors would give IUPUI a non-exclusive permission to distribute a version of the work at IUPUIScholarWorks. In fact, this policy would help faculty preserve their rights as authors to reproduce and distribute their scholarly articles.
- 11. What does the policy mean by "exercise any and all rights under copyright"?** Copyright is not one right, but rather is best thought of as a bundle of rights granted to authors by the Copyright Act. Generally, these rights are reproduction, distribution, making derivative works, public performance, and public display. For IUPUI to most effectively make scholarly articles freely and widely available, it may need to use many of these rights. For instance, simply taking a word processing file of an article, converting it to PDF and making it available for public reading or download could involve the distribution, derivative works, reproduction, and display rights. The most important points are that the policy does not prevent you from exercising any of these rights and IUPUI's exercise of these rights is only for the purpose of making the articles freely and widely available.
- 12. What if my article is archived in IUPUIScholarWorks with my permission, but afterwards I decide that I no longer want it to be available to readers on the site?** Under this policy, authors retain rights to their scholarly articles. An author may change a particular article’s archival status (open access, no access, or delayed access) at any time. Although requests are rare, authors currently have the ability to contact IUPUIScholarWorks to ask for temporary and indefinite embargos on the full text access to an item.
- 13. Would this policy result in a burdensome administrative overhead and a difficult compliance process?** The libraries have the expertise and the software to manage this process. Faculty would need to keep their final manuscript, complete the short web form (mentioned above, FAQ #3), and select “submit,” “embargo,” or “opt out.”
- 14. Would this policy hurt my reputation as a scholar?** No. By increasing your readership, this policy would be to your benefit. This policy does not reduce your opportunity to publish in any journal—including a subscription journal with a leading citation impact factor.
- 15. Would this policy have a negative impact on the quality of science and the record of scholarship?** No. By increasing access and the speed of dissemination, policies such as this one reduce barriers to research and learning. Articles archived under this policy would not replace or supplant the version of record.
- 16. Would this policy hurt my scholarly society or journal?** Authors may opt out as needed. We do not, however, have any peer reviewed evidence to demonstrate that open access policies result in

cancelled journal subscriptions. Libraries consider multiple factors when subscribing to journals, including: quality, price and anticipated use. Libraries, scholarly societies and journals face a publishing marketplace in transition; this transition will happen with or without open access policies.

17. **Would large publishers bring legal action to stop the implementation of this policy?** Commercial publishers spend a lot of money lobbying against federal public access policies, but none of the over 127 U.S. institutions with open access policies have been the subject of legal action as a result of a policy.
18. **Would co-authors from other institutions need to grant permission to IUPUI?** No. Each co-author owns the copyright to their co-authored work and may grant nonexclusive permissions without consulting the others. However, if a co-author expressed that they did not want an article to be shared in IUPUIScholarWorks, the IUPUI author could decide to opt out of the policy for that article.
19. **What if my co-authors' institutions have different policies regarding author's rights and self-archiving?** It is very unlikely that this policy will create a true conflict with policies at other institutions. In fact, IUPUI co-authors may find their work already included in the repositories of universities that have adopted a policy such as this one. See, for example, the following:

Hoggatt, J., Mohammad, K. S., Singh, P., Hoggatt, A. F., Chitteti, B. R., Speth, J. M., ... Pelus, L. M. (2013). Differential stem- and progenitor-cell trafficking by prostaglandin E2. *Nature*, 495(7441), 365–369. Available from Harvard: <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:11876987>.

Siddiki, S., Basurto, X., & Weible, C. M. (2012). Using the institutional grammar tool to understand regulatory compliance: The case of Colorado aquaculture. *Regulation & Governance*, 6(2), 167–188. Available from Duke: <http://hdl.handle.net/10161/6738>.
Citi, L., Djilas, M., Azevedo-Coste, C., Yoshida, K., Brown, E. N., & Barbieri, R. (2011). Point-process analysis of neural spiking activity of muscle spindles recorded from thin-film longitudinal intrafascicular electrodes. *Conference Proceedings: Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*, 2311–2314. Available from MIT: <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/70063>.

If, for some reason, a co-author objects to providing access to the item in IUPUIScholarWorks, the IUPUI author may decide to “opt out” of the policy for that article.

20. **But I already comply with the NIH Public Access policy, why does IUPUI need its own policy?** This policy would supplement existing public access policies—many articles are published without federal funding. By building a repository of IUPUI scholarship, we ensure that the university can maintain and preserve a record of the work completed by our faculty. By acquiring and preserving the author's accepted manuscript, the IUPUI Open Access Policy would make it easier to comply with the NIH Manuscript Submission process. One proposal for compliance with the coming U.S. agency (NSF, DOE, DOD, NEH, etc.) public access policies would leverage records in repositories like IUPUIScholarWorks for compliance.
21. **Why do we need a policy if faculty can submit works to PubMed Central, SSRN, arXiv, and other sites? Don't these services meet the need for open access archiving?** Other repositories have limitations that exclude many of the scholarly articles and proceedings authored by IUPUI

faculty. PubMed Central, for example, is not open to submissions from any author, but is limited to journal articles reporting research funded by the NIH and to biomedical journals with pre-existing agreements with PubMed Central. As your home institution, IUPUI has a vested interest in providing services that cannot be promised elsewhere--for example, long term preservation. Furthermore, this policy aims to increase access to scholarship authored by IUPUI faculty members--as such, it maximizes author's rights. By helping faculty to retain their rights, this policy facilitates sharing in any repository. If authors choose to share in another repository, IUPUIScholarWorks will archive a version of the shared item for safe keeping.

22. **I already self-archive my work in an open access repository; will this policy detract from download counts from my preferred repository (e.g. SSRN, ResearchGate, Academia.edu)?** IUPUIScholarWorks is a noncommercial repository supported by an academic library. Items are indexed for discoverability and included in long-term, digital preservation plans. If you prefer to protect your download counts at another repository, IUPUIScholarWorks will archive a version of the shared item for safe keeping, but link out to a stable URL for downloads.

Definitions

Preamble, “disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible”: The intention of the policy is to promote the broadest possible access to the university’s research. The preamble emphasizes that the issue is access, not finances.

Grant of License and Limitations, “grants”: The wording here is crucial. The policy causes the grant of the license directly. An alternative wording, such as “each faculty member shall grant”, places a requirement on faculty members, but does not actually cause the grant itself.

Grant of License and Limitations, “scholarly articles”: The scope of the policy is scholarly articles. What constitutes a scholarly article is purposefully left vague. Clearly falling within the scope of the term are (using terms from the Budapest Open Access Initiative) articles that describe the fruits of scholars’ research and that they give to the world for the sake of inquiry and knowledge without expectation of payment. Such articles are typically presented in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and conference proceedings. Clearly falling outside of the scope are a wide variety of other scholarly writings such as books and commissioned articles, as well as popular writings, fiction and poetry, and pedagogical materials (lecture notes, lecture videos, case studies). Often, faculty express concern that the term is not (and cannot be) precisely defined. The concern is typically about whether one or another particular case falls within the scope of the term or not. However, the exact delineation of every case is neither possible nor necessary. In particular, if the concern is that a particular article inappropriately falls within the purview of the policy, a waiver can always be obtained. One tempting clarification is to refer to scholarly articles more specifically as “articles published in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings” or some such specification. Doing so may have an especially pernicious unintended consequence: With such a definition, a “scholarly article” doesn’t become covered by the policy until it is published, by which time a publication agreement covering its disposition is likely to already have been signed. Thus the entire benefit of the policy’s nonexclusive license preceding a later transfer of rights may be vitiated. If clarifying language along these lines is required, simultaneously weaker and more accurate language can be used, for instance, this language from Harvard’s explanatory material (also used above): “Using terms from the Budapest Open Access Initiative, faculty’s scholarly articles are articles that describe the fruits of their research and that they give to the world for the sake of inquiry and knowledge without expectation of payment. Such articles are typically presented in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and conference proceedings.”

Grant of License and Limitations, “Intellectual Property Policy”

<http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/administration-operations/intellectual-property/intellectual-property.shtml>. The following is an excerpt from the Indiana University Intellectual Property Policy UA-05;

B. Traditional Works of Scholarship

- i. The University shall assert no claims to copyright ownership in or to distribution of revenue from Traditional Works of Scholarship.
- ii. The University may use Traditional Works of Scholarship, including Online Instructional Materials, created for ordinary classroom and program use, such as syllabi, assignments, and tests, for administrative purposes, which may include course equivalency assessments for transfer purposes, accreditation agency reviews, and other functions that allow the University to fulfill its responsibilities for accountability.
- iii. If a Creator of Online Instructional Materials leaves the University, he or she hereby grants the University a non-exclusive, royalty-free, worldwide, unlimited license to use the Online Instructional Materials for Online Instruction, including the right to revise such Online Instructional Materials.

Grant of License and Limitations, “exercise any and all rights under copyright”: The license is quite broad, for two reasons. First, the breadth allows flexibility in using the articles. Since new uses of scholarly articles are always being invented — text mining uses being a prime example — retaining a broad set of rights maximizes the flexibility in using the materials. Second, a broad set of rights allows the university to grant back to an author these rights providing an alternative method for acquiring them rather than requesting them from a publisher. Even though the university is being allowed to exercise a broad set of rights, it is not required to exercise them. Universities are free to set up policies about which rights it will use and how, for instance, in making blanket agreements with publishers. For example, a university may agree to certain restrictions on its behavior in return for a publisher’s acknowledgement of the prior license and agreement not to require addenda or waivers. Harvard has provided a model agreement of this type as well: <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/docs/model-pub-agreement-090430.pdf>.

Grant of License and Limitations, “irrevocable”: This term indicates that subsequent “transfers” of copyright do not invalidate this policy.

Grant of License and Limitations, “not sold”: This term may be preferable to the vaguer term “noncommercial”. Given that open access availability allows seamless distribution using a medium with essentially zero marginal cost, Harvard has stipulated in agreements with publishers that it will refrain even from cost-recouping sales: “When Harvard displays or distributes the Article, Harvard will not charge for it and will not sell advertising on the same page without permission of Publisher. Even charges that merely recoup reproduction or other costs, and involve no profit, will be forbidden.”

Grant of License and Limitations, “authorize others”: The transferability provision allows the university to authorize others to make use of the articles. For instance, researchers can be authorized to use the articles for data mining. The terms of use of the institution’s repository can take advantage of transferability to make available an appropriately scoped set of rights automatically for articles covered by the policy. The Harvard DASH terms of use (<http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/dash/termsfuse>) provides an example. Most importantly, the transferability provision allows the university to transfer the broad rights in the policy back to the author, so that authors can legally distribute their articles from their own web

sites, to use them for their classes, to develop derivative works, and the like. In that sense, the policy leads to authors retaining rights, not just universities obtaining rights.

Grant of License and Limitations, “do the same”: This ordering of phraseology, introduced in the MIT policy, makes clear that the transferability provision applies both to the retained rights and the noncommercial limitation.

Scope and Waiver (Opt-Out), “articles completed before the adoption”: Application of the license retroactively is problematic, and in any case suspect. This clause makes clear that the license applies only prospectively.

Scope and Waiver (Opt-Out), “will waive”: Not “may waive”. The waiver is at the sole discretion of the author. This broad waiver policy is important for the palatability of the policy. It is perhaps the most important aspect of this approach to open access policies. The ability to waive the license means that the policy is not a mandate for rights retention, but merely a change in the default rights retention from opt-in to opt-out. Many of the concerns that faculty have about such policies are assuaged by this broad waiver. These include concerns about academic freedom, unintended effects on junior faculty, principled libertarian objections, freedom to accommodate publisher policies, and the like. Some may think that the policy would be “stronger” without the broad waiver provision, for instance, if waivers were vetted on some basis or other. In fact, regardless of what restrictions are made on waivers (including eliminating them entirely) there is always a de facto possibility of a waiver by virtue of individual faculty member action demanding an exception to the policy. It is far better to build a safety valve into the policy, and offer the solution in advance, than to offer the same solution only under the pressure of a morale-draining confrontation in which one or more piqued faculty members demand an exception to a putatively exception-less policy. In any case, with several years of experience with these policies, it has become clear that waiver rates are exceptionally low even with this completely open waiver provision.

Scope and Waiver (Opt-Out), “license”: The waiver applies to the license, not the policy as a whole. The distinction is not crucial in a pragmatic sense, as it is generally the license that leads to waiver requests, not the deposit aspect of the policy, and in any case, an author has a de facto waiver possibility for the deposit aspect by merely refraining from making a manuscript available. Nonetheless, if it is possible to use this more limited formulation, it is preferable in reinforcing the idea that all articles should be deposited, whether or not a waiver is granted and whether or not they can be distributed.

Scope and Waiver (Opt-Out), “delay access”: Duke University pioneered the incorporation of an author-directed embargo period for particular articles as a way of adhering to publisher wishes without requiring a full waiver. This allows the full range of rights to be taken advantage of after the embargo period ends, rather than having to fall back on what the publisher may happen to allow. Since this is still an opt-out option, it does not materially weaken the policy. An explicit mention of embargoes in this way may appeal to faculty members as an acknowledgement of the prevalence of embargoes in journals they are familiar with.

Scope and Waiver (Opt-Out), “express”: An author must direct that a waiver be granted in a concrete way, but the term “express” is preferred to “written” in allowing, e.g., use of a web form for directing a waiver.

Scope and Waiver (Opt-Out), “direction”: This term replaced an earlier term “request” so as to make clear that the request cannot be denied.

Deposit of Articles, “author’s final version”: The author’s final version—the version after the article has gone through peer review and the revisions responsive thereto and any further copyediting in which the

author has participated—is the appropriate version to request for distribution. Authors may legitimately not want to provide versions earlier than the final version, and insofar as there are additional rights in the publisher’s definitive version beyond the author’s final version, that version would not fall within the license that the author grants.

Deposit of Articles, “no later than the date of its publication”: The distribution of articles pursuant to this policy is not intended to preempt journal publication but to supplement it. This also makes the policy consistent with the small set of journals that still follow the Ingelfinger rule. An alternative is to require submission at the time of acceptance for publication, with a statement that distribution can be postponed until the date of publication.

Deposit of Articles, “may make the article available”: The word “may” is used in a permissive sense. In some circumstances (e.g., retractions), an article may not be made available or may be archived without open accessibility. Authors may also opt to delay access to an article.

Deposit of Articles, “open access repository”: For IUPUI this will be IUPUIScholarWorks (<https://scholarworks.iupui.edu>).

Deposit of Articles, “reviewed”: Specifying a review makes clear that there will be a clear opportunity for adjusting the policy in light of any problems that may arise.

Report from the Faculty Council Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Presentation to the IUPUI Faculty Council (IFC)

April 7, 2015

With approval of the Faculty Council Executive Committee, the IFC Constitution and Bylaws Committee makes the following motions.

Motion 1:

As the [Ad Hoc] Distance Education Committee's work has increased with the addition of IU Online and other distance education matters, the IFC Constitution and Bylaws Committee moves to change the IFC bylaws to change the committee's status from ad hoc to a standing committee.

Motion 2:

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee moves to amend the Faculty Council bylaws to reflect the changes in the Distance Education Committee's charge.

FROM:

Bylaw Article III. Committees of the Faculty

Section B. Standing Committees

6. Distance Education. This committee represents the IUPUI Faculty Council and administrative interests in programs of distance education, including those that involve collaboration with other institutions. The Committee coordinates its activities with those of the IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee, the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Community Learning Network, the Office of Online Education, and individual schools. 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.

TO:

Bylaw Article III. Committees of the Faculty

Section B. Standing Committees

6. DISTANCE EDUCATION. This committee represents the IUPUI Faculty Council and advises and acts as liaison with administration as well as faculty and other units concerned with distance education, including those that involve collaboration with other institutions. The committee coordinates its activities with those of the IUPUI Faculty Council Technology Committee, the Center for Teaching and Learning, UITS, the Office of Online Education, and individual schools.

Motion 3:

The Faculty of Indiana University recently voted to change the Constitution of the Indiana University Faculty to reflect the leadership of the University Faculty Council be three “co-chairs” – one from IUPUI, one from IUB, and one from the Regional Faculty Caucus. With those changes, the IUPUI Constitution and Bylaws Committee moves to amend the Faculty Council bylaws as follows:

FROM:**Bylaw Article 1. Officers of the Council: Duties****Section A. President**

2. represent the IUPUI Faculty at the University Faculty Council meetings;

TO:**Bylaw Article 1. Officers of the Council: Duties****Section A. President**

2. serve as co-chair of the University Faculty Council and represent the IUPUI faculty at University Faculty Council and University Faculty Council Executive Committee meetings.

Motion 4:

As the university no longer supports an *Academic Handbook* for use by faculty, but rather lists policy for faculty in University Policies (<http://policies.iu.edu/>), the Constitution and Bylaws Committee moves to amend the Faculty Council bylaws to reflect the changes in the Handbook Committee’s charge as well as the name of the supplement to the handbook to The Faculty Guide.

FROM:**Bylaw Article III. Committees of the Faculty****Section B. Standing Committees**

8. IUPUI Faculty Handbook.
 - a) Composition. This committee shall include faculty members appointed by the Executive Committee and administrative members appointed by the IUPUI Chancellor as appropriate for review and production of the Handbook.
 - b) Duties. This committee shall be responsible for developing the IUPUI Faculty Handbook as a supplement to the Indiana University Academic Handbook. This committee then shall review both handbooks annually and make recommendations concerning revisions to the Faculty Council.

TO:**Bylaw Article III. Committees of the Faculty****Section B. Standing Committees**

8. IUPUI Faculty Handbook.
 - a) Composition. This committee shall include faculty members appointed by the Executive Committee and administrative members appointed by the IUPUI Chancellor as appropriate for review and production of the Faculty Guide.
 - b) Duties. This committee shall be responsible for developing the IUPUI Faculty Guide as a supplement to the Indiana University Academic Policies. This committee then shall review the IU Policies and the IUPUI Faculty Guide annually and make recommendations concerning revisions to the Faculty Guide to the Faculty Council.

Motion 5:

To reflect the change in name of the supplement to the *Academic Handbook* to the IUPUI Faculty Guide, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee moves to change the committee's name to the IUPUI Faculty Guide Committee.



IUPUI

OFFICE OF THE
FACULTY COUNCIL

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY
Indianapolis

Faculty Bonus Plan for IUPUI

Circular 2015-04

FULL POLICY CONTENTS

[Scope](#)
[Policy Statement](#)
[Procedures](#)
[History](#)

Effective: *May 4, 2015*
(Passed by the IFC at the May 4, 2015, meeting.)

Last Updated: *May 4, 2015*

Policy Contact:
Melissa Lavitt
Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
mlavitt@iupui.edu

Scope

This policy applies to Responsibility Centers (RC) that elect to award faculty bonuses.

Policy Statement

Each Responsibility Center (RC) must develop its own specific policy and process, in consultation with appropriate faculty governance groups. The bonus policy must be approved by IUPUI Finance and Administration.

Faculty bonuses at IUPUI differ from annual merit raises in terms of the source and process for funding. RC leaders recognize annual meritorious contributions during annual pay increase opportunities. A one-time cash bonus may be awarded no more than once every fiscal year in recognition of extraordinary accomplishment in service, teaching, research, and/or creative activity.

Cash bonuses cannot replace raises but are awarded in addition to raises. Raises should be awarded equitably and independent of any cash bonus award. Bonuses may not be given from funds that are intended for yearly raises. Bonus awards, like salaries, must be a matter of record made available upon request. The percentage and amount of each awarding RC's budget allocated to such bonuses annually must be available upon request.

Procedures

Only full-time appointed faculty members are eligible for faculty bonuses.

Calculation of faculty bonus:

- 10 percent of individual's base salary is the maximum for faculty bonuses (base salary is defined by the IU School of Medicine as core plus adjustable).

Process for determining faculty bonus:

- Each RC must develop its own policy and guidelines for faculty bonuses.
- Policy and guidelines must be approved by the RC's faculty governance group.
- Faculty bonus policy and guidelines must be filed with IUPUI's Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer.
- Faculty bonus policy and guidelines must be approved and administered by IUPUI Finance and Administration.
- Bonus pay is distinct from research incentive pay and extra compensation.

History

This policy replaces the Policy for Cash Bonuses for Academic Appointees at IUPUI as passed by the IUPUI Faculty Council in May 2003.

Revised by the IUPUI Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee and presented to the Faculty Council on May 5, 2015.